



**EIGHT-COUNTRY INITIATIVE ON SHAPING  
THE PROGRAMME OF WORK OF THE  
UNITED NATIONS FORUM ON FORESTS  
27 NOVEMBER – 1 DECEMBER 2000**

The International Expert Consultation on the Eight-Country Initiative on Shaping the Programme of Work of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) convened from 27 November to 1 December 2000 in Bonn, Germany. The Consultation brought together approximately 100 experts from 32 countries representing governments, NGOs, the private sector, international organizations and UN agencies to consider the functions of the UNFF. Participants sought to assist the international community in developing the concept and basic elements of the UNFF's multiyear programme of work (MYPOW). The Consultation resulted in a report of views exchanged, which will be forwarded to the UN Secretary-General's office to contribute to preparations for the first session of the UNFF. Consultation participants emphasized that the report does not represent consensus views.

**A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
FOREST REGIME AND THE  
EIGHT-COUNTRY INITIATIVE**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS:** The possibility of developing international forest policy and a mechanism to coordinate such policy was discussed at UNCED in 1992, but delegates agreed only to the "Non-legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests," also known as the "Forest Principles," and Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 "Combating Deforestation." In 1995, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), at its third session, established the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) to continue the intergovernmental forest policy dialogue. During its two-year mandate, the IPF developed some 150 negotiated proposals for action on issues related to sustainable forest management. Matters requiring further consideration included issues related to institutions and legal instruments for the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests. The fifth session of the CSD, in April 1997, and the 19th Special Session of the UN General Assembly (UNGASS), in June 1997, endorsed the IPF's outcome and recommended a continuation of the intergovernmental policy dialogue on

forests. Subsequently, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) established the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) under the CSD.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL FORUM ON FORESTS:** The IFF met four times between October 1997 and February 2000 to "identify the possible elements of and work towards consensus on international arrangements and mechanisms, for example, a legally-binding instrument." The IFF produced approximately 120 proposals for action on a variety of topics.

At its fourth and final session in February 2000, the IFF concluded its deliberations and issued its final report. The report included a recommendation to establish an international arrangement on forests that would establish the UNFF and invite the relevant international organizations, institutions, and instruments to participate in a collaborative partnership on forests (CPF). Delegates at CSD-8, meeting in April 2000, endorsed the IFF's conclusions and proposals for action and invited the President of ECOSOC to initiate informal consultations on options for placing the United Nations Forum on Forests within the intergovernmental machinery of the UN system. On 18 October 2000, ECOSOC adopted resolution E/2000/L.32\*, outlining an international arrangement on forests and establishing the UNFF as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC.

**INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENT ON FORESTS:** The ECOSOC resolution states that the main objective of the international arrangement on forests is to promote the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end. Its purpose is to: promote the implementation of internationally agreed actions on forests at the national, regional and global levels; to provide a coherent, transparent and participatory global framework for policy implementation, coordination and development; and to carry out principal functions, based on the Rio Declaration, the Forest Principles, Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the IPF and the IFF, in a manner consistent with and complementary to existing international legally binding instruments relevant to forests.

The resolution sets out six principle functions for the international arrangement on forests to meet its objective:

(a) Facilitate and promote the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action as well as other actions that may be agreed upon, including through national forest programmes (nfps) and other integrated programmes relevant to forests; catalyze, mobilize and generate financial resources; and mobilize and channel technical and

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

scientific resources, including by taking steps toward the broadening and development of mechanisms and/or further initiatives to enhance international cooperation;

(b) Provide a forum for continued policy development and dialogue among Governments, which would involve international organizations and other interested parties, including major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, to foster a common understanding on sustainable forest management (SFM) and to address forest issues and emerging areas of priority concern in a holistic, comprehensive and integrated manner;

(c) Enhance cooperation as well as policy and programme coordination on forest-related issues among relevant international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments, as well as contribute to synergies among them, including coordination among donors;

(d) Foster international cooperation, including North-South and public-private partnerships, as well as cross-sectoral cooperation at the national, regional and global levels;

(e) Monitor and assess progress at the national, regional and global levels through reporting by Governments, as well as by regional and international organizations, institutions and instruments, and on this basis consider future actions needed; and

(f) Strengthen political commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests through: ministerial engagement; developing ways to liaise with the governing bodies of international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments; and promoting action-oriented dialogue and policy formulation related to forests.

To carry out these functions, the resolution establishes the UNFF as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC and, to support its work and to enhance cooperation and coordination, the CPF. Other provisions include that the UNFF will consider, within five years, the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests, with a view to making a recommendation to ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly (UNGA), and take steps to devise approaches toward appropriate financial and technology transfer support to enable implementation of SFM as recommended under the IPF and IFF.

The resolution also decides that the UNFF will operate under the rules and procedures of ECOSOC and that it should, *inter alia*: be open to all States and operate in a transparent and participatory manner, with relevant international and regional organizations, including regional economic integration organizations, institutions and instruments, as well as major groups involved; build upon the transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, IPF and IFF; and ensure the opportunity to receive and consider inputs from representatives of major groups, in particular through the organization of multi-stakeholder dialogues.

The resolution also states that the UNFF will initially meet on an annual basis for up to two weeks and have a high-level ministerial segment for two to three days, as required. It suggests the UNFF may convene *ad hoc* expert groups for scientific and technical advice.

The resolution decides that the UNFF will work on the basis of a MYPOW to be adopted at its first meeting. The UNFF is also tasked with developing, at its first meeting, a plan of action (PoA) for the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, which will address financial provisions.

**EIGHT-COUNTRY INITIATIVE:** In September 2000, the government-led Eight-Country Initiative, Shaping the Programme of Work for the UNFF, was launched by Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Iran, Malaysia and Nigeria. The Initiative aimed to assist the international community in developing the MYPOW of the UNFF. Building on the consensus reached at IFF-4, the Initiative initiated its

work by conducting a survey of stakeholders' views on the UNFF and hosting the International Expert Consultation on the functions of the UNFF. The Initiative worked in close collaboration with the extant IFF Secretariat.

To elicit a wide range of views on the programme of work for the UNFF, a questionnaire endorsed by the Initiative was distributed to some 500 interested parties, including governments, NGOs, the private sector and international organizations. The responses to the questionnaire were subsequently incorporated into a Synthesis Report that did not attempt to identify areas of consensus, but rather reflected different views in a transparent manner. The Synthesis Report provided background information and served as a working document for the International Expert Consultation held from 27 November – 1 December 2000 in Bonn, Germany.

The Consultation sought to provide an informal forum for participants acting in their personal capacities to exchange views and information on the concepts and basic elements of the UNFF programme of work. The Initiative did not address the structure and institutional setting of the international arrangement on forests or the future support of the CPF to the UNFF. The Initiative culminated in the Report of the Expert Consultation, which will be submitted to the IFF Secretariat to be used as input in preparing a Secretary-General's Report for consideration at the UNFF's first session.

### REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT CONSULTATION

#### *OPENING PLENARY*

Christian Mersmann, Head of the Eight-Country Initiative Secretariat, opened the International Expert Consultation during an afternoon Plenary on Monday, 27 November. Ulrich Hoenisch (Germany) and Ositadinma Anaedu (Nigeria) were elected to serve as Co-Chairs of the Consultation.

Uschi Eid, Parliamentary State Secretary of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, welcomed participants, highlighting the importance of the process. She underscored joint responsibility for all types of forests, emphasizing the need for new partnerships and forms of international cooperation among the private sector, governments and NGOs. She stressed the importance of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and reaffirmed the use of nfps as the implementation tool. She noted that international cooperation between the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and the International Labor Organization Convention 169 on the Protection of Indigenous Peoples would lead to the implementation of SFM. Eid noted that the international community had established the UNFF as a UN body under ECOSOC to, *inter alia*, support national efforts and enhance North-South partnerships. She emphasized the importance of the UNFF functions on coordination and promotion of international cooperation and called for growing political will in participating countries, transparency and greater civil society participation. She called upon the UNFF to address illegal logging and the role of certification in SFM.

**CO-CHAIR REMARKS:** Co-Chair Hoenisch recalled developments in international forest policy over the past ten years and identified two key events that made forest policy prominent: the FAO's 1990 Forest Resource Assessment (FRA) documenting forest decline world wide, especially in the tropics; and the preparations for UNCED, wherein the important role of forests was identified. He noted that, at UNCED, opinions varied on how to proceed, with some supporting a legally binding instrument on forests and others preferring to discuss in detail various aspects of forests prior to entering into commitments. He

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

recalled that the IPF and IFF processes had resulted in proposals for action and in the nfp instrument. He stated that the actions to be taken are now well known and that, if they were implemented, the forest sector could demonstrate how to attain sustainable development. He said the Consultation's task was to identify how to fulfill the functions agreed to in the ECOSOC resolution.

Co-Chair Anaedu said the lack of implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action led to the establishment of the UNFF to ensure implementation. He said developing countries wanted a body that would make a reality of the ideas developed by the IPF and IFF. He emphasized that the UNFF should achieve policy consistency, and suggested that the CPF could be instrumental in reaching this goal. He stressed tackling the issues of a financial mechanism and the development and transfer of technology. He underscored the importance of development, cautioning that without it a new wall similar to the Berlin Wall will divide developing and developed countries. In closing, he reminded participants that "we are here to smash that wall down."

Providing background information on the Eight-Country Initiative, Co-Chair Hoenisch informed participants that the Initiative's basic purpose is to provide an opportunity to discuss issues prior to negotiations. He said the organizing countries' intent was to gather as much good information as possible to assist the UNFF in developing the MYPOW. He described the Synthesis Report as the outcome of the first stage of the Initiative, which included the drafting and distribution of a questionnaire on the functions of the UNFF. He stressed that the Consultation would not seek to achieve consensus but to exchange ideas and air opinions. He reviewed the work schedule for the week, noting that participants would split into four parallel working groups that would discuss each of the functions of the UNFF.

Elaborating on the Consultation's working structure, Mersmann called upon participants to distinguish between content and thematic issues as well as the instruments to be used and final products. He encouraged participants to ground their discussions in the Forest Principles and the outcomes of the IPF and IFF processes.

**KEY NOTE ADDRESS:** Jagmohan Maini, Head of the IFF Secretariat, offered a general overview on the international dialogue on forests, highlighting positive outcomes of the last decade. He also outlined the contents of the international arrangement on forests and the challenges ahead.

He labeled the past ten years of dialogue the "decade of progress" and said institutions and instruments on trade, the concept of SFM, and related multilateral environmental agreements had led to the international forest regime. He explained that the use of a comprehensive and holistic approach moved the dialogue from North-South polarization to consensus and common understanding on areas such as: the need to discuss how to reconcile economic, social and environmental priorities, as well as their transboundary regional and global impact; the integration of national forest policy with regional and global policies; and the need to manage forest ecosystems for multiple benefits.

On the international arrangement on forests, he highlighted the PoA and the CPF as key components and underlined the importance of the UNFF's tasks to facilitate and enhance international cooperation and the MYPOW. On the PoA, he advocated the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action at the country-level, while looking at regional and global dimensions. On the CPF, he suggested that it should continue as a collegial and expert body like the Intergovernmental Taskforce on Forests (ITFF), and noted that CPF members are directed by their governing bodies.

On future challenges, Maini flagged developing a dialogue between the UNFF, CPF members and ministers in order to strengthen cooperation. He highlighted the need for the programme elements in the MYPOW to be politically attractive enough to engage ministers in the process. In conclusion, he called on participants to begin thinking about the parameters of the five-year assessment of the international arrangement on forests and stressed the need to draw political attention towards forests as a microcosm of sustainable development.

**SYNTHESIS REPORT INTRODUCTION:** Mersmann provided an overview of the Synthesis Report, noting that it distills the approximately 50 responses to the Initiative's questionnaire. He stressed that the report is not a consensus document, but reflects different views, and was intended to provide background information and serve as the foundation for the Consultation. He emphasized that the Consultation should not debate the structure and institutional setting of the international arrangement on forests and explained that the report of the Consultation would be forwarded to the Secretary-General's office.

Mersmann next drew attention to some general conclusions put forward in the Synthesis Report. Regarding the UNFF's position within the international forest regime, it was suggested that the UNFF's role is to: provide a coherent, transparent and participatory global framework for policy implementation; act as the focal point for guidance on implementation, coordination and policy development on forest-related decisions; act as a "caretaker" of SFM; and include follow-up on the policies and decisions of relevant instruments and institutions of the international forest regime.

On the relationship between the UNFF and the CPF, it was indicated that: they should perform distinct roles; the UNFF should provide guidance to the CPF; the CPF will report to the UNFF; the CPF will play a key role in assisting countries to put forest-related policy into practice; and the CPF will have a critical role in monitoring and evaluation.

Instruments of the UNFF identified in the report included: the PoA to implement the IPF/IFF proposals, distinguishing between those targeted at the national level and those at the international level; *ad-hoc* expert groups; and government led-initiatives.

Regarding the framework for the UNFF's MYPOW, questionnaire responses indicated the functions in the ECOSOC resolution provide the basic framework, and that the MYPOW must draw upon the Rio Declaration, the Forest Principles, Chapter 11 of Agenda 21 and the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

The Synthesis Report notes that there are links and synergies between the functions and that elements of each function relate to at least one other function. It was suggested that function "f" (strengthening political commitment) is the foundation for the UNFF, that functions "a" (implementation) and "b" (providing a forum) are the key functions, and that functions "c" (cooperation and policy/programme coordination), "d" (international cooperation) and "e" (monitoring and assessment) are the tools for realizing functions "a" and "b."

Mersmann then summarized the general conclusions of the Synthesis Report by function:

**Function "a" (implementation):** support nfps and implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action; identify impediments and constraints in implementation; develop nfp guidelines; identify priority areas; cooperate with relevant institutions and organizations; guide the CPF in the development of joint programming; and mobilize financial, technical and scientific resources as a prerequisite.

**Function "b" (providing a forum):** avoid repeating the nature of the IPF/IFF discussions; foster a common understanding of SFM through policy dialogue; organize work by thematic areas; identify priority areas through international assessments and monitoring; collab-

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

orate with international bodies; incorporate organizations' "real world" experience; and organize high-level ministerial sessions to promote political awareness and support policy coordination and implementation.

**Function "c" (cooperation and policy/programme coordination):** promote policy development and coordination among governments and forest-related instruments and institutions; request CPF members to support UNFF policies, strategies and activities in their programmes and in coordination with others; develop MOUs with UN organizations and convention secretariats; include ITFF members and some additional instruments, specifically the CCD and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), in the CPF; develop a CPF action programme under UNFF guidance; and request the CPF to inform UNFF of its members' activities.

**Function "d" (international cooperation):** clarify outstanding issues of financial assistance and technology transfer; make SFM self-financing in the long-term; use existing financial resources effectively; establish an international forest fund; establish an investment promotion entity; develop new North-South partnerships that move beyond the donor-recipient relationship; demonstrate a transformation toward SFM in order to receive additional funding; develop national financing strategies as part of nfps; establish appropriate economic and trade policies to facilitate private sector investment; and negotiate a legally binding instrument to leverage support.

**Function "e" (monitoring and assessment):** use information from existing monitoring systems (Global Forest Watch, Global Information Service of the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations, FRA 2000); request CPF to assist in monitoring; harmonize reporting requirements of all forest-related instruments; establish an expert group to develop a harmonized reporting format; use NGO contributions; and negotiate a legally binding instrument to establish a mandate for monitoring and reporting.

**Function "f" (strengthening political commitment):** fulfill the UNFF functions; use the nfp process to increase political commitment; hold high-level ministerial segments; improve national-level enabling conditions for SFM; set indicators of political commitment such as funding and attendance at high-level ministerial segments; prohibit discussion on parameters for a legal framework until UNFF-4; and establish an expert group on parameters immediately.

In the ensuing discussion, one participant expressed regret that the report and the questionnaire focused more on the functions, rather than on substance and real outcomes. He stressed the need to prioritize activities according to political interest and suggested there is a need to get away from a comprehensive approach. In response, Mersmann remarked that the goal is not to identify priorities but rather to find a process to identify priorities, and that the meeting should discuss the structure of the UNFF's work rather than substance. Co-Chair Anaedu added that during IFF discussions, the issue of priorities created an atmosphere of tension because interests vary from nation to nation.

Another participant asked how the UNFF could avoid developing an additional 150 proposals for action and questioned its relationship with the CPF. She stressed that the CPF is an independent and informal body and cannot be directed by the UNFF. Maini responded that some "policy mature" issues should be further developed. With regard to the CPF, he said the model of the ITFF should be followed and stressed that a collegial atmosphere should be maintained in the CPF.

A participant emphasized that discussion at the Consultation should focus on how to avoid a five-year marathon repeating the IPF/IFF processes. He asked for assurance that the UNFF will focus on imple-

mentation rather than discussion. Another participant underscored the need to devise a clear way to ensure that the UNFF and CPF make something happen beyond dialogue. He remarked that this would require funding, technology transfer and some action on the ground. Participants also drew attention to the need to: avoid repeating the mistakes of the past; keep the MYPOW, plan of action, and the CPF distinct; place greater emphasis on the holistic nature of forests; and avoid duplication with the many existing forest-related instruments and bodies, such as the CBD and the FCCC.

Co-Chair Anaedu said the UNFF is a focal point for forests. He said the UNFF must correct the communication gap between processes by improving awareness of the ongoing work of the CCD, CBD and FCCC.

### WELCOMING RECEPTION

On Monday evening, November 27, participants attended a reception hosted by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the City of Bonn. The Vice-Mayor of the City of Bonn welcomed participants and Hans-Peter Schipulle, Deputy Director General, BMZ, delivered an address. Schipulle underscored Germany's commitment to leading the new stage of the international forest regime to a successful and concrete result. He expressed frustration at the slow pace of forest-related commitments, but commended progress with regard to the institutional structures, commenting that the UNFF must be shaped and targeted in an appropriate way. He commented that without political will, implementation will fail or be difficult, and stressed listening to forestry practitioners, forest dwellers and local communities. He wished the meeting success.

### PLENARY

In Plenary on Tuesday, 28 November, Peter Maier, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE), presented "An Assessment on the Relation and Linkages between the Work of the MCPFE and the IPF/IFF Proposals For Action." He explained that this background paper provides a comparative analysis between the IPF/IFF proposals for action and the activities of the MCPFE.

Elisabeth Barsk-Rundquist, IFF Secretariat, delivered a presentation on the common understanding of the ECOSOC resolution establishing the UNFF (E/2000/L.32\*). She described the UNFF's objectives and outlined its functions, tasks and working modalities. She explained that the UNFF is an intergovernmental body and not an organization that performs functions and undertakes specific tasks to fulfill its objective. She described the UNFF's objectives as including the promotion of SFM, the strengthening of long-term commitment, the promotion of the implementation of internationally agreed action proposals, and the provision of a coherent, transparent and participatory global framework for policy implementation, coordination and development.

She listed the UNFF's principal functions, including to: facilitate and promote implementation; foster policy development and dialogue; enhance cooperation and policy and programme coordination; foster international and cross-sectoral cooperation; monitor, assess and report; and strengthen political commitment. She identified the UNFF's tasks, including: considering with a view to recommending the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests; devising approaches toward appropriate financial and technology transfer support; holding high-level ministerial segments, policy dialogues with heads of organizations and multi-stakeholder dialogues; convening *ad-hoc* expert groups for scientific and technical advice; encouraging country-sponsored initiatives; developing a PoA that will

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

address financial provisions; providing guidance to the CPF; and reviewing the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in five years.

On the working modalities of the UNFF, Barsk-Rundquist explained that its members are enabled to negotiate, vote and take decisions in an annual meeting, and that the participation of organizations, institutions, instruments and major groups is allowed and regulated by ECOSOC rules. She concluded that UNFF will report to ECOSOC and through it to the UN General Assembly. Regarding the CPF, she described it as an informal coordination and cooperation mechanism that supports the UNFF. She explained that the CPF is governed by its members' respective governing bodies. She highlighted the CPF's main functions as the facilitation and promotion of coordinated and collaborative action, joint programming, joint submissions of coordinated proposals to governing bodies and the submission of coordinated inputs and progress reports to the UNFF.

She flagged the next steps in this process: the upcoming informal consultations in February, where discussions regarding the draft MYPOW will take place and the first session of the UNFF, in June 2001. At the June session, the UNFF will adopt the MYPOW, develop the PoA and initiate its work with the CPF.

Co-Chair Anaedu remarked that technology transfer and financial mechanisms would not be issues on the agenda at the first UNFF session. He informed participants that the resolution ensured the participation of major groups according to ECOSOC rules of procedure.

Following the Plenary session on Tuesday morning, participants broke into four parallel working groups to consider the six functions of the UNFF. The working groups met in five sessions and all groups considered each of the functions. The outcomes of these sessions were presented in Plenary over the course of the meeting. A report synthesizing the work of these groups was produced and considered in Plenary on the final day of the Consultation.

### **WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE UNFF**

The following is a summary of the discussions held in the four working groups according to the six UNFF functions. This summary is based on exchanges in the working groups as well as the groups' daily reports to Plenary. Working group discussions were guided by questions developed by the Initiative's Steering Committee and facilitated by two moderators in each group. Their discussions focused on the instruments and outcomes or products for each section. It should be noted that the working groups' approaches varied slightly.

Regarding how the working groups were conducted, some participants expressed difficulty in discussing the functions separately from the issues they are intended to address. Others commented that the instruments are indicated in the ECOSOC resolution and that the only products the UNFF can formally produce are recommendations to the UNGA and ECOSOC. The need to bear in mind the relationship between the functions was stressed and participants called for clear discussion of what the UNFF is expected to do. The need for the MYPOW to be open to incorporating new issues was also emphasized.

**FUNCTION "A" (IMPLEMENTATION):** Participants emphasized that implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action were a priority. Participant proposals suggested that all governments participating in the UNFF should commit to implementing nfps as the foundation of the MYPOW and that the first years of the MYPOW should include reporting on national level assessments. Some also proposed that the definition of nfp should be considered. Some participants suggested that the implementation of recommendations through

existing regional institutions and instruments should be promoted, and that a reporting system to identify successes, obstacles and solutions related to implementation be developed.

On actions to facilitate and promote implementation, participants flagged a number of tasks for the national level, including gap analysis, assessments, development of political will and facilitating conditions for implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action. Setting implementation targets, developing guidelines for nfp implementation, providing a brokerage service for financing nfp implementation and collaborating with forest-related conventions such as the CBD, CCD and FCCC were also stressed.

Participant proposals indicated that the UNFF should: promote information exchange and sharing of experiences in nfp implementation; identify means for governments to provide mutual support; enhance multilateral support; contribute guidance to advance objectives; inform the public on progress made; encourage the translation of documents and communication of the results of IPF/IFF to the public in accessible language; facilitate cross-sectoral cooperation and collaborative multi-stakeholder partnerships; and, through the CPF, ensure that the orientations of forest-related organizations and institutions are in line with the UNFF.

Regarding setting implementation priorities, some suggested that thematic international prioritization could form the first point of departure, while others felt that international prioritization would harm the process of developing country-specific approaches. Some participants commented that only cross-cutting issues such as nfps will be a priority at the international level.

Regarding mobilizing financing for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, one participant suggested that addressing some obstacles to national implementation does not require financial assistance. The need to establish an expert group on finance was stressed.

Regarding the relationship between the international and national levels, some suggested that the UNFF should operate from the bottom up, incorporating input from the local level. Partnership with stakeholders and broad participation in the UNFF were stressed along with coordination of forest-related institutions and organizations. One participant stressed that implementation at the national level cannot happen without an understanding of the regional and international contexts. A number of participants suggested that a communication strategy be developed to bridge the communication gap between international-level deliberations and practitioners on the ground. The responsibility of delegates at international meetings to convey the messages from such meetings to the national and local levels was noted.

Regarding the PoA, participants noted that its relationship with the MYPOW must be clarified. One participant reiterated that the ECOSOC resolution indicates a PoA that addresses financial provisions will be agreed to at UNFF-1. Another participant questioned how the UNFF, which is not an organization or an institution, could have a PoA that addresses financial provisions. It was stressed that the PoA is about national action, and that the UNFF's role is in coordinating and facilitating this. Participants supported the establishment of priorities and timeframes. A participant suggested developing an annual PoA with specific targets to be evaluated each year. Another speaker suggested that the PoA would need to be broad with a series of strategies for facilitating national-level implementation. Some participants suggested that the PoA could provide a common framework at the international level with countries determining how to achieve implementation at the national level. Participants noted the need to further clarify this matter prior to negotiations.

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Participants noted means for implementation available to the UNFF to develop its tasks and activities, including expert groups, memoranda of understanding (MOUs), intersessional meetings on IPF/IFF proposals, debate on successes and obstacles to implementation, and analytical work of the Secretariat.

Additional means for implementation highlighted included country-led initiatives, the high-level ministerial segment, reports to ECOSOC, links with the CSD, UNFF resolutions, a partnership approach to implementation, national assessments and cooperation with other organizations to make use of existing expertise. In considering the possible products of the UNFF, participants identified principles, norms, standards, guidelines, policy guidance, resolutions and a budgeted PoA.

**FUNCTION "B" (PROVIDING A FORUM):** Participants noted that the UNFF will provide a forum for continued policy development, with the aim of fostering a common understanding of SFM. Participants underscored the importance of avoiding general debates in the UNFF. With regard to fostering a common understanding of SFM, participants proposed: improved communication and information exchange, including the dissemination of lessons learned at the national level on nfp experiences; ongoing work on criteria and indicators (C&I); addressing "policy mature" issues; clarification of language of key concepts and definitions; cross-sectoral coordination; certification; and the facilitation of sharing of experiences in implementing nfps. One participant commented that expert groups and country-led initiatives could also contribute to carrying out this function.

Many participants supported limiting discussion to a few key thematic issues or priority areas at each UNFF session. They also supported developing a mechanism to identify priority areas based on ongoing reporting and assessment. Some priority areas were flagged, including financing for SFM, valuation, nfps, forest fires, illegal logging, underlying causes, trade and matters left pending from the IFF. Participants suggested using the high-level ministerial segment of the UNFF to: secure political backing to address obstacles to implementation; seek political guidance on main points; enhance awareness domestically and internationally; and obtain commitment from countries. Participants considered the high-level ministerial segment the political authority of the UNFF. Participant proposals indicated that the high-level ministerial segments could: elaborate a declaration on priority areas; develop one powerful statement on one important topic per session; include policy dialogue with key organizations and major groups; and discuss multi-stakeholders' dialogue recommendations. Broad participation in the high-level ministerial segment was requested by some, with specific reference to involvement of indigenous groups. Participants noted that the UNFF should schedule high-level segments in a timely manner in relation to other high-level meetings of related issues, e.g. Rio + 10.

Participants proposed activities that the UNFF should include in the MYPOW, including: developing universal C&I; capacity building, including institutional capacity building; focusing dialogue on obstacles and success stories; promoting broader public understanding within countries of IPF/IFF proposals for action; facilitating a common understanding of nfp; fostering a common understanding of SFM; continuing the discussion on pending issues from IFF; and fostering more effective multi-stakeholder collaborative partnerships.

Participants also highlighted the need to: draw on bottom-up reporting to prioritize dialogue; link discussions to the obstacles and successes of IPF/IFF proposals for action to enhance effective implementation; address pending issues of the IPF/IFF processes as priority areas; and resolve areas of extreme disagreement during the IPF/IFF

processes through multi-stakeholder collaboration. On the instruments to develop these activities, participants suggested developing: state of knowledge reports on SFM; reports on on-going work of existing organizations and regional processes; debate in high-level segment sessions; regional UNFF sessions; working groups for each pending issue; and a clearing-house mechanism.

**FUNCTION "C" (COOPERATION AND COORDINATION WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL FOREST REGIME):** Participants stressed the importance of this function for facilitating implementation of existing forest-related commitments, and underscored the need to identify areas requiring improved coordination and to clarify the CPF's mission and modalities. Cooperation and coordination at the national and regional levels was also stressed. Participants suggested that the UNFF identify forest-related issues in most need of cooperation and coordination to be discussed at each UNFF session. Participants stressed that the MYPOW should be flexible enough to respond to emerging issues. Participants also noted the need to develop effective mechanisms for the UNFF to provide guidance for cooperation and coordination, and underscored that such guidance should be based on the assessment of implementation reports.

Participants viewed the UNFF's relationship with the CPF as central to this function. However, participants reiterated that the UNFF can only provide guidance to the CPF. Participants emphasized the CPF's role in enhancing cooperation and coordination, with some suggesting that it should take a cross-sectoral thematic approach. Participants highlighted the work of the ITFF and suggested the CPF adopt the same model with limitations on new members, as an enlarged CPF would be cumbersome. Others supported wider participation of NGOs and indigenous peoples organizations (IPOs).

Participants' suggestions also indicated that the UNFF should identify gaps or contradictions in CPF members' work, CPF members should include support for implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action in their agendas, and CPF members should develop a joint action plan. Many expressed support for joint programming among CPF members, however possible complications were flagged and some noted that joint activities might be more realistic.

To facilitate coordination with forest-related conventions, including the CBD, CCD and FCCC, participants proposed that the UNFF should provide guidance to convention secretariats in a timely manner to allow input at COPs, and that it could hold discussions on forests and climate change. Some participants also encouraged coordination of conventions at the national level.

Some participants indicted that country-led initiatives and UNFF resolutions could facilitate cooperation and coordination, and that the CSD provides a forum to discuss forest-related matters. Additional means for encouraging cooperation and coordination put forward by participants included: encouraging partnerships, elaborating recommendations, creating transparency and cooperating with organizations outside the CPF. Other proposals highlighted possibilities for collaboration with the International Forestry Advisors Group (IFAG) and recommended discussion of forests at the WTO. Efforts to involve the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) in other international fora were noted.

Regarding cooperation in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action, some participants noted it would be impossible to identify global priorities, given the differences in national realities and concerns, and national priority setting was stressed. Some participants emphasized that gaps and hindrances should be assessed at the national level and that regional priorities should be set.

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Participants also proposed: elaborating a list of relevant institutions and organizations and their activities and available resources; developing MOUs between CPF members and other relevant institutions and instruments; inviting CPF members to brief the UNFF on their relevant activities; ensuring that the CPF works in a transparent manner; identifying ways to facilitate cooperation with organizations not included in the CPF; and holding meetings among regional organizations.

Other recommendations noted included CPF strategies for coordination, CPF reports on progress in implementation, agreement within the CPF on common priorities, identification of common aspects and issues and possible synergies with other organizations, dissemination of documentation on priority thematic issues, civil society participation, an inventory of the international forest regime, and improved communication between international organizations, countries and groups.

**FUNCTION "D" (INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION):** The importance of financing, partnerships, technology transfer, capacity building, policy development and trade were stressed for this function. Some participants emphasized that SFM should be self-financing in the long run. Some participants remarked that funding is available and that it just needs to be accessed. Others noted the fierce competition for increasingly scarce resources. A number of participants suggested that the UNFF develop and maintain a directory of donors, including their areas of activity. Some participants called to establish an international forest fund.

Participants supported the development of innovative approaches and looked forward to fruitful outcomes from the Oslo meeting on financing SFM. Participant suggestions included direct funding to local levels, a sector-wide approach, public-private partnerships, an initiative on how to foster national conditions to encourage investment, regional cooperation mechanisms, and best practices and success stories in the management and use of funds for implementation.

Some participants said the establishment of an international forest fund would enable more effective implementation and help countries access financial support. Others commented that new funds would not necessarily promote more effective implementation and underscored the importance of identifying the most efficient mechanisms and partnerships for managing and channeling funds to implementation. Another idea discussed was to integrate bilateral or multilateral aid into a UNFF- international cooperation fund to be used only for the coordination of North-South public-private partnership and cross-sectoral cooperation.

Participants stressed the need to take activities on the ground into account, study existing activities and conduct capacity-building activities. A participant proposed that agencies involved in international cooperation evaluate the modalities and approaches they apply and consider a thematic approach instead of a programmatic approach. Some participants indicated that the basis for fostering international cooperation is countries' commitment to implementation, and that groups of countries with commonalities should cooperate to share experiences. One participant remarked that the IFAG could provide advice on how to coordinate donors.

Some speakers noted the need for improved knowledge about GEF funding for projects. Others proposed that the GEF Council be requested to open a new funding window for forest projects. One participant proposed that the UNFF could analyze successful private sector investment in SFM. Some participants stressed that countries should mainstream forests into national development plans and annual budgets to assure financing. One participant commented that funding should not be for nfps alone, but also for forest policy development, as nfps are not effective without good national policy.

Participant comments suggested that: donor requirements be harmonized; guidelines be given to international donors on priorities and mechanisms; a code of conduct for donors be developed; the UNFF monitor effectiveness of funds spent on SFM; the UNFF analyze private sector investment in SFM; a database on international cooperation on forests be included in the MYPOW; and the CPF should inform the UNFF on international cooperation. Participants emphasized cross-sectoral linkages.

One participant commented that, in bilateral arrangements, the donor country sometimes forces its strategy or interests and the necessary skill transfers do not always take place before projects end. Participants requested that the UNFF develop a clear monitoring system to ensure such situations are avoided. One participant said the international community should guide countries on how to establish high-level commitment and to coordinate ministries within their governments.

Participants also suggested that the UNFF establish an informal forum for North-South cooperation, encourage cooperation between regional processes, and hold round-table meetings with donors including foundations and the private sector. Participants suggested building partnerships with donor agencies and financial institutions such as the GEF and the World Bank.

Participants also identified cross-sectoral issues for the UNFF, such as the promotion of links with cross-sectoral forums on forest-related issues to assess synergies in terms of implementation and obstacles to progress. They said the UNFF should use Rio+10 as the most appropriate venue to promote cross-sectoral linkages on forest-related issues.

On ecological conditionality, participants noted the need for the UNFF to invite institutions and organizations at the macro-level to develop studies and participate in debates aimed at eliminating measures and practices of forest-related activities that undermine efforts toward SFM. Participants recommended that the UNFF monitor that financial support by international donors is not provided to projects that can be detrimental to SFM. One participant stressed that coordination of World Bank lending must be improved.

Participants' proposals included calls for: the establishment of a facility for the exchange and dissemination of up-to-date information on donor activities; an evaluation by the CPF of the potential for a clearing-house mechanism to facilitate transfer of technologies, information on scientific research, education and training and capacity building; UNFF encouragement for developing countries to report on implementation, including the international action required to address impediments and to attract donor support; and UNFF encouragement for the CPF to assist in developing SFM technologies adapted to regional conditions.

On trade issues, participants stressed that they must be addressed by the UNFF in a focused way as they relate to implementation and transition to SFM. Some indicated that trade questions must be dealt with as a cross-cutting issue. One participant also flagged addressing forest-related issues in the WTO. Others raised concerns that dialogue on trade might distract the UNFF from implementation.

Possible outcomes on this function included regional UNFF sessions to exchange views and experiences, action programmes, regional guidelines, joint activities and innovative partnerships, and the dissemination of publications on finance of technology transfer.

**FUNCTION "E" (MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS):** Some participants emphasized that this function is integral to all of the UNFF's work, especially implementation. Views varied as to whether the UNFF is to monitor implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action or progress toward SFM, how often reporting should occur, and whether countries would report in a substantive or

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

simplified manner. Opinions varied on adoption of C&I as a basis for reporting on progress made in SFM. Some participants preferred focusing on implementation and not on the general state of forests. One participant recalled that the IFF had agreed that reporting is required on the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and on C&I to provide information on the state of the forests.

Participants emphasized drawing on existing reporting mechanisms to avoid creating another body that would be costly, duplicate existing efforts and increase governments' reporting burden. Participants supported reducing reporting burdens through harmonization of reports and suggested that the CPF address reporting coordination. Many participants suggested that an expert group be established to assess gaps in existing mechanisms and to harmonize reporting.

Participants stressed the need to: take into account existing reporting requirements for other fora such as the ITTO, CBD, CCD and FAO; determine how existing formats could be harmonized; improve reliability and transparency in reporting; identify how to make resources for reporting available; and prioritize the IPF/IFF proposal to facilitate reporting and review.

Some participants drew attention to the need to avoid cumbersome reporting requirements and to make reporting a more rewarding experience. Many participants stressed the importance of comparability of information and independent monitoring. Participant suggestions also included that the PoA include reporting, national reports could be used to identify regional trends, and national reports be submitted at the regional level and then forwarded to the international level.

One participant proposed that criteria for assessing the Forum's success in five years be identified to help determine what information should be included in reports. Other points noted that: the IPF/IFF proposals for action do not cover everything that needs to be monitored, especially non-forestry related matters; reports from regions or based on forest type could be useful for lesson learning; and streamlining reporting could improve accuracy on assessing global trends. A number of participants proposed that the UNFF request the CPF to identify respective roles of relevant bodies and related budget implications.

Other activities discussed included: establishing a mechanism for the effective dissemination of UNFF results; using random sampling to inform monitoring and assessment; using monitoring and assessment information to apply a "bottom-up" approach in the MYPOW; establishing a flexible process to receive and review varied implementation reports; conferring formal status to implementation reports prepared by a variety of experts and sources; and using Internet technology to aid reporting and evaluate progress.

On the means to develop these activities, participants suggested that the UNFF Secretariat receive and review monitoring information as during the IFF, an expert group streamline reporting and an expert panel assess progress in implementation. Participants also supported having regional groups present reports to UNFF sessions, holding multi-stakeholder dialogues at each UNFF session, requiring a minimum of one full day of reporting at each UNFF session, and establishing a UNFF monitoring and assessment committee. A number of participants also stressed independent monitoring and NGO involvement in assessing progress.

Participants expressed their expectation to obtain clear recommendations on implementation from an assessment and reporting system. Participants recommended that the UNFF focus reports on issues related to each session topic and provide annual synthesis reports on implementation to the high-level ministerial segment. Other outcomes suggested were: UNFF reports on progress in implementation; simplified and/or abbreviated reports on implementation progress for general

dissemination; and input and feedback to the other UNFF functions and the MYPOW. Participants also commented that the reports should provide a basis for UNFF discussions, recommendations to the high-level ministerial segment and UNFF resolutions to the high-level ministerial segment.

### **FUNCTION "F" (STRENGTHENING POLITICAL WILL):**

Participants emphasized that the strengthening of political commitment is essential to perform the other functions and for the implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action. Participants also commented that political will would not be developed in the absence of a common sense of urgency and broad consensus for action. Implementation of existing forest-related commitments was seen as key to strengthening political commitment. Some noted that political attention will increase following a focus on clear issues, that political commitment will be generated from practical actions, and that practical actions will come if there are political rewards. Some participants indicated that national awareness building would result in bottom-up pressure on governments to strengthen political commitment. Participants also remarked that a dynamic, action-oriented PoA would enhance political commitment.

Many viewed the high-level ministerial segments as central to this function. However, it was noted that ministers will only attend meetings that address matters of high political interest, that ministers should be brought in to reinforce the political importance of priority areas, and that ministers are interested in addressing topics that will be viewed as a success. Participants emphasized the need to attract ministers from sectors other than forestry along with the need to educate ministers about the advantages of SFM and how it can contribute to addressing issues they are concerned with, such as poverty. The need to convince ministers that forestry is worth talking about and to help them develop a more mature understanding of cross-sectoral issues affecting forests was stressed. One participant noted that ministers can secure funding for forestry and that ministerial involvement can trigger funds at the national level.

Several participants supported holding two ministerial segments during the five year period. Participants suggested that two or three issues of priority be discussed at each high-level ministerial segment. Political topics that speakers identified for ministerial discussion included: forest fires, restoration, illegal logging, instilling knowledge of better forestry into trade rules and promoting good investment in forestry.

Other suggestions included: local level preparation for the high-level segment; regional ministerial meetings to build political support for international ministerial meetings; a global focal point network for preparation and follow-up to high-level segments; NGO and private sector participation; a method for identifying topics that would interest ministers; national level meetings to engage civil society; an electronic bulletin to increase transparency; and increased media presence at meetings.

On the legal framework, some suggested that an *ad hoc* expert group should be established to initiate work on the parameters of a legal framework, while others said such a measure would "contaminate" the UNFF's work and opposed any consideration of the matter in the first years of the UNFF.

Liaising with governing bodies of international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments and promoting action-oriented dialogue and policy formulation were identified as means to achieve political commitment. Other measures discussed proposed including ministers in country-led initiatives and holding high-level ministerial segments with real debate instead of statements, as is done in the CSD.



## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Some participants suggested that valuation of forest goods and services would increase political commitment. Speakers encouraged addressing cultural and social values in addition to economic value. Some participants suggested enhancing political commitment through the use of indicators that could measure increased awareness of multiple values, lower rates of deforestation, and increasing flows of financial assistance and technology.

Individuals projected various outcomes that would result from increased political will, including: adequate resources for SFM at the national level; more country and regional involvement in the UNFF; increased budgets for nfps; long term cross-sectoral national planning and management for forests with the support of the international community; ministerial declaration of the significance of nfps in low forest cover countries (LFCCs); support to establish long-term-oriented forest policies in the countries; policy dialogue and decisions; concerted international strategies, support and instruments to address the emerging forest crisis; a forest fund; a legally binding instrument; a draft resolution for the UNGA urging CPF members to direct more attention to forests; institutionalization of cross-sectoral ministerial discussions about forest-related issues; and agreed guidelines and principles for transparent and participatory cross-sectoral forest activities.

### FINAL PLENARY

Co-Chair Anaedu opened the final Plenary session and drew attention to the Report of the Consultation, which had been produced by a drafting group including members from each working group. He thanked the drafting group members for their efforts, noting that the group had worked through the night and finished at 7:30 am. He emphasized that the report did not represent a consensus document, but rather aimed to reflect the views and ideas of the experts that participated in the event. Participants were allowed time to read the draft report, following which Co-Chair Anaedu invited comments on the report, explaining that the constraints of time would not allow the Plenary to debate its content.

In a section highlighting the potential means available to the UNFF, some participants suggested including multi-stakeholder dialogues as a means within UNFF meetings. Co-Chair Anaedu opposed, stating that the suggestion would not be taken as multi-stakeholders technically are not official participants at UNFF meetings. With regard to expected outcomes of the MYPOW, one participant suggested adding reference to the establishment of a financial mechanism for SFM. Another participant requested removing "standards" from a list of possible outcomes of the MYPOW, arguing that the UNFF will not be a standards setting body. The suggestion was accepted.

In the section on function "a" (implementation), a participant suggested adding a paragraph to reflect that "some participants noted the useful contribution towards implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action that could be made by simplified summaries of the proposals for action." Regarding reference to the need for operational guidance for implementation, a participant called for the deletion of specific reference to the FAO guidelines on nfps. Co-Chair Anaedu opposed, stressing again that any substantial changes would be rejected.

With regard to function "b" (providing a forum), one participant requested noting that expert groups would lead to substantive sessions under the MYPOW and possibly to the development of resolutions to be forwarded to ECOSOC and the UNGA. Co-Chair Anaedu opposed, stating that it would be unfair to add entirely new proposals at this point.

One participant noted that forestry and poverty alleviation had been omitted from the list of possible priorities to be discussed. Reference to this issue was added. Some participants expressed concern that the order of the list demonstrated a ranking of priorities. Co-Chair Anaedu stressed that the lists did not demonstrate a ranking in any sense.

Many participants expressed disapproval of a sentence stating that a "few" participants emphasized the importance of involving all relevant organizations, private sector, NGOs, IPOs and other members of major groups in policy development and dialogue. The sentence was modified to note that "many" participants emphasized the importance of involving all relevant organizations.

With regard to function "c" (cooperation and policy/programme coordination), one participant proposed adding text indicating that NGOs and other members of major groups be included among CPF members. Co-Chair Anaedu opposed the suggestion, clarifying that the CPF is to be modeled after the ITFF and limited in membership to enable it to produce concrete outcomes and not just hold debates.

Under function "f" (strengthening political commitment), one participant requested that a sentence stating that there is already a good level of commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests be modified to "in some countries" there is already a good level of commitment. This was accepted.

Regarding a list of means to strengthen political commitment, a participant's request to include the proposal to establish an expert group to begin preparations on developing the parameters of a mandate for developing a legally binding instrument on forests was rejected along with a proposal to include a resolution on the parameters as a possible outcome of the UNFF MYPOW. Another participant requested adding reference to the valuation of forest goods and services as a measure to improve political commitment. This was also rejected.

Regarding a sentence stating that the development of parameters through an *ad hoc* expert group would "contaminate" the work of the UNFF, some participants opposed this language and offered alternative wording, such as "initially distract." Other participants requested that "contaminate" be retained. After informal consultations it was agreed that the original wording would stand.

Some participants asked whether the notes from the working groups would be annexed to the report of the meeting. Co-Chair Anaedu indicated that the annex would be included in the reports distributed to the meeting participants, and that the Secretariat would make the final decision.

Participants called for additional text in the report to officially thank the Government of Germany for organizing the meeting and for its hospitality.

Co-Chair Hoenisch noted the report's quality despite the fact that it was not a consensus document. He thanked the other partner countries, the IFF Secretariat, the Eight-Country Initiative's secretariat, the moderators, rapporteurs and the drafting group for their hard work. He noted the spirit of cooperation and highlighted the achievement of a product that identifies the questions surrounding the new forest arrangement and some possible answers.

Jagmohan Maini, Head of the IFF Secretariat, communicated to participants that former IFF Co-Chair Ambassador Bagher Asadi (Iran) regretted that he was unable to attend the Consultation. Maini remarked that the IFF Secretariat had benefited from the flow of knowledge at the Consultation. He noted that participants to the Consultation had assisted in the launching of a new phase of the dynamic process. He thanked Christian Merssman and his team for their important contribution and wise guidance.

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Merssman highlighted the level of participation and openness of participants and congratulated his colleagues from the other partner countries that co-sponsored the event. He highlighted the hard work of the working group facilitators and the team of the IFF Secretariat, noting that their intellectual guidance was critical to achieving results.

Co-Chair Anaedu closed the meeting expressing his personal appreciation for the quality of dialogue. He wished other meetings of this substance could make a difference in forests and sustainable development. He reiterated that the Report of the Consultation is not a consensus document, but reflects different views and a broad range of ideas of participants. He commended the hospitality of the German Government and thanked Christian Merssman for organizing the event. He called upon future meeting organizers to extend fellowships to more participants from Africa and grassroots movements to enrich the process. Co-Chair Anaedu drew the Consultation to a close at 1:00 pm.

### THINGS TO LOOK FOR

#### **EIGHTH SESSION OF WORKING GROUP I OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE:**

This meeting will take place from 17-20 January 2001 in Shanghai, China. For more information, contact: N. Sundararaman; Secretary to the IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland; tel: +41-22-730-8208; fax: +41-22-730-8025; Internet: <http://www.ipcc.ch>

**INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP OF EXPERTS ON FINANCING SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT:** This government-led initiative in support of the IPF/IFF/UNFF Processes will be held from 22-25 January 2001 in Oslo, Norway. For more information contact: Secretariat, Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, Division of Sustainable Development, UN DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-6208; e-mail: [vahanen@un.org](mailto:vahanen@un.org)

**UN FORUM ON FORESTS - ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION:** This meeting will convene from 12-16 February 2001 in New York. For more information contact: Secretariat, Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, Division of Sustainable Development, UN DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-6208; e-mail: [vahanen@un.org](mailto:vahanen@un.org)

**CBD SBSTTA-6:** The Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity will meet from 12-16 March 2001 in Montreal, Canada. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Canada; tel: +1-514-288-2220; Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/>

**16TH COMMONWEALTH FORESTRY CONFERENCE - FORESTS IN A CHANGING LANDSCAPE:** This Conference will meet from 18-25 April 2001 in Fremantle, Western Australia. For more information contact: Libby Jones, Standing Committee on Commonwealth Forestry, Edinburgh, UK; tel: +44-131-314-6137; fax: +44-131-334-0442; e-mail: [libby.jones@forestry.gov.uk](mailto:libby.jones@forestry.gov.uk)

**MCPFE (Meeting on the Improvement of the Pan-European Indicators for Sustainable Forests Management):** This meeting will be held from 19-20 or 26-27 March 2001 in Liechtenstein. This meeting is convened by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE). For more information contact: Peter Mayer, Liaison Unit Vienna, Marxergasse 2, A-1030 Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-7702; fax: +43-1-710-77-02-13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net>

**CSD-9:** The Ninth Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development will meet in New York from 16-27 April 2001. This session will focus on: atmosphere; energy/transport; information for decision making and participation; and international cooperation for an

enabling environment. For more information contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, Major Groups Focal Point, Division for Sustainable Development; tel: +1-212-963-8811; e-mail: [aydin@un.org](mailto:aydin@un.org); Internet: [http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd9/csd9\\_2001.htm#](http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd9/csd9_2001.htm#)

**CSD-10 (PREPCOM):** The Tenth Session of the Commission on Sustainable Development is expected to convene in New York from 30 April-2 May 2001 to serve as the Preparatory Committee for the Tenth Review of UNCED. For more information contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, Major Groups Focal Point, Division for Sustainable Development; tel: +1-212-963-8811; e-mail: [aydin@un.org](mailto:aydin@un.org)

**TECHNICAL EXPERTS GROUP ON FORESTS:** The meeting will convene in Edinburgh, Scotland, from 23-27 April 2001 (tentative). For more information contact: Ms. Frida Velarde, Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat; tel: +1-514-287-7001; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [frida.velarde@biodiv.org](mailto:frida.velarde@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/conv/events/events.asp?cbd>

**MCPFE ROUND TABLE MEETING:** This meeting will be held from 14-15 May 2001 in Brussels, Belgium. This meeting is convened by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) and is open to participants and observers of the MCPFE. For more information contact: Peter Mayer, Liaison Unit Vienna, Marxergasse 2, A-1030 Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-7702; fax: +43-1-710-77-02-13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net>

**FORESTRY IMPACTS OF CHINA'S REFORMS: LESSONS FOR CHINA AND THE WORLD.** This symposium on the forestry impacts of China's rural, industrial, and financial reforms since 1978 will meet in Beijing in May 2001. The symposium is organized and co-hosted by the Center for International Forestry Research, China State Forestry Administration, the Research Center for Ecological and Environmental Economics under Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Chinese Academy of Forestry, and the Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy under Chinese Academy of Agricultural Science. For more information contact: [L.Dachang@cgiar.org](mailto:L.Dachang@cgiar.org) and [T.Suhartini@cgiar.org](mailto:T.Suhartini@cgiar.org).

**UNFCCC SB-14/RESUMED COP-6:** The 14th sessions of the Subsidiary Bodies of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change will take place from 21 May-1 June 2001, in Bonn, Germany. This meeting may also serve as the resumed COP-6 (as outlined under COP-6 decision FCCC/CP/2000/L.3). For more information contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int>

**30<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER COUNCIL:** The 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the International Tropical Timber Council is scheduled from 28 May - 2 June 2001 in Yaounde, Cameroon. For more information contact: the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO); International Organizations Center, 5th Floor, Pacifico-Yokohama 1-1-1, Minato-Mirai, Nishi-ku, Yokohama, 220-0012 Japan; tel: +81-45-223-1110; fax: +81-45-223-1111; e-mail: [itto@itto.or.jp](mailto:itto@itto.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp/>

**FIRST SUBSTANTIVE SESSION OF THE UN FORUM ON FORESTS:** This meeting is expected to be held in June 2001 at UN Headquarters in New York. For more information contact: Secretariat, Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, Division of Sustainable Development, UN DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-6208; e-mail: [vahanen@un.org](mailto:vahanen@un.org)