


July 2012

E

	منظمة الأغذية والزراعة للأمم المتحدة	联合国 粮食及 农业组织	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture	Продовольственная и сельскохозяйственная организация Объединенных Наций	Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura
---	--	--------------------	---	---	---	--

# COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY

## TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Rome, Italy, 24-28 September 2012

## MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STRATEGIC EVALUATION OF FAO'S WORK IN FORESTRY

### I. BACKGROUND

1. In September 2011, the Organization's Office of Evaluation (OED), in accordance with its programme of work as approved by the Programme Committee, began work on a Strategic Evaluation of FAO's Work in Forestry. As part of that process, initial findings were presented to FAO Management in March 2012, and a draft report produced in April. An Expert Panel provided comments on the draft report in May and the final Report was issued to Management by the Evaluation Team in mid-June.

2. The Evaluation Report sets out nine specific recommendations categorized under three overarching recommendations for management response. These recommendations call for FAO to:

- i.) sharpen priorities and better leverage its cross-sectoral expertise to develop an holistic approach to forests and trees that contributes to each of the three Global Goals of FAO Members;
- ii.) take a more pro-active role in the global forestry regime; and
- iii.) strengthen the modalities for shared learning and better linking normative and field work across all levels of the Organization, and with partners.

3. The present document contains the Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report (Annex 1). The full Evaluation Report, along with the FAO Management Response (being finalized at the time of the drafting of this document), will be presented to the 112<sup>th</sup> session of the Programme Committee from 5 to 9 November 2012. The present document is to be seen in conjunction with COFO/2012/9.2 Strategic Framework and Programme Priorities for FAO in Forestry and COFO 2012/9.3 Recommendations of the Regional Forestry Commissions for FAO, as well as COFO/2012/8 Decisions and Recommendations of FAO Bodies of Interest to the Committee, which together provide the basis for the Committee to provide its views on future programme priorities for the FAO Forestry Programme.

## **II. GUIDANCE REQUESTED FROM COFO**

4. The Committee is invited to take note of the nine evaluation recommendations and provide its views. In particular the Committee is invited to provide guidance on:

- key areas of cross cutting work where it believes the Organization should strengthen its integration of the Forestry dimension to achieve better results in Member countries contributing to all of the three Global Goals of Members;
- how FAO might assume a more proactive role in the global forestry architecture and how Members might support this; and
- how FAO might strengthen the connection between its normative and field work across all levels of the Organization, and more effectively respond to needs at decentralized level.

---

## ANNEX

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

ES1 The promotion of the sustainable management of forests and trees has been an integral part of FAO's mission since its founding in 1945. FAO's forestry activities include monitoring, assessing and sharing information on forests, participating in global forestry processes, supporting national forest policies and institutions, and more broadly work on forest resources management, the socio-economic aspects of forests, and cross-cutting themes such as watershed management and climate change. These activities are intended to contribute to all three global goals of the Organization, namely food security, poverty reduction, and the sustainable management and utilization of natural resources.

ES2. FAO's forestry activities prior to 2006 were subject to a high-level assessment as part of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO in 2007. The IEE noted that no major external evaluation of FAO's forestry activities had been undertaken for some time prior to the assessment. Accordingly, FAO's Programme Committee requested an evaluation of FAO's role and work in forestry at its 103rd session in April 2010.

ES3. This evaluation covers all of FAO's activities relating to forests and trees at the country, regional and global levels for the period 2006 to 2011, while also looking at some trends in challenges and opportunities beyond the evaluation period. The results framework defined by Strategic Objective E "sustainable management of forests and trees" was used as the guiding framework for the evaluation. However, given the contribution of forestry-related activities to other Strategic Objectives, additional cross-cutting themes have also been included in the scope of the evaluation. The evaluation team thus considers that the evaluation covers all major aspects of FAO's work relating to forests and trees, as undertaken across the Organization.

ES4. The evaluation was carried out from September 2011 to May 2012. The team visited a sample of 11 countries in Latin America, Asia, Africa and Europe, as well as three decentralized offices, where interviews were conducted with a wide range of stakeholders. Other evaluation tools included interviews with FAO staff at head office and with key individuals and institutions engaged in forestry issues throughout the world, a survey of FAO member countries, a synthesis of previous relevant programme and project evaluations, and a review of FAO forestry-related normative products.

ES5. This evaluation aims to provide FAO's Senior Management and Member Countries with an assessment of the Organization's performance and comparative advantages related to its work in forestry; and provides a set of recommendations on FAO's strategic directions and future activities in this field. As such, the evaluation is forward-looking and formative.

## II. KEY FINDINGS

### FAO's mandate and resources for forestry

ES6. At its origin, FAO, as a specialized agency of the United Nations, was mandated to sustain forest timber values towards ensuring "continuous productivity of existing forests". Today's FAO, as part of the larger global forest architecture, attempts to protect the multiple values of forests through

addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and the challenges they present to conservation and sustainable forest management (SFM). FAO is renowned globally as an organization that combines technical knowledge in forests and forestry with a visible role as a key “steward of the world’s forests.” FAO’s work in forestry is largely guided by its Strategic Objective E on the ‘sustainable management of forests and trees’, although other Strategic Objectives also cover forest-related activities. In addition the broader FAO vision has been translated into the context of forests and forestry in a dedicated Strategy for Forests and Forestry.

ES7. A review of **financial resources** indicates that the ratio of Regular Programme budget allocations to FAO’s forestry programme over the evaluation period (2006-2011) has remained stable at 3.7%. Voluntary contributions for forestry activities have increased substantially over recent years, and are estimated to contribute 73% of all funding for FAO’s forestry programme. Regular Programme funding and voluntary contributions in support of forestry work combined are estimated at \$416 million over the evaluation period. In terms of **human resources**, the number of filled posts dedicated to forestry activities showed an increasing trend over this time, and the distribution has changed with the transferral of some staff from Headquarters to the Regional and Sub-Regional Offices.

#### **Overall assessment of FAO’s role and work in forestry**

ES8. **Global and Regional Forest-Related Policies and Processes:** FAO is visible within the international forestry realm. FAO has been centrally involved in shaping the global, and to a lesser extent, regional forest “architecture” for many years. This has primarily been done through FAO participating in various global forest-related policy processes, and through its forestry governing bodies which also provide fora for policy discussion. FAO maintains visibility as a leader in the global forest arena as publisher of a number of globally recognised normative products, and as organizer or co-organizer of mega-events. However, although FAO is recognized by its members and partners as an agency that has considerable strengths on technical grounds, today it is seen to have less convening power than in earlier periods to shape forest policies globally and regionally.

ES9. **National Forest Policies, Programmes and Institutions:** FAO is undertaking relevant work in terms of its activity related to supporting forest governance reform, tenure reform, national forest policy and programme development, and supporting capacity building for relevant institutions. As is to be expected, effectiveness of the various interventions is highly variable, mainly because of differences between countries and in FAO follow-up capacities. Through the National Forest Programme Facility (NFPF), ACP-FLEGT Support Programme, and policy and legal advice and capacity strengthening, FAO has helped some countries to improve the forest-related policy environment and institutions and has created more inclusive policy processes in terms of participation of CSO groups and the private sector. NFPF and ACP-FLEGT represent a program approach which could serve as a model for other FAO work. The fact that FAO has hosted the NFPF for such a long time has helped to: create a synergistic relationship between FAO and the Facility, make FAO more engaged with non-state actors, improve the efficiency of resource use, and enable cross-learning between NFPF and FAO staff.

ES10. **Monitoring and Reporting on Forests and Forest Products:** FAO provides timely and extensive information on the state of forest resources and forest products statistics, and disseminates this information relatively effectively to provide services to a broad audience. However, the quality and transparency of the global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA) and national forest assessment can be improved by a more efficient collaboration with other organisations dealing with forest resource monitoring. In the preparation of FRA 2015 that situation is changing, *inter alia* with the recent collaborative effort to produce remote sensing estimates of global forest change over time. There is a great need to strengthen country-level capacities related to forest resources assessment and data management in order to improve the information base for SFM/REDD+ and forest sector planning and monitoring to meet country needs. Also, the analysis of data needs to be improved, such as through a better integration of FRA and the State of the World’s Forests (SOFO). New REDD+ related requirements for monitoring and reporting on carbon add another challenge to forest management planning, and linking forest monitoring and carbon monitoring.

**ES11. Forest Resources Management:** FAO is one of few organizations that still addresses a wide array of biophysical, technical and socio-economic aspects of SFM, and conducts a wide variety of activities in this area. However, the resources FAO devotes to this area are too small to have a significant impact. FAO needs to broaden the understanding of and tools for sustainable management of forests and trees in the wider landscape and highlight the multiple functions of and demands on forests, especially in the context of climate change, biodiversity and bioenergy. There also needs to be a broad vision of forest management that includes ecosystem services (of which REDD+ is one) and a prioritization of climate change adaptation – of much greater importance to most of FAO’s ultimate beneficiaries than mitigation – together with forest management systems that are more strongly focused on beneficiaries’ livelihood needs. While the work on biophysical and socio-economic aspects of managing forests remains relevant, there is a need for FAO to develop a clearer strategic vision of its role and contribution in this area. Such a vision needs to be developed with attention to securing balance across biomes and topics and through enhanced collaboration with other agencies where appropriate.

**ES12. Forest Products and Economic Aspects:** FAO and the UNECE/FAO Forestry and Timber Section are seen as a world leader in global forest products statistics. More use should be made of this information for analytical purposes to feed into global and regional development processes. Both the effectiveness and efficiency of forest products statistical work could be increased by investing more on capacity building in those countries with weak statistical capacity related to forests and forest products. FAO’s work in non-wood forest products (NWFPs) and woodfuel is relevant and well recognized in some regions. Through its work on small and medium sized community-based enterprises and NWFPs, FAO is contributing to livelihood improvements and food security. However, the related field projects are often quite small with limited links to national processes and no scaling up potential. The work on forest industry and economics has relatively low visibility and limited impacts; other organisations are leading the work in these fields.

**ES13. Cross-cutting Themes: Technical Areas:** Mainly due to their small size, many of the cross-sectoral activities relating to, for example, watershed management, agroforestry and urban/peri-urban forestry are not very effective in addressing the magnitude of existing needs. The programmes for the most part do not create critical mass for the significant impact that is needed. The exception in terms of size is the forest and climate area. REDD+ has received significant extra budgetary funds from resource partners over the past few years; but FAO faces difficulties in implementing its work in this area which eventually may affect the results. Furthermore, the evaluation team finds that the narrow focus on the more technical subject of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) does not do justice to the potential contribution that FAO could make related to REDD+ and governance, the related subject of tenure reform, and the role of forest management/SFM in REDD.

**ES14. Cross-cutting Themes: Social Dimensions:** Despite a few positive examples, for the most part gender mainstreaming has not been explicitly and systematically included in FAO’s normative or operational work on forestry. Similarly, social inclusion has not been sufficiently mainstreamed into this work. While the work done in participatory forestry is to be commended for its focus on indigent populations and the role of forests in poverty alleviation, FAO’s forestry activities seldom explicitly target particular social groups that may most require assistance (e.g. Indigenous populations). Overall, FAO has not internalized or operationalized a human rights-based approach in its forestry activities.

**ES15. Normative outputs in forestry:** In general, forestry-related normative outputs produced in the evaluation period are relevant contributions to the forestry literature, but are often not well-known or used in Member countries in policy, planning and forest management. Furthermore, they are of varying quality and importance in terms of responding to needs. Better targeting of normative products to address key gaps in knowledge, combined with improved dissemination and follow-up activities to encourage greater adoption and adaptation to country contexts could improve their effectiveness, usefulness and impacts at regional and especially country level. FAO’s increasing reliance on its web site for dissemination risks to reduce access to normative products in developing countries.

**ES16. Field activities in forestry:** In many cases, FAO’s support has not been sufficiently linked to national forestry and cross-sectoral land use policy development and processes, and is practically

absent from emerging policy dialogues – particularly at the national level but also regionally, with the possible exception of RAP. Much of the forestry field work, particularly that funded through TCP projects, is not strategically focused on achieving the goals of FAO and its members related to food security and poverty reduction. FAO's work in the field is very scattered geographically and thematically, project interventions being on average small. The links between normative products and field activities are usually weak. The long-term impacts of FAO's field activities in many countries are questionable.

ES17. **Capacity:** The work on forestry is essentially conducted at Headquarters by the Forestry Department and by Forestry Officers located in regional and sub-regional offices. Within the Forestry Department, the current organisational structure is not conducive to effective collaboration, communication and coordination across divisions. This inadequate communication and collaboration is also evident in the relationship between headquarters and decentralized forestry staff. While inter-sectoral collaboration at headquarters level is limited, staff in some decentralized offices have succeeded in building collaborative relationships. There are great disparities as well across the decentralised offices in terms of their capacity to effectively fulfil FAO's mandate on forestry. FAO's capacity, visibility as well as impacts at country levels are in general strongest in those countries with large forestry-related field projects with the presence of long-term forestry expertise. However, in most cases, the effectiveness of FAO's work in forestry is constrained by operational weaknesses, short-termism of projects and uneven technical backstopping.

ES18. **Partnerships:** FAO forestry has important strategic relationships with other international groups working at either the global or regional levels. Strategic relationships at country level are often not actively pursued. FAO is known for working very much in a traditional project mode with insufficient links with others and with a focus only on the traditional forestry authorities in a country. Furthermore, FAO often does not actively participate in existing policy fora where different stakeholders are involved.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

#### FAO's role and position in the international forestry regime

ES19. FAO is largely seen by the global forestry community as a technical organization whose role in the international forest regime has been declining over the years due to the emergence of new actors, many of them competitors, and fragmentation of the global forestry agenda. There are many other entities that can do various activities as well or better than FAO now, in contrast to the past where FAO was the main or only entity in the field.

ES20. At the same time there is more need than ever for an impartial global leader looking at forests and forestry in a holistic sense, linking global, regional and national levels and relating forests and forestry to other land use sectors. FAO has the potential to become again an international leader in forestry; with its unique ability to meet the cross-sectoral needs related to forestry contributions to food security and poverty reduction.

#### FAO's comparative advantages in forestry

ES21. FAO's main comparative advantage compared to other international organisations dealing with forests is the fact that it has, under one roof, the expertise to deal with technical issues in forestry and also with most kinds of land and natural resource uses (other than mining). FAO has the expertise and capacity to deal with the interactions between resource uses that are manifested in cross-sectoral challenges and opportunities existing in many countries. There is a need both within FAO to bring its work across different land uses together, and within member countries to promote an integrated landscape approach.

ES22. FAO also has a comparative advantage in forest resource assessment and monitoring, global forest-related information services, forest sector policies and planning, and some aspects of forest

resources management. Some of these become more important in terms of being able to fully utilize the cross-sectoral comparative advantage in helping countries resolve complex land, water and other resource challenges and opportunities.

ES23. Unfortunately, FAO's comparative advantage in cross-cutting or cross-sectoral work is not yet being fully realized. The evaluation team concludes that FAO has missed a number of opportunities to make use of its potential, e.g., by not combining its expertise and work in the current internationally important topic of "land grabbing" with its expertise and work related to deforestation and SFM. There are two main reasons for this: First, FAO is not set up institutionally to foster cross-sectoral activities, other than for the small scale types of collaborative activities that often involve *ad hoc*, informal links between individual staff members. Second, FAO is "demand" driven, and cross-sectoral linkages at the country level are also hampered by the fact that countries often still operate in "silos" themselves with regard to land and other natural resource management.

ES24. FAO forestry programme resources are spread too thin to adequately address all of the needs that it tries to cover. FAO continues to try to maintain a presence in areas where it is losing (or no longer has) comparative advantage. This translates into a distribution of resources that does not fully reflect FAO's potential in areas where it does have comparative advantages.

#### Institutional arrangements and partnering

ES25. FAO needs to be more inclusive and partner more effectively with NGOs, CSOs and the private sector. Through strengthening its forestry capacity and work in areas where it enjoys a clear comparative advantage and becoming a more inclusive organisation, FAO would be seen as a more desirable partner and could achieve better results in its forestry work. An increased emphasis on contributing to food security and poverty reduction would open up new potentials for effective partnering.

ES26. FAO has made great efforts in the field of communication and outreach at the global level over the period under evaluation, and information is becoming increasingly easy to access. However, FAO needs to reflect on the way it communicates and interacts on information and communication in forestry at the regional and country levels. Traditionally, communication has been seen primarily as a one-way flow – the dissemination of FAO outputs to users. Increasing dependence of users on web-accessible information, however, will continue to increase expectations for up-to-date knowledge that is tailored to user needs, while ensuring greater interaction between providers and users of information.

ES27. There is scope for improving the working arrangements in forestry at FAO to better reflect a strategic approach to FAO's role in forestry, and to develop incentives and mechanisms to enhance sharing of experiences and lessons learned both horizontally across sectors and vertically between headquarters, regions, sub-regions and member countries.

#### FAO's forestry strategic vision and its implementation

ES28. FAO's forestry work program does not reflect a clear vision and inter-connected priorities focused on achieving that vision. The way SOE and the organizational results are structured does not give guidance on how the three global goals of FAO are to be achieved. SOE reflects a forest-centric approach to forestry and does not reflect one of FAO's comparative advantages, i.e. cross-sectoral work. While there are reports on outputs achieved, there is little individual accountability in terms of outcomes resulting from resources spent in the context of the Strategic Objectives.

ES29. At the country level, project interventions are in most cases opportunistic and based on availability of funding and not on the assessment of how FAO overall could best help the country, in partnership with other organizations. A common perception of external stakeholders is that FAO often does not work on key strategic issues in the forestry sector of member countries, and that it is often not

actively involved in various fora concerned with policy and strategic sector development issues at national level – particularly if the issues being dealt with are controversial. FAO is perceived as being too focused on the work of traditional national forest agencies, even though the drivers of many forest-related challenges and opportunities lie outside the traditional forestry sector.

ES30. Assuming little or no increase in regular programme funding, and the fact that extra-budgetary funding will remain primarily linked to current interests of donors, certain areas of work will have to be de-emphasized in order to strengthen the cross-sectoral work and traditional core areas in which FAO still has a comparative advantage. The obvious topics to de-emphasize are those with low need/demand from member countries, those for which FAO does not have a comparative advantage, and those in which other entities are active and have recognized leadership. Some kind of priority setting concerning countries in which to work also is necessary, given the scarcity of human and financial resources. This could mean working relatively less in more well-off countries that have other resources from which to draw, and focusing more on countries where FAO interventions can make a difference and where forestry assistance is paramount to the development agenda.

ES31. FAO must find ways to keep the various pressures upon it at bay in order to become more strategically focused and therefore more effective, and thus to become again the “leading light” in international forestry for sustainable development. The evaluation team is of the view that FAO can be more strategic and effective in: (i) its leadership role in dealing holistically with forests in the international forest regime, (ii) strengthening its role and responsibilities in the assessment and monitoring of forests, and (iii) in developing the broader role of forests in climate change adaptation and REDD+.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

ES32. The evaluation team *presents three overarching recommendations containing a total of nine more specific recommendations* to FAO for dealing with the major challenges and opportunities discussed in the conclusions. Suggestions are given for the most critical actions needed to implement these recommendations. Also, specific suggestions dealing with the various thematic areas have been made at the end of each finding chapter.

ES33. **Overarching Recommendation 1:** *Founded on its comparative advantage of expertise and accumulated knowledge across land and other natural resource sectors, FAO should develop a holistic approach to forests and trees outside forests aimed at meeting the three global goals of FAO and its Members.*

**Recommendation 1.1:** FAO senior management in forestry should develop a thorough assessment of how the results of FAO’s work in forestry can and do contribute to the achievement of all three of the global goals of FAO and its members. The results should be used to develop a strategic action program for FAO as a whole on how the Organization can best utilize its comparative advantages to enable forests to contribute more to meeting the global goals.

**Recommendation 1.2:** FAO senior management should lay the groundwork for greater and more effective interaction and collaboration between the various statutory/advisory bodies of FAO that will contribute to strategic priority setting. Specifically, FAO should develop a more effective interaction and collaboration between COFO and COAG, for example by (i) FO and AG preparing a joint briefing paper on the challenges and opportunities; and (ii) establishing a joint COAG-COFO Panel of Experts that would advise both committees on the strategic priorities for key cross-sectoral activities that would need to be jointly addressed by FAO departments.

**Recommendation 1.3:** FAO senior management in forestry should prioritize its programme areas based on its comparative advantages and with guidance from the governance bodies. This would require identification of topics/activities: (i) where FAO has a unique, possibly leading role to play;



(ii) where FAO will be working actively along with partners; and (iii) where FAO will not be active but will serve mainly as a knowledge broker and facilitator.

**Recommendation 1.4:** FAO regional senior management, in collaboration with headquarters, should prepare, for each region, a strategy on how to enhance the value of FAO's presence in forestry at regional/sub-regional levels. This strategy should particularly reflect on how FAO works with existing regional policy processes and organisations and other strategic partners on common regional challenges and opportunities relating to forests and other land uses. This process could draw on the existing development of Country Programming Frameworks to identify regional issues and priorities.

**Recommendation 1.5:** FAO senior management in forestry and communication staff should communicate more effectively FAO's forestry vision, mission and strategic priorities in-house, as well as to potential funders and other stakeholders at global, regional and country levels.

ES34. **Overarching Recommendation 2:** *FAO should take a more proactive approach to its role and place in the global forestry regime, and together with strategic partners, carry out policy dialogue and analytical work to address global forest-related issues and link fragmented forest-related entities and processes – utilising in particular FAO's comparative advantage as a global organisation with strong convening powers, long term presence in Member countries and linkages with host country governments.*

**Recommendation 2.1:** FAO senior management in forestry should undertake a joint effort with selected CPF members and other key resource partners to redefine FAO's convening role as a global technical institution that, with its partners is able to tackle forestry challenges and opportunities in a holistic way across land and other natural resource sectors.

**Recommendation 2.2:** FAO senior management in forestry and NR should renegotiate FAO's role in UN-REDD and reassess its role in REDD+ more broadly (e.g. its involvement in UNFCCC, FCPF and other REDD+ related groups and activities), to ensure that FAO's broad SFM expertise and knowledge is used to effectively and efficiently support member countries in their efforts in REDD+ readiness and REDD+ implementation.

ES35. **Overarching Recommendation 3:** *FAO should strengthen modalities for linking knowledge and expertise on forestry across the Organisation, between normative work and field activities and with identified partners, and promote cohesion and shared learning between the global, regional and national levels.*

**Recommendation 3.1:** FAO forestry staff should streamline its normative work on forests and forestry by being more selective and more responsive to regional and sub-regional needs.

**Recommendation 3.2:** FAO senior management should strengthen expert capacity in forestry at SRO and RO level and selectively in prioritised countries to provide technical and operational support and facilitate a two-way flow of information and coordination.

## V. SUMMING IT UP: THE WAY FORWARD

ES36. Addressing the above recommendations is essential if FAO is to maintain a dynamic comparative advantage in international forestry. As the global discourse on environment and development moves towards a more integrated management of landscapes, ecosystems and resources, there are windows of opportunity for FAO to increase its contributions to meeting the global goals of the Organization and its members. However, this will require a recasting of the work of FAO in forests and forestry to maintain a high level of professionalism in forestry and at the same time to better link to other rural development sectors. The implementation of the recommendations should lead to less opportunistic work, and greater alignment between resources and priorities as defined in a logical and strategic vision for FAO in forestry.

ES37. FAO has a comparative advantage in integrated forest management and broader land-use management issues because of its global mandate on all aspects related to forests and forestry and its capacities built up across land uses in forestry, agriculture and rural development. However, within such an integrated vision, the Organization needs to carefully examine where it can best make a difference. FAO faces a resource constraint vs. the needs in forestry at present. If FAO cannot increase its financial resources, then it must develop priorities for which forestry topics it will deal with. Otherwise, it runs the risk of not meeting the needs in all areas, let alone addressing well those areas where it has its greatest assets.

ES38. It is also critical to develop a more rational base for regular funding and extra-budgetary funding. Funding should be less opportunistic and more focused on resource partners' willingness to fund the implementation of FAO's own logical and strategic vision for forestry in which it contributes to achieving all three global goals of the Organization. This will require that funding partners truly understand and share FAO's vision, and also see that FAO is doing important work in forestry that others are not doing.

ES39. Combining the thoughts and recommendations made with the insights and suggestions of the FAO staff interviewed, the field personnel, and the interviews with outside interlocutors, the Evaluation Team envisions a forestry programme in the future that is more proactive in the international forestry regime, and focused on a strategic agenda with clear priorities for a more limited set of themes in forestry that FAO will focus on in greater depth. It will be a programme that capitalizes on the main comparative advantages of FAO, with better connections between normative products and application in the field in priority areas, and with a more focused, programmatic approach to field work that fits FAO's strategic agenda and delivers more impacts.

ES40. Given its strong global mandate on forests, backed by its constituency of COFO and the member countries and its capacities to tackle sustainable forest management and to integrate forests and forestry in a broad cross-sectoral and landscape approach, FAO is well placed to take a lead in dealing with forests and forestry in a more holistic way and in improving coordination within the global forestry regime. Being both a technical as well as a policy organization, for forests as well as other land uses, FAO can help to shape the role of forests in a wider landscape context.