Kenneth MacDicken, FRA Team Leader, described four key areas where FRA data has made a positive difference in forestry: 1) widespread forest loss in the tropics was detected, resulting in more than 60 years of investment to try to assist people in the tropics in forest management to improve sustainability and productivity; 2) gaps in wood supply were identified, and companies, governments, and international agencies responded by increasing support to forest planting; 3) forest conversion was identified as a contributor to climate change, and as a result forest management is now part of mitigation strategies; 4) remote sensing was proven as a tool for monitoring forest resources, leading to some 100 earth observing satellites.

Forest monitoring provides tangible returns on investment, with many examples globally. Both FRA and GFW have value but they report different things, and a distinction needs to be made between the two, whilefinding synergies to benefit all users. There are six main areas in which FRA and GFW statistics differ: purpose; forest versus trees; statistical content; data sources; frequency; and measures of quality.

Charles Barber, World Resources Institute, explained that GFW is a geo-spatial, open-source, peer-to-peer data-sharing tool on particular issues or countries comprising a broad alliance of over 40 partners. Launched four months ago, it is a work in progress, that stems from the idea that confronting the crisis? cannot be left to the authorities alone, but requires partnerships between citizens, stakeholders, businesses, etc. and constructive civic engagement. Credible action requires real time factual information as well as a platform to provide and assemble this information and ways to cooperate and mobilize locally and globally. Improved technology is making this increasingly possible, as witnessed in the increasing sophistication of forest monitoring over the past 60 years.

Benjamin Jones, World Resources Institute, gave a demonstration of the GFW website, noting that while many of the key data sets are provided by satellite imagery, other data are provided by users themselves. Pages are available to showcase individual country data and feedback is encouraged in order to continuously improve the GFW website.

In the ensuing discussion, participants raised the following points:

- How can a user actively respond to the sheer number of alerts on the GFW website. **Charles Barber** explained that users can click on particular alerts to learn about the respective issues. **Benjamin Jones** stated that a GFW initiative team focuses on engagement, utilizing GFW statistics to work to improve the livelihoods of forest-dependent people.

- The crowdsourcing aspect of GFW data leaves the site open to potential inaccuracies. **Benjamin Jones** explained that although the website allows for informal crowdsourcing, and this information is monitored, GFW has not yet used it to take action. He also mentioned that GFW is currently designing two apps that will be used to validate data provided by users.

- Whether countries view GFW as a threat to their own country statistics or rather as an opportunity for people to participate in forest inventories. **Charles Barber** indicated that GFW's statistical information is provided on a voluntary basis by those who benefit from the information, especially in the private sector (such as major palm oil producers in Indonesia). Thus, since they have a stake in the information, the feedback is generally positive.

- Whether FRA reports could use clearer, more accessible language in order for the general public to better understand the statistical information presented. **Kenneth**

MacDicken explained that FAO's definitions had been developed for consistency over 60 years of reporting, and that there is plenty of room at national and local levels to discuss issues of language in order to better meet the needs of various stakeholders.