



Earth Negotiations Bulletin

A Reporting Service for Environment and Development Negotiations

Vol. 13 No. 25 Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) Monday, 23 September 1996

REPORT OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE CSD INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS 9-20 SEPTEMBER 1996

The Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) held its third session from 9-20 September 1996 in Geneva. Delegates undertook substantive discussions on eleven programme elements: I.1 (national forest and land-use plans); I.2 (underlying causes of deforestation); I.3 (traditional forest-related knowledge); I.4 (ecosystems affected by desertification and pollution); I.5 (needs of countries with low forest cover); II (financial assistance and technology transfer); III.1(a) (forest assessment); III.1(b) (valuation of forest benefits); III.2 (criteria and indicators); IV. (trade and the environment); and V.1 (international organizations and multilateral institutions). They also initiated discussion on programme element V.2 (legal mechanisms).

The objective of IPF-3 was to produce a document containing elements to be considered for inclusion in the Panel's final report to the CSD. Delegates did not engage in negotiations or drafting of the elements at IPF-3, but made comments and proposed amendments to be negotiated at IPF-4. While some regard IPF-3 as a success in that it provided an opportunity for a meaningful exchange of views on the issues, others expressed disappointment at the Panel's inability to reach the negotiating stage on any of the programme elements and noted that this task may prove daunting during IPF-4.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE IPF

The Economic and Social Council, in its decision 1995/226, endorsed the recommendation of the third session of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) to establish an open-ended *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) to pursue consensus and coordinated proposals for action to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests. In pursuing its mandate, the IPF is focusing on 12 programme elements clustered into five interrelated categories. The IPF will submit final conclusions and policy recommendations to the CSD at its fifth session in April 1997.

The first session of the IPF took place in New York from 11-15 September 1995. At this meeting, delegates adopted the IPF

programme of work and attempted to set the dates and venues of future meetings. Several issues that have typically divided North and South again proved difficult. Members of the G-77 and China were resistant to any proposal that could foreseeably lead to a loss of national control over forests and forest products. There was also concern about the subject of criteria and indicators (C&I) and whether proposed intersessional workshops should constitute an official part of the Panel process. Developed countries questioned the need to extend the length of Panel meetings and expressed serious concerns about the Panel's work.

The IPF held its second session from 11-22 March 1996 in Geneva. Delegates conducted their first substantive discussions on six programme elements and completed initial consideration of the others. During the final two days of the meeting, delegates considered the Co-Chairs' summaries. They labeled these transitional in nature to signify that the summaries did not represent negotiated text. Delegates agreed to begin negotiations at IPF-3 on items that had received substantive consideration at the second session, although another substantive discussion was scheduled on the programme element on financial assistance and technology transfer. Delegates left Geneva satisfied that they had expressed national positions on a range of forest issues, but were somewhat frustrated that all of their positions were not always reflected in the report of IPF-2.

IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of the IPF	1
Report of the Third Session	2
A Brief Analysis of IPF-3.....	11
Things to Look For	12

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*© <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Chad Carpenter, LL.M. <chadc@iisd.org>, Pamela Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@dti.net>, Deborah Davenport <ddavenp@unix.cc.emory.edu>, Emily Gardner <egardner@hawaii.edu>, and Kira Schmidt <kiras@iisd.org>. The Managing Editor is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The sustaining donors of the *Bulletin* are the International Institute for Sustainable Development <iisd@web.apc.org>, the Dutch Ministry for Development Cooperation and the Pew Charitable Trusts. General support for the *Bulletin* for 1996 is provided by the Overseas Development Administration (ODA) of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark, the Swedish Ministry of Environment, the Swiss Federal Office of the Environment, the Ministry of the Environment of Iceland, the Ministry of Environment of Norway and the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. Specific funding for this volume is provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Natural Resources Canada and the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association. The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses or at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are automatically sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found on the gopher at <gopher.igc.apc.org> and in hypertext through the *Linkages* WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/> on the Internet.

REPORT OF IPF-3

Co-Chairs Sir Martin Holdgate (UK) and Manuel Rodriguez (Colombia) opened the session, emphasizing its importance because delegates must arrive at negotiated conclusions and recommendations for transmission to the CSD. They applauded the level of progress made during the intersessional period and encouraged consideration of reports produced at intersessional workshops. A workshop on traditional forest-related knowledge sponsored by Denmark and Colombia was announced for December.

The Director of the Division for Sustainable Development, Joke Waller-Hunter, highlighted progress made during the intersessional period and encouraged the Panel to take advantage of work accomplished. Common understanding has emerged with regard to several programme elements including land-use planning, national forest plans and forest assessments. Further deliberation on C&I, valuation of forest goods and services and underlying causes of deforestation is needed. The IPF should adopt realistic recommendations and refrain from taking a "wish list" approach.

The provisional agenda (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/13) was then introduced. The proposed agenda of work consisted largely of two parallel working group sessions. Preliminary conclusions were to be drafted during the first week and negotiated into final text during the second week. Programme element V.2 (legal mechanisms) would be discussed in plenary. SWITZERLAND suggested that plenary be extended to facilitate the adoption of conclusions. The provisional agenda was adopted.

The EU, supported by GABON and SENEGAL, expressed concern regarding the unavailability of certain documents in all working languages, noting that the Panel's work could be impeded.

The floor was open for general comments. The EU highlighted the need to formulate clear and appropriate conclusions as well as concrete proposals for action. Cross-sectoral issues must be acknowledged and incorporated. COLOMBIA and the ALLIANCE OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES emphasized the importance of intersessional activities, such as the upcoming meeting sponsored by the Colombian and Danish governments on traditional forest-related knowledge. MEXICO said the Panel should deliver practical conclusions that spell out means to implement them. FINLAND reported that the Nordic forestry ministers met in July and expressed their support for the IPF's work and urged it to formulate recommendations for concrete action. He underlined that the Panel's work should be holistic and intersectoral, and a policy forum must continue to exist after IPF-4 to maintain momentum.

After the opening plenary, the majority of the Panel's work was conducted in two parallel working groups. Working Group I, chaired by Sir Martin Holdgate, considered programme elements I.1-I.3 and III. Working Group II, chaired by Manuel Rodriguez, considered programme elements II, IV, I.4 and I.5. Programme elements V.1 and V.2 were taken up in plenary and joint working group sessions.

Delegates conducted an initial round of discussions during the first week, based on the Secretary-General's reports on each programme element. The reports were prepared by the IPF Secretariat in collaboration with the UN agencies participating in the Inter-Agency Task Force on Forests, governments sponsoring intersessional initiatives and NGOs. The reports reviewed the current status of international work on the programme elements and provided an appraisal of recent developments, with special reference to issues raised by the Panel during IPF-2.

The Secretariat then prepared "draft negotiating texts" that were based on the first week's discussions. These texts served as the basis for a second round of discussions during the second week. The Secretariat then produced revised "draft negotiating texts" for

most programme elements. These texts incorporated alternative drafting suggestions for negotiation during IPF-4, with direct attributions to the proposing delegations incorporated in the texts.

A third round of discussions was undertaken on several of these revised texts on the final day of the session, but time did not permit further discussion of all programme elements. The objective of this last round of discussions was to arrive at some preliminary, *ad referendum* agreement on "easy" parts of the texts and to identify the most controversial parts. This text will be incorporated into a forthcoming document to be entitled "Elements for further negotiations at the Fourth Session of the Panel." This document will note that all programme elements are open for further discussion and negotiation with a view to arriving at a general agreement on conclusions and proposals for action that the IPF will submit to the fifth session of the CSD in April 1997. The report will also incorporate the findings of upcoming intersessional initiatives.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT I.1: NATIONAL FOREST AND LAND USE PLANS

Working Group I took up initial consideration of programme element I.1 on 9 and 10 September. Jean Clement (FAO) introduced the Secretary-General's report on progress through national forest and land use plans (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/14). The report, based on the outcomes of workshops held in South Africa and Germany, covers definitions of terms, future challenges and proposals for IPF action. It notes progress made, but identifies a series of obstacles to overcome, at both the global and national levels, in the areas of: policy and institutional reforms; investment programming and funding; capacity building; and international cooperation. The report urges the adoption of a universal concept of national forest programmes (NFPs), while recognizing the need to respect national sovereignty, particularly with regard to implementation. NFPs should consider the needs of all stakeholders and employ international cooperation.

During the initial debate, GERMANY presented options for action produced by a German expert consultation on implementing the Forest Principles, including a code of conduct. SWEDEN highlighted an upcoming Sweden/Uganda initiative on sustainable forestry and land use. The EU supported the basic principle of NFPs in the report and emphasized public and private investments and capacity-building as an objective. NORWAY, BRAZIL, SWITZERLAND, MOROCCO and ITALY supported some form of a continuing international forum for forest dialogue. SENEGAL, supported by the PHILIPPINES and MALAYSIA, expressed concern regarding this proposal. FINLAND emphasized integration of forest planning into wider land use planning and incorporation of criteria and indicators (C&I) into NFPs. NEW ZEALAND, supported by the PHILIPPINES, CHINA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA, COSTA RICA, COLOMBIA and MOROCCO, stressed flexibility in addressing countries' different conditions. The US also supported this, noting countries' varying land ownership patterns and mechanisms for public participation. MALI stated that NFPs should reflect established policies. The NETHERLANDS supported the universal development of NFPs. JAPAN suggested a pilot phase. NORWAY sought universal terminology. PAPUA NEW GUINEA supported forest planning for all countries and international cooperation for capacity building. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' ORGANIZATIONS noted that land use is closely linked to social and cultural issues. CANADA said NFPs are the best way to achieve sustainable forest management (SFM) and should incorporate national-level C&I, views of all stakeholders and biodiversity concerns. BRAZIL noted the relationship between C&I, NFPs and resource and technology transfer. COSTA RICA noted historical deforestation in developed countries.

A draft negotiating text was discussed on 16 September. The G-77/CHINA, supported by UGANDA, proposed new language urging donor countries to provide new and additional resources for development and implementation of NFPs. With INDIA and the IUCN, he proposed replacing a reference to SFM with "conservation, management, and sustainable development of all types of forests" from the Rio Statement of Forest Principles. The EU sought a continuing forum for international consultation rather than a consultative body, and, supported by INDIA and the IUCN, encouraged governments to form Forest Partnership Agreements (FPAs). The US urged substituting "SFM" for "NFPs." INDIA and the IUCN emphasized incorporation of a broad spectrum of forest-dependent communities into NFPs. UKRAINE asked for language on capacity building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. CANADA proposed language stressing linkages to the Convention on Biological Diversity's work on biodiversity and forests.

A revised version of the draft negotiating text, with annotations based on earlier textual comments, was discussed on 20 September. Countries only addressed paragraphs relating to proposals for action. The G-77/CHINA called for definitions of terminology used in the text and questioned FINLAND's proposal calling for land use plans as a means to promote "land use husbandry." The US agreed with a proposal urging countries to "monitor" NFPs and added "or other forest policy frameworks." He opposed internationally acceptable definitions that apply to all forests, but supported definitions for key terms and concepts for C&I. He emphasized that participation of interested parties and major groups in forest use planning and decision-making only applies to public forests, and stressed the need for recipient countries to make a clear commitment to SFM. He generally supported INDIA's proposed language stressing community forestry as well as language on "further exploration of voluntary partnerships" rather than specific FPAs. While the EU supported CANADA's inclusion of language welcoming the input of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the US and the G-77/CHINA opposed it.

Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT 1.2: UNDERLYING CAUSES OF DEFORESTATION AND DEGRADATION

Working Group I held initial discussions on programme element 1.2 on 12 September. Ralph Schmidt (UNDP) introduced the Secretary-General's report on underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/15). The report addresses methods for judging optimum forest cover and considers the usefulness of a diagnostic framework to assist countries in identifying the causes of deforestation and forest degradation (D&FD). The report contains conclusions and proposals for action on consumption and production patterns, a national policy framework and application of the diagnostic framework.

The G-77/CHINA, COLOMBIA, MALI and the PHILIPPINES noted a lack of proposals for addressing social and economic factors in D&FD and dissimilarities between deforestation and degradation. Along with the EU and BRAZIL, the G-77/CHINA emphasized historical lessons. NORWAY noted that national policy frameworks must adhere to similar principles in all countries. INDIA noted that deforestation can physically cross political boundaries. The PHILIPPINES emphasized natural causes of forest destruction. UGANDA and ZIMBABWE called for balanced treatment of developed and developing countries and said actions can precede studies. The NETHERLANDS called for determination of desired forest cover.

On the diagnostic framework, SOUTH AFRICA supported its establishment. CHINA called for voluntary diagnostic frameworks.

KENYA called for a flexible diagnostic framework and capacity-building assistance, and rejected efforts to compare case study results. ZIMBABWE called for diagnostic frameworks to address implementation strategies and financing requirements. ECUADOR encouraged international support for testing a diagnostic framework.

On consumption and production, MALI, supported by UGANDA and ZIMBABWE, stressed energy needs as a cause of D&FD, and, supported by CAMEROON and INDIA, called for poverty alleviation. ECUADOR and GABON called for increased attention to the effects of oil prospecting and consumption. The US sought characterization of long-term trends in consumption and production of forests and forest products. The EU, supported by the NETHERLANDS and FINLAND, noted unplanned causes of D&FD and supported further analysis of international causes. FUNDACION NATURA said international causes of deforestation, such as poverty, transboundary pollution and consumption patterns, must be addressed. NEW ZEALAND noted the role of plantation forests in mitigating forest degradation and encouraged their use.

A draft negotiating text was discussed on 18 September. The G-77/CHINA, supported by COLOMBIA, emphasized: production and consumption patterns; non-market values of forest goods and services; studies on historical causes of D&FD; and discriminatory international trade practices. COLOMBIA proposed language acknowledging the need for an international meeting to discuss the underlying causes of D&FD.

The G-77/CHINA proposed Forest Principles language on "management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests" for several locations in the text. The US proposed using "SFM." Supported by JAPAN and CANADA, he said a reference to environmental impact assessments should be included as an example of mechanisms to improve policy formulation and coordination rather than as a separate point. The EU specified language on the "promotion of open and participatory programmes for the implementation of NFPs, taking into account D&FD." She also called for: formulation of mechanisms aimed at the equitable sharing of benefits from the forests; policies for securing land tenure for indigenous peoples and local communities; and prompt government action when direct or indirect causes have been identified.

On production and consumption patterns, the US called for further study of the conclusions from a recent Norwegian conference on consumption and production patterns as underlying causes of D&FD. The EU deleted a statement that poverty and consumption patterns have a major influence on deforestation and urged governments, "where relevant," to prepare strategic studies of the implications of "current" consumption and production patterns for forests. JAPAN proposed deleting language to address terms of trade, discriminatory trade practices and unsustainable policies related to sectors such as agriculture and energy.

On diagnostic frameworks, the EU proposed deleting language stating that such frameworks should not be used as a basis for ODA conditionality. NEW ZEALAND, on behalf of AUSTRALIA, CHILE, CHINA, SOUTH AFRICA and UGANDA, urged countries to actually use the diagnostic framework as an analytical tool in assessing options for utilization of forests and forest lands. CANADA called for all countries to undertake case studies using the diagnostic framework, as well as research, technology transfer and capacity-building activities. Environmental NGOs called for donor assistance to developing countries for strategic analysis of policies contributing to D&FD. CANADA added assistance for countries with economies in transition.

On plantation forests, NEW ZEALAND, on behalf of AUSTRALIA, CHILE, CHINA, SOUTH AFRICA and UGANDA, noted the role of plantation forests as an important element of SFM.

JAPAN added language supporting the conversion of plantation forests. NORWAY stressed the need for plantations to meet social, economic and environmental conditions, including conservation of biodiversity.

A second version of the draft negotiating text, containing annotations based on earlier textual comments, was discussed on 20 September. Countries only addressed paragraphs relating to proposals for action. Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT I.3: TRADITIONAL FOREST-RELATED KNOWLEDGE

Delegates undertook the first round of discussion on programme element I.3, traditional forest-related knowledge (TFRK) on 10 September. Co-Chair Sir Martin Holdgate introduced the Secretary-General's report on the issue (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/16). The report contains a general overview of the nature of traditional knowledge, its relationship to property rights and the distinctions that need to be drawn regarding its integration into SFM.

In the discussion that followed, the Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat urged wider application of TFRK and, with the EU and GABON, equitable sharing of benefits. JAPAN, supported by AUSTRALIA, CANADA and the G-77/CHINA, emphasized the Convention on Biological Diversity's major responsibility on the issue. The EU, COLOMBIA, UKRAINE, the NETHERLANDS, the PHILIPPINES and UNESCO said indigenous peoples should be consulted in the development of land use plans and SFM programmes. DENMARK called for social equity in participation regarding the development of forest and land use plans.

COICA and the INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF INDIGENOUS TRIBAL PEOPLES sought recognition of indigenous peoples' rights to their intellectual property and territories and, with MALAYSIA, urged that TFRK be protected by national legislation. COLOMBIA said intellectual property rights (IPR) should be determined at the State and international levels. Environmental NGOs called for international legislation on IPR. PAPUA NEW GUINEA said that TFRK should be addressed on a piecemeal basis and called for the establishment of incentives for contributions. BRAZIL and NORWAY sought a *sui generis* type of protection for TFRK. The US supported partnership agreements, but questioned IPF attempts to facilitate contracts between governments and TFRK owners. GERMANY sought delineation of traditional, local and contemporary knowledge.

Delegates considered revised text on TFRK on 17 September. The US said the Convention on Biological Diversity should complement rather than direct the IPF's work on TFRK. He added that the introduction of new technologies and economic opportunities could accelerate forest loss and undermine forest communities and TFRK. CANADA encouraged support for capacity building of indigenous people and local communities, and their participation as full partners in SFM. JAPAN urged governments to identify knowledge, innovations and practices relevant to the practical application of SFM.

The G-77/CHINA called for heightened protection of indigenous people's IPR and rights to patents. The EU sought recognition of the knowledge and rights of forest owners. NORWAY said instruments regarding TFRK should be developed and implemented to be mutually supportive while avoiding duplication of work. A NAPGUANA representative noted that indigenous peoples could contribute more effectively if the reports were available in languages other than English. He urged that TFRK be viewed as an integral part of indigenous people's lives and not just as a marketable commodity. Environmental NGOs called on governments to collaborate with indigenous peoples,

concerned groups and institutions in the compilation of TFRK at national and local levels. The INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF INDIGENOUS TRIBAL PEOPLES reported on an upcoming intersessional meeting on TFRK sponsored by Denmark and Colombia to be held in Colombia, from 9-13 December 1996.

Delegates briefly revisited TFRK during the final session of Working Group I on September 20. The US supported a *sui generis* regime for the protection and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of TFRK. The G-77/CHINA supported participatory approaches and management of TFRK but called for inclusion of language emanating from the Rio Declaration and Forest Principles rather than that proposed by the EU referring to "community forest management, land-use resource management, research training and extension, the formulation of criteria and indicators and conflict resolution." The EU supported JAPAN's proposal inviting governments to work toward identifying knowledge, innovations and practices that are relevant to the practical attainment of SFM. Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT I.4: FRAGILE ECOSYSTEMS AFFECTED BY DESERTIFICATION, AND THE IMPACT OF AIRBORNE POLLUTION

Working Group II considered programme element I.4, fragile ecosystems affected by desertification, and the impact of airborne pollution on forests on 12 September. Jean Clement (FAO) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/17). The report is divided into two parts. The first part addresses progress related to afforestation, reforestation and the restoration of forest systems, particularly in countries with fragile ecosystems and those affected by desertification and drought, and focuses on national dryland programmes, capacity-building, land tenure, periodic assessment, preventive and restorative measures and coordination. The second part addresses progress related to the impact of airborne pollution on forests, focusing on emission reduction, periodic assessment, research and rehabilitation of affected areas. Based on delegates' comments, a draft negotiating text was produced by the Secretariat. Delegates considered this text on 18 September and, based on the comments, a revised draft negotiating text was produced for consideration on the final day.

During the course of these discussions, delegates offered the following comments. On desertification and drought, environmental NGOs asserted that poor resource management may be caused by a lack of alternatives as opposed to a lack of education, and recommended new language regarding support for participatory research with indigenous people and local communities in resource management. GERMANY recommended that strategies on desertification should be integrated within existing forest and land use programmes. CANADA said national forestry action programmes provide the best framework for addressing reforestation and afforestation by providing cross-sectoral linkages, participation of stakeholders, policy and legislative reviews and institutional strengthening. DENMARK noted that the provision of financial means and incentives for private owners will not ensure successful afforestation efforts. The IUCN suggested that bilateral and multilateral agencies and government planners shift investment emphasis away from plantations toward improving communities' tenure rights.

The US added language encouraging countries to undertake the obligations contained in Article 5 of the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and emphasized the need to avoid duplication with the CCD. He said the proposed formulation of guidelines for conservation and environmental management of plantations is premature. Supported by JAPAN and the G-77/CHINA, he proposed deleting a reference to long-term institutional and legal arrangements in a proposal on strengthening

partnerships. The G-77/CHINA emphasized the need for financial resources and technology transfer to promote forest land rehabilitation. He added language on: the positive and cost-effective results from plantations of fast-growth trees in terms of soil protection; the use of protected areas as an *in-situ* conservation strategy for ecosystems affected by drought and desertification; and the promotion of protected areas in arid and semi-arid regions, including preservation of water resources and traditional and historical uses. The EU called for new language on: the important role of education, training and extension systems aimed at specific groups; institutional and land tenure reform; coordination and harmonization of national forest and land use plans at the regional level; and consideration of dryland issues in NFPs and promotion of stakeholder education and training in drylands management.

On the impact of air-borne pollution on forests, TURKEY called for promotion of technical cooperation to encourage capacity building in research. The US called for further work under existing monitoring systems on ways to assess and monitor national level C&I for SFM on air-borne pollutants. JAPAN emphasized the need for region-wide forest monitoring systems and testing and application of the critical loads approach, and proposed language encouraging governments to adopt a preventive approach for reducing transboundary air pollution in the context of national sustainable development strategies. The G-77/CHINA recommended deleting proposals to incorporate reduction of air pollution into national sustainable development strategies and to encourage regions to enter into binding agreements to reduce the impact of air-borne pollutants.

Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT I.5: NEEDS AND REQUIREMENTS OF COUNTRIES WITH LOW FOREST COVER

Working Group II considered programme element I.5, needs and requirements of countries with low forest cover. Bai-Mass Taal (UNEP) presented the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/18), which was discussed on 12 September. The report acknowledges the strong dependence on forest goods and services for subsistence; major problems of countries with low forest cover (poorly protected watersheds, decreasing number of endemic species and scarcity of forest products); concentration of investment in countries with abundant forest cover; and the need for special attention to the needs and requirements of countries with low forest cover. It contains proposals for action on NFPs; forest plantations; importation and substitution; participatory mechanisms; information collection and dissemination; capacity building; and coordination mechanisms.

On 19 September, delegates conducted a second round of discussions on a revised negotiating text that contains conclusions and proposals for action on the definition of low forest cover; NFPs; and international cooperation. The text calls for a more precise categorization of countries with low forest cover as the FAO's global Forest Resource Assessment 2000 (FRA 2000) currently defines such countries as those having 20% and 10% and of minimum crown cover for developed and developing countries, respectively, and has no scientific foundation or opportunity for global comparability.

The US recommended a universal definition of 10% be adopted for all countries. SOUTH AFRICA recommended expanding the definition of countries to include countries in which the lack of forests has resulted in an unfulfilled national demand for forest products.

INDONESIA called for increased assistance and technology transfer for low forest cover countries. AUSTRALIA noted that

low forest cover is only a crude criterion for allocating forest funding. Environmental NGOs called for: special care to avoid replacing natural species with large-scale tree plantations; assessment of financial, socio-cultural and environmental costs associated with increasing plantation cover; and exploration of means to reduce demand for pulp and paper, particularly in northern countries. The EU called for: special attention to the needs of least developed countries with low forest cover; close coordination with Convention on Biological Diversity activities to establish networks of protected areas; and the retention of natural species where appropriate. With the US, he noted that official development assistance (ODA) is "an important," rather than "the most important," source of funding to countries with low forest cover. UKRAINE added references to buffer zones and ecological corridors to conserve biodiversity and to support countries with economies in transition with low forest cover. The US, supported by JAPAN, proposed deleting paragraphs on permanent forest estates, non-wood substitutes and Forest Partnership Agreements (FPAs).

The G-77/CHINA proposed language on the need to emphasize natural regeneration of degraded forest areas by involving communities and indigenous people in their protection and management. He called for: national and international measures to protect distinctive or rare forest types in countries with low forest cover; financial assistance, transfer of technology and know-how; provision of new and additional resources; and assistance to developing countries in data gathering and analysis. Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT II: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

Working Group II considered programme element II (international cooperation and technology transfer) on 10 September. Co-Chair Manuel Rodriguez introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/19) and a document containing a summary of the report and the proposals for action (E.CN.17/IPF/CRP.1). The report recognizes that there are limited opportunities to increase funds from international public resources other than official development assistance (ODA) to finance SFM. Several case studies quoted in the report highlight the potential for raising additional financial resources at the domestic level in developing countries, although most of these countries have limited ability to raise sufficient funds to finance SFM activities. The report also discusses: public finance; market-based instruments; private sector investment; policy reform to attract investments; and establishment of information systems to speed up investments. It also proposes: a working group on innovative ways to generate financial resources; a code of conduct for forest-based private companies; and a set of indicators for evaluating international cooperation.

On technology transfer, the report notes that the majority of technologies for forest management required by developing countries are well-known and are already being utilized in some countries. The proposed measures to encourage effective transfer include: using technology needs assessment as a tool for analyzing requirements; strengthening research and development institutions; exploring the possibility for new international research institutions for SFM; and developing global databases. The report highlights the need to optimize existing available funds. The report also states that in-country coordination and coordination among donors are crucial, and NFPs are a good basis for setting priorities on cooperation.

Delegates first discussed the report on 10 September. Based on the comments of delegations, the Secretariat produced a draft negotiating text, which delegates considered on 19 September.

Based on further comments from delegates, the Secretariat produced a revised draft negotiating text, which was considered on the final day of the session. During the course of these discussions, delegates offered the following comments, proposals and suggestions.

On public finance, delegates offered a number of recommendations for inclusion. The G-77/CHINA recommended provision of predictable levels of funding to support long-term objectives in the conservation, management and sustainable development of forests, as called for in Agenda 21. He also sought substantial new and additional financing, and noted that ODA for forests is insufficient and declining. The G-77/CHINA also proposed replacing all references in the text to "SFM" with "management, conservation and sustainable development of forests" from the Forest Principles. The US said references to the Forest Principles should only be included as needed and proposed recognizing the need to increase the absorptive capacity of markets. He noted that SFM is not given sufficient priority in ODA and highlighted community-based enterprises. The EU proposed noting that ODA has been insufficient to achieve SFM and called for donor agencies to finance national initiatives aimed at developing NFPs in developing countries. NORWAY recognized that ODA will continue to be important to support SFM, but to maximize effectiveness, these funds should be combined with other sources.

On private sector investment, delegates disagreed on the proposed code of conduct and the proposed working group on innovative ways to generate financial resources. BRAZIL supported the proposed working group and recognized the need for a code of conduct. MALAYSIA, COLOMBIA, SWITZERLAND and MOROCCO supported the code of conduct and the working group. JAPAN questioned the need for a working group and said the code of conduct requires further consideration. NEW ZEALAND, supported by the G-77/CHINA, JAPAN and CANADA, suggested removing the brackets from "voluntary" codes of conduct. CANADA said the code must not overshadow the need for regulation of foreign investment at the national level. GABON questioned whether the proposed code of conduct would be national or international and suggested the former would be more appropriate given differences in countries' circumstances. The US said it is premature to include voluntary codes of conduct, but their potential should be explored.

Delegates offered other comments on private sector investment. The G-77/CHINA proposed adding: fair and even distribution of private capital flows among developing countries; strengthening of national regulations and enforcement; and cooperation with major groups. The EU, supported by AUSTRALIA, proposed including the negative social and environmental aspects of policies and regulations. GERMANY highlighted the need for closer involvement of the private sector in development of NFPs. FINLAND emphasized favorable conditions for long-term private investment in SFM, including incentives for small-scale and micro-enterprises, internalization of environmental costs, and appropriate pricing of environmental goods and services. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA recognized the need and potential to mobilize private investment in SFM in developing countries, but noted that a lack of information and insecurity of investment create obstacles to realizing this potential. CHINA noted an overemphasis on national and private investment at the expense of international financing and technology transfer from North to South.

On technology transfer, the US proposed noting that technology needs assessment is one approach among many and questioned the utility of establishing new research institutions. Supported by AUSTRALIA, the US proposed that the IPF identify research priorities. Supported by the UK, the US proposed that bilateral and multilateral donors give priority in financing technology development, exchange and transfer to each country's assessment

of its technological requirements. JAPAN called for references to North-South, South-South and trilateral cooperation. CANADA recommended a reference to related work on cooperation being conducted under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The G-77/CHINA proposed noting that technology mainly resides in the North, in particular technologies in the private domain, therefore considerable potential exists for North-South cooperation in technology transfer under favorable conditions. SWITZERLAND called for improved knowledge sharing and extension mechanisms.

On coordination, the G-77/CHINA called for development of indicators for monitoring the "adequacy" as well as the effectiveness of international cooperation. She proposed deleting references to an external agency to support in-country donor coordination and mandatory coordination among UN organizations, and proposed changing the name of the section from "coordination" to "cooperation." AUSTRALIA called for a shared vision of SFM toward common objectives. The EU noted that NFPs should provide the basic framework for national and international cooperation including priority setting. The US proposed that NFPs provide a good basis for priority setting "in many countries," and for national level coordination "in recipient countries." The US also invited countries to give priority to SFM in programming the ODA available to them. CANADA proposed a reference to international instruments related to forests, particularly the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

On information systems, the G-77/CHINA deleted a reference to Internet-based information systems, noting that many developing countries do not have Internet access. GERMANY proposed a reference to effective implementation of NFPs through improved information systems. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION proposed inviting the FAO to develop a global "depository box" for information on available technologies and potential funding sources for SFM.

Working Group II met on the final day to consider a revised draft text on this programme element. The G-77/CHINA noted that language from the Forest Principles on "conservation, management and sustainable development" of forests did not need to be used throughout the document, but noted that some agreed terms were needed. She proposed that specific references to the Convention on Biological Diversity should be replaced with more general language. The EU proposed deleting a list that described priorities for technology transfer and capacity building. CANADA noted that a clearinghouse for technology transfer was under consideration by the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity and expressed hope that COP-3 would provide clarification. The US called for clear references to developing, recipient or other types of countries throughout the text. UGANDA said that the text's references to NFPs in a section on coordination appeared to impose an element of conditionality. JAPAN questioned a reference to the development of indicators for international cooperation. Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT III.1(a): ASSESSMENT OF FOREST BENEFITS

Working Group I conducted the first round of discussions on programme element III.1(a), assessment of the multiple benefits of all types of forests, on 10 and 11 September. Jean Clement (FAO) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/20). The report addresses: the need to make primary forest data widely accessible; forest resource assessment processes, such as FAO's FRA 2000; and country capacity building. AUSTRIA, supported by CANADA and PORTUGAL, called for comprehensive FRAs

incorporating social and cultural aspects. He said C&I should be used to prioritize data gathering. JAPAN emphasized the need to standardize key definitions and classifications used in FRAs. NORWAY and VENEZUELA called for prioritization of data collection and recognized the importance of capacity building. AUSTRALIA said national forest inventories are an essential tool for planning and decision-making and urged clarification regarding how inventories will match up against C&I.

The EU and the US requested information on the time frame and resource planning for FRA 2000 and called for utilization of existing data. The US urged FAO to consider ways to improve FRAs beyond the year 2000, redirect existing resources toward it and collaborate with UNEP. SWEDEN, supported by SWITZERLAND, suggested "rolling" resource assessments rather than assessments every ten years. He sought strengthening of national capacities and institutions for data collection.

UNESCO warned against confusing a proposal for the collection of "core data" with those for a global harmonization of C&I. UNESCO, COLOMBIA and UNEP called for collaboration with other forestry and educational organizations. CHINA emphasized the need for transparency in funding FRA 2000. The US supported user payment for resource use, data collection and capacity building. FINLAND, the US and the EU supported a user-pays approach to garnering funds for FRA 2000. GERMANY expressed concern regarding the FAO's ability to financially and technically complete FRA 2000 at this time. He called on the FAO to prepare a detailed analysis of progress and available resources for review at IPF-4. FAO acknowledged the funding shortage for FRA 2000, stating that the problem goes beyond the simple transfer of resources from one programme to another.

Delegates began the second round of discussion on forest assessments on 17 September. In reviewing the revised text, the EU highlighted regular data updates, accessibility to assessment programmes, comparability of data collection methodologies and liaison with the Convention on Biological Diversity to ensure that gaps in knowledge are quickly addressed. The G-77/CHINA called for use of national forest assessments, where appropriate, in the development of NFPs. The G-77, supported by CANADA and environmental NGOs, sought the assessment of a broad range of values, including non-timber values, in FRA 2000. The G-77 also supported JAPAN's proposal calling for the standardization of terms and definitions used in assessments. The US called for the development of plans for implementation of assessments; the deletion of language from the Forest Principles on "sustainable use, conservation and equitable sharing of benefits;" and the need for capacity building. Environmental NGOs urged the use of an ecosystem approach in assessments and consultations with all stakeholders to identify the range of forest benefits.

A revised draft negotiating text was produced but not discussed due to time constraints.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT III.1(b): FOREST VALUATION

Working Group I conducted the first round of discussions on programme element III.1(b), forest resource valuation, on 11 September. David Cassels (World Bank) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/25). The report acknowledges the need to: identify and measure the various values of forests; develop methodologies to measure forest values; and determine how valuation will contribute to the attainment of SFM.

Many countries noted overlapping responsibilities with the Climate Change and Biodiversity Conventions. MEXICO, supported by JAPAN, the EU, COLOMBIA, CANADA, MALAYSIA and environmental NGOs, called for assessment of the non-economic benefits of forests. The US and NORWAY

differentiated between research on technical aspects of valuation and policy recommendations, noting limitations to "across the board" solutions. BRAZIL and the US recommended that the IPF encourage other organizations to conduct research on methodologies. NORWAY highlighted the development of appropriate policies and regulations to control rent-seeking.

TURKEY noted the Forest Principles' emphasis on the promotion of public awareness and, with NEW ZEALAND, stressed difficulties with recommending that governments seek to control pricing. The NETHERLANDS highlighted the need to recognize the value of soil conservation and carbon sequestration, particularly in swamp forests. The WORLD BANK noted the need to differentiate between quantifying values and setting prices.

AUSTRALIA supported economic rent for wood products to cover management costs, national resource accounting plans and user fees as a means of supporting conservation. NEW ZEALAND called for ways to internalize externalities related to non-timber values in order to determine appropriate economic rents. The REPUBLIC OF KOREA called for practical means to incorporate natural resource accounting into SFM. UNESCO sought pilot projects to test valuation methodologies and economic rent for non-timber values. The EU and the UK noted that application of appropriate valuation methodologies will justify forest management economically. KENYA, the REPUBLIC OF KOREA and NEW ZEALAND called for capacity building for valuation programmes. CANADA, UGANDA and INDIA emphasized participation by all interested parties in identifying values and developing methodologies.

Delegates addressed the draft negotiating text on forest valuation on 17 September. The EU stressed the need to address the values of forest owners. She noted that while a variety of valuation methodologies have been developed, governments should be encouraged to develop methodologies addressing their own legal and political circumstances. The US said the report exceeds the mandate of the CSD and urged further discussion within the context of the Climate Change and Biodiversity Conventions. He added that references to the religious values of forests should be omitted.

The G-77/CHINA called for methodologies to assess the cultural, social and economic values of forest degradation and for matrices matching available forest valuation methodologies with required data sets for all forest goods and services. NORWAY called for analysis of costs associated with changes in forest quality.

A revised draft negotiating text was produced but not discussed due to time constraints.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT III.2: CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

Working Group I held initial discussions on programme element III.2 on 11 and 12 September. David Harcharik (FAO) introduced the Secretary-General's report on criteria and indicators (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/21). He encouraged wider country participation in the development of criteria and indicators (C&I), harmonization of terminology and identification of a core set of common indicators at the international level. FINLAND said C&I should be incorporated into NFPs and contribute to policy formulation. JAPAN called for multiple stakeholder participation.

On harmonization of C&I, AUSTRALIA, supported by NORWAY and INDONESIA, sought harmonization of terms, definitions, methodologies and measurement standards used in developing national C&I. GERMANY stressed harmonization between C&I and other concepts such as codes of practice or performance standards. SWITZERLAND and MALAYSIA also sought consensus on key concepts and mutual recognition of

initiatives such as FAO's FRA 2000. DENMARK supported inclusion of C&I in NFPs and, with TURKEY, supported a core set of global criteria. NEW ZEALAND emphasized the need to maintain momentum on C&I and sought consensus on terms. He stressed that C&I together define SFM and selectively removing elements lessens their effectiveness. AUSTRIA stressed the indivisibility of SFM and C&I and recalled IPF-2's unanimous support for expanding C&I. UGANDA emphasized the importance of harmonization and convergence of C&I developed nationally.

CIFOR noted that only a small set of C&I are universally applicable. The EU and POLAND supported C&I at the national level. The US supported efforts toward national C&I and expressed reservations about global C&I. ITALY, supported by GERMANY and CUBA, called for flexibility in the formulation of C&I for SFM. The UK, supported by POLAND, called for flexibility in application to account for diverging needs. The UK also said C&I should be implemented without waiting for further refinement. INDIA said C&I should be more specific for application at the national and forest management unit levels. PAPUA NEW GUINEA said sufficient guidelines exist for governments to develop and apply their own C&I. The G-77/CHINA said specificity should not be traded for universality, and called for diffusion of information on C&I. The GLOBAL FOREST POLICY PROJECT distinguished national level C&I from certification of individual forest management units and said harmonization of C&I is premature. CANADA said identification of a comprehensive set of C&I at the global level would be premature and highlighted the importance, measurability and comparability of cultural and social C&I. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION noted difficulties associated with harmonizing criteria.

BRAZIL said the report fails to emphasize the international cooperation needed to allow all developing countries to participate in C&I initiatives. TURKEY noted difficulties in the implementation of C&I and called for cooperation on technology transfer. CHINA, supported by MEXICO, called for assistance to developing countries for development and implementation of C&I. MEXICO called for prioritization of proposed actions.

A draft negotiating text was discussed on 17 and 18 September. The EU highlighted: the importance of C&I implementation at all levels; descriptive criteria; land use plans; mutual recognition, consistency and convergence of C&I; and, with the US, forest owner and land tenure issues. JAPAN requested recognition of levels equivalent to management-level units and, with the US, voiced concerns over what criteria should help to assess. The US expressed concern over language on: benefit apportionment; forest management unit C&I; and C&I as a basis for trade restrictions. FINLAND, supported by the EU, suggested language from its recent C&I seminar on, *inter alia*: actions for poverty alleviation; institutional strengthening; human resources development and public participation; consensus on terms; and research on C&I for measuring biodiversity, non-wood forest products, non-market benefits and human and cross-sectoral impacts on forests. Environmental NGOs stressed language on sub-national level C&I for large countries and Convention on Biological Diversity assistance on C&I for forest quality and biodiversity. CANADA said the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity should complement existing C&I frameworks. The G-77/CHINA called for: criteria that reflect components of SFM; a global set of C&I; and contributions from donor countries and multilateral organizations for the development and implementation of C&I. GABON, citing the Rio Declaration and Forest Principles, stated the need for the international community to mobilize the financial resources and technology required for C&I formulation and SFM in developing countries.

A revised draft negotiating text was produced but not discussed due to time constraints.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT IV: TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT

Working Group II considered programme element IV, trade and environment relating to forest goods and services, on 11 September. J.E.K. Aggrey-Orleans (ITTO) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/22), which delegates considered along with a summary document (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/CRP.2) containing only the conclusions and proposals for action. The report addresses market access and trade barriers to forest products; relative competitiveness of forest products; promotion of less used species; certification and labelling; full cost internalization of environmental impacts; and market transparency. The report proposes that the IPF call on relevant international organizations to: support developing country efforts to increase productivity and efficiency of downstream processing activities; conduct analyses of the costs and benefits as well as the potential substitution effects resulting from a transition to SFM; form a working group on procedures for country certification schemes; undertake efforts to promote harmonization and mutual recognition of standards among certification schemes; and create a global database to improve market transparency.

Delegates discussed the report on 11 September. From these discussions the Secretariat produced a draft negotiating text that delegates considered on 16 September. The Secretariat then produced a revised draft negotiating text that was discussed on the final day. During the course of these rounds of discussions, delegates submitted a wide range of comments.

On general conclusions on trade and environment, the EU emphasized that trade-related mechanisms must be compatible with World Trade Organization (WTO) rules. The G-77/CHINA noted the need to consider both market and non-market values of forest-related goods and services and recommended greater emphasis on the mutually supportive roles of trade and environment. He proposed deleting text suggesting that trade restrictions may be necessary to achieve environmental objectives in special circumstances. The US, the EU and CANADA objected to the possible need to explore an agreement on trade in forest products, while the G-77/CHINA, BRAZIL, COLOMBIA and environmental NGOs supported the idea. ZIMBABWE recommended further studies on non-wood forest products and on domestic trade in forest products. UGANDA stated that the report overemphasizes international trade at the expense of domestic and regional trade.

On market access, COLOMBIA said the reduction of non-tariff and tariff barriers should take place in the context of instruments that seek to control multinationals. IRAN said measures that affect trade in forest goods should not decrease the purchasing power of developing countries. To a proposal requesting the WTO to further reduce tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade in forest products, NORWAY added a reference to the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment's work to ensure mutually supportive roles of trade and environment. UGANDA expressed concern that unilateral tariffs were not considered. Environmental NGOs called for "adjustment" of tariff and non-tariff barriers to ensure consistency with efforts to promote SFM. They proposed language on the possibility that non-tariff barriers may promote SFM and on the exceptions to WTO rules contained in the Uruguay Round agreements. The G-77/CHINA recommended new proposals for: assessment of the effectiveness and trade impacts of subsidies; removal of all unilateral bans and boycotts; and exploration of the possible need for an agreement on trade in forest products and for voluntary codes of conduct. Timber industry NGOs suggested including the potential negative effects of trade restrictions in forest products.

On relative competitiveness of forest products, GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL said the IPF should not cast substitution of forest products (with non-wood forest products or with forest products produced with more efficient technology) in a negative light, as it can serve to reduce pressures on the world's forests. The US and environmental NGOs called for further studies on how best to use markets and economic instruments to promote SFM. Regarding efforts to promote downstream processing industries and exports of processed products, industry NGOs emphasized that these efforts should not take the form of tariff and non-tariff barriers, and environmental NGOs stressed that they be consistent with wider environmental and social considerations. The G-77/CHINA suggested a new proposal regarding mechanisms for community-based processing and marketing of wood and non-timber forest products.

On promotion of less used species, AUSTRALIA said ITTO should continue its work in this regard, provided it is within the context of SFM principles. The US, supported by environmental NGOs, proposed a reference to community-level efforts in technology development. Environmental NGOs proposed promotion of non-timber forest products.

On certification, the EU proposed adding "and labelling" to the title of the section and language noting that voluntary certification and labelling are not considered to be non-tariff barriers. CAMEROON said schemes must be developed according to specific national conditions. PERU said certification should include its own system of C&I to assess SFM. SWITZERLAND emphasized the need to distinguish governmental measures from voluntary private sector measures. The NETHERLANDS stressed the need to focus on all forests rather than strictly tropical forests. AUSTRALIA stated that certification at the regional and provincial levels should also be explored. FRANCE noted that market demand for certified products and its consequences for SFM have yet to be proved.

The US said certification is not a "magic bullet" that will bring about SFM, but is one useful tool that can complement other beneficial policy instruments. A proliferation of schemes will likely help rather than hamper certification, and competition among schemes is a positive development. The EU said proliferation of different schemes with different criteria could damage the credibility and effectiveness of certification and labelling. The G-77/CHINA supported a proposal calling on trade agencies to promote international harmonization and mutual recognition of standards among schemes. CANADA contested the conclusion that there is a proliferation of schemes but noted their small number and limited experience in certification. He said the proposal to promote international harmonization is premature at this stage, and several other delegations echoed this sentiment.

The GLOBAL FOREST POLICY PROJECT said that because certification schemes are private and voluntary, governments should play no significant role in enforcing harmonization among them. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION highlighted the important roles of governments in providing information, support and monitoring of certification. The G-77/CHINA emphasized the role of governments in ensuring transparency, full participation, nondiscrimination and open access of schemes. He also highlighted that certification should observe sovereignty.

The US stressed the need to involve exporters in the development of schemes. GERMANY called upon relevant agencies to promote information exchange. The EU added references to the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, including application of credibility, non-deceptiveness, cost-effectiveness and encouragement of mutual recognition and equivalence to certification schemes. AUSTRALIA proposed new

language regarding performance standards and environmental management systems as important components of SFM.

The GLOBAL FOREST POLICY PROJECT said that country certification is extremely controversial and could trigger a consumer backlash and renew country bans and boycotts of forest products. Environmental NGOs, supported by AUSTRALIA, recommended deleting the reference to feasibility of country certification. Regarding an initial proposal for the formation of a working group to consider the formulation of procedures for country certification schemes, UGANDA, MALAYSIA, NEW ZEALAND, PAPUA NEW GUINEA and INDONESIA supported it, while the US, FRANCE, CANADA, the EU, NORWAY and environmental NGOs argued that it is premature to do so at this stage. The G-77/CHINA proposed language noting that the Panel did not endorse the concept of country certification.

On full cost internalization, NORWAY noted that the treatment of this issue overemphasizes the increased costs incurred in the transition to SFM. He added language stating that without full cost internalization, socioeconomic and environmental costs may not be reflected in the market. CANADA said studies must address subsidies and the distribution of impacts. Industry NGOs noted that only limited consensus exists on definitions, measurements and techniques to introduce environmental costs into pricing mechanisms. Environmental NGOs added language noting that reallocation of costs and benefits is likely to result, and a reference to environmental and social implications.

On market transparency, CANADA stated that more work is needed on information gaps on trade barriers before work begins on a new global database. The ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY called for the formation of an inter-agency task force to assess the extent of illegal logging, timber smuggling and transfer pricing, especially with respect to the activities of transnational corporations. The EU and environmental NGOs called for an independent global assessment of the illegal forest products trade. Discussions on this programme element will continue at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT V.1: INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS AND INSTRUMENTS

Programme element V.1 was considered by a joint Working Group session on 13 September. Based on these discussions, the Secretariat produced a draft negotiating text, which was considered by the Plenary on 19 September. A revised text, based on comments from these two sessions, was distributed but not discussed on the final day of IPF-4.

Jag Maini (IPF Secretariat) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/23). The report includes: an examination of the anticipated functions and activities required from international organizations and institutions and instruments to support internationally-agreed future priorities; the establishment of a structured body to coordinate intergovernmental agencies; NGO and government activities; the value of NGO contributions; the need to evaluate the operational capacity of existing instruments; and the need to develop a high-level forum for continued dialogue. The report proposes several options for action, including: a high-level forum for international policy; strategic data collection; regional and global projects; additional funding for research and development; and improved mechanisms for coordination.

Most delegations noted the need for better coordination. The G-77/CHINA, supported by the PHILIPPINES, BRAZIL, PERU and MALAYSIA, said more work is needed to develop a clear view of the work being undertaken by international and regional institutions. Gaps and overlaps should be identified and coordination among agencies enhanced. The EU, supported by the

UK, noted that the issue will lay the groundwork for the international community's support of all other IPF issues. He sought to accelerate the implementation of UNCED decisions, enhance government and private sector financing and strengthen inter-agency coordination. A number of delegations, including the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, NORWAY and the US, supported increasing the efficiency and coordination of existing institutions rather than establishing new ones.

Delegates offered differing levels of support for a continued high-level forum to address forest-related issues. INDONESIA and MALAYSIA supported its establishment, while CANADA called for a new legally-binding instrument rather than just a continuation of the IPF. PAPUA NEW GUINEA, supported by SOUTH AFRICA and PERU, favored an informal forum for discussion, and recommended maintaining the IPF as an open-ended intergovernmental umbrella. SWITZERLAND called for a report on options, and the US and JAPAN said the proposal for a high-level forum for forest policy debate requires further elaboration. INDIA rejected any global policy for forests and called for a study of the effects on forests from farming marginal land. Environmental NGOs voiced several concerns, including: increased clarity regarding the roles and activities of existing institutions and instruments; the merit of a potential forest protocol under the Convention on Biological Diversity; increased attention by international organizations to land tenure issues and agrarian reform; and establishment of a mechanism to monitor the relationship between deforestation patterns and national social and political changes.

On 19 September, the Plenary considered a draft negotiating text. The EU called for improved efforts to integrate and clarify the mandate and task of UN agencies and to strengthen their coordination. He proposed replacing a reference to national forest development with NFPs. The G-77/CHINA proposed language inviting governments to contribute to this process in order to improve the work of forest-related institutions. He proposed replacing several references to "SFM" in the text with "management, conservation and sustainable development of forests" from the Forest Principles. On proposals for action, he deleted references to "regional" and "global" data collection and projects and to specific agencies for research and development. The US proposed noting that there is significant potential for better coordination and collaboration, rather than further enhancement, of existing international structures. He called for improved participation of major groups in forest fora to promote SFM, and suggested focusing, rather than strengthening, relevant international organizations.

CANADA proposed replacing "sub-regional" with "sub-national" action toward SFM and deleting a reference to building consensus on standards. He called for the establishment of a high-level forum for international policy debate on forests. He supported the proposal for further study of the institutions and instruments relevant to forests and highlighted the need to identify the institutional capacity to implement the UNCED agreements. SWITZERLAND agreed that further study of forest-related institutions and instruments is very important and called for an independent review of the forthcoming proposals of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Forests. JAPAN suggested that countries, rather than international organizations, facilitate international consultations on SFM, and proposed that these consultations develop, rather than implement, principles and content of NFPs. He recommended deleting a proposal to assign forest programmes increased priority in bilateral ODA.

A revised negotiating text was distributed, but not discussed on the final day of the IPF-4. It notes that the elements for further negotiation under this programme element are preliminary in nature. The Panel felt that further information and study would be

needed in order to achieve a more accurate diagnosis and to formulate proposals for action. The text also notes that a number of delegations stated that final conclusions and proposals for action would need to take into account conclusions and proposals under programme element V.2, which will be the subject of substantive discussions at IPF-4.

PROGRAMME ELEMENT V.2: CONTRIBUTION TO CONSENSUS BUILDING TOWARDS THE FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOREST PRINCIPLES

Programme element V.2 was considered by a joint Working Group session on 13 September and by the plenary on 19 September. Jag Maini (IPF Secretariat) introduced the Secretary-General's report (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/24). The report describes the relevance of existing legal instruments and attempts to define gaps and overlaps with respect to forest-related issues in these instruments.

A number of delegations, including the G-77/CHINA, MALAYSIA, COLOMBIA and the PHILIPPINES, supported the development of an international forum for policy coordination and dialogue on all types of forests and continuation of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Forests. Several delegations supported the commencement of negotiations on a convention or other legally-binding instrument on forests, including the EU, ITALY, FRANCE, POLAND, CANADA and INDIA. The CANADIAN PULP AND PAPER ASSOCIATION also advocated an international convention on forests. Other delegations did not favor a convention at the present time or noted that additional factors must be considered. The US said the report introduces a new way of classifying the Forest Principles and the work of the IPF. He questioned the report's gap analysis and called for an extended IPF or similar forum to continue the international dialogue on forests. BRAZIL said a case has not been made for a new convention and suggested better use of existing instruments. NEW ZEALAND stated that the time is not yet ripe for a forest convention and more progress should first be achieved through existing mechanisms. SWITZERLAND said that concentrating all efforts on negotiating a convention might result in a loss of momentum, so consensus-building on forest issues should continue simultaneously. The PHILIPPINES highlighted the energy function of forests and proposed an analysis of the linkages to related work within the Climate Change Convention. Financial implications of a convention would need to be studied.

Many delegations, such as AUSTRALIA, the EU and FRANCE, supported the development of an inter-agency task force and an intergovernmental mechanism to maintain momentum. MEXICO supported the continuation of a high-level policy dialogue on forests. NORWAY noted that there is a wide range of views on how to attain SFM, and cautioned against allowing the format to hinder progress. COLOMBIA said the report should highlight the establishment of protected areas and the just and equitable distribution of benefits. She called for strengthening existing instruments and leaving the door open for a political dialogue on forests. PERU recommended a short-term commitment to continuing high-level intergovernmental dialogue on forests to meet twice a year, and called any proposal for a convention premature and inopportune. Environmental NGOs recommended using regional agreements as a model and developing an analysis of existing initiatives. They warned against jeopardizing the implementation of existing instruments by focusing on a new one and called for implementation of current agreements with local participation.

On 19 September, the plenary considered a draft negotiating text on programme element V.2. The G-77/CHINA, supported by MALAYSIA, argued for a holistic and comprehensive treatment of

existing legal mechanisms and their relation to conservation, management and sustainable development of forests. Supported by the PHILIPPINES and MALAYSIA, the G-77/CHINA called for clear identification of existing gaps, such as on trade and environment and on financing of technology.

The US noted there is no consensus on gaps and overlaps nor on what existing organizations can accomplish. Supported by NEW ZEALAND, he called for an extension of the IPF with a more focused mandate. He called for a report from the Secretariat for IPF-4. Such a document would examine continuation of the IPF's *ad hoc* inter-agency mechanism as well as alternative mechanisms for continuing the forest dialogue using existing structures such as FAO and *ad hoc* temporary organizations. The report should also consider duration of meetings and of the Panel. The EU emphasized that the Panel should send a clear message to the Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1997 to engage a high-level commitment and guidance on worldwide forest management and its successful implementation.

SWITZERLAND supported a report for IPF-4 and called for negotiations on a framework convention that would: provide a holistic programme for SFM; facilitate coordination and implementation of existing programmes and instruments; and foster negotiation of regional instruments. JAPAN said all proposals for action made at IPF-3 should be considered simply as conclusions, leaving deliberations of actions for IPF-4. He supported the need for continued international consultation on forest issues, but called for language stressing the general need for a holistic and comprehensive approach rather than a specific continuation and enhancement of the current exercise. The PHILIPPINES recommended stronger language on the need for a high-level intergovernmental mechanism and sought one holistic instrument on forests rather than a separate convention on trade in forest products.

MALAYSIA called for recognition that existing instruments collectively impose significant responsibilities and commitments on tropical producers but not on temperate and boreal producers. He said that proposed protocols to existing conventions would give unbalanced treatment to forest issues rather than the required holistic approach, noting gaps in the handling of certain issues such as financing, technology and resource transfer and capacity building under existing instruments. With MEXICO, he called for a set time frame for actions to ensure definite progress. MEXICO supported calls for preparation of a document for IPF-4 and said it should address the existing gap on economic issues such as the comprehensive need for technology and resource transfer and international policies that have an impact on SFM. ARGENTINA urged that options remain open and called for a study devising a comprehensive programme on SFM at the international level. INDIA sought the establishment of a mechanism similar to the IPF, with some refinement, and suggested that a new legal instrument may not be necessary. BRAZIL noted the Panel has the option to maintain the status quo, modify it or adopt new instruments and/or arrangements. He highlighted the need to take the onus off governments and increase private sector involvement.

A revised negotiating text incorporates the preliminary proposals and will serve as basis for discussion at IPF-4. The text contains the specific proposals for action that emerged during IPF-3. At the intergovernmental level, proposals include a high-level forum for policy coordination or continuation of IPF, and at the inter-agency level, a continuation of the informal Inter-Agency Task Force on Forests or a merging of the functions of existing institutions into a new institution. Proposals for legal mechanisms include: improved coordination; establishment of a forum of existing institutions to review the need for a new instrument; and initiation of negotiations on a convention. The proposals on a convention contain many courses of action, such as

a convention on the Forest Principles and forest-related provisions of Agenda 21, a convention covering all aspects of forestry needed for SFM and a convention on forest product trade covering all types of forests.

CLOSING PLENARY

The Plenary convened in the afternoon on 20 September to adopt the report of the Panel on its third session (E/CN.17/IPF/1996/L.3). In addition, the Co-Chairs presented delegates with an informal paper containing a draft introduction to the report. The paper notes that the objective of IPF-3 was to produce a document containing elements for use at IPF-4, and states that all elements are open for further discussion and negotiation with a view to achieving general agreement on all conclusions and proposals for action. The paper empowers the Secretariat to prepare a document for IPF-4 that will integrate additional proposals and inputs from intersessional activities. The Co-Chairs also proposed that the Panel welcome contributions from the Convention on Biological Diversity and that the IPF Secretariat provide the information on progress made by the Panel to Convention's Conference of the Parties so as to continue the dialogue between the Panel and the Convention. The US suggested amending the final portion of the proposal to "continue an exchange of information between the Parties."

The paper notes that the Panel expressed concern that most reports were not translated in all official UN languages by the commencement of the session and that some were never available in all languages. SWITZERLAND, supported by the US, proposed a request to the Secretary-General to make available the necessary resources to reproduce the documents in all languages in due time.

In his closing remarks, Co-Chair Holdgate noted that the Panel has a diversity of views on the table for consideration between now and IPF-4, and suggested the Panel was right not to hurry the process. IPF-4 will produce a valuable statement to the world community and the IPF has already contributed to the advancement of an understanding on forests matters.

Co-Chair Rodriguez noted there was considerable disagreement that must be dealt with in the future. He said it was clear that governments want specific results, and delegates will have to be imaginative to devise viable methods to achieve the IPF's goals. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF IPF-3

Many arrived at IPF-3 anticipating that the Panel would reach the negotiating stage on at least some of the less divisive programme elements. Their hopes were extinguished when the session concluded with the adoption of a report that simply notes delegations' stated views on the issues. The reasons behind the Panel's apparent lack of action are diverse: the vastness of the agenda, which comprised twelve separate programme elements; the time needed to consolidate regional groups' positions; delays stemming from the unavailability of documents in languages other than English; and the amount of time the Panel devoted to modifying its programme of work for the session, rather than discussing programme elements. IPF-3 left the distinct impression that delegates had much to say and barely enough time in which to say it, let alone negotiate.

Nonetheless, the most positive product of IPF-3 was a thorough airing of views, providing an opportunity for the presentation of many innovative ideas and creative suggestions from delegates, intergovernmental agencies and NGOs who participated. Delegates were quick to note that the IPF and related intersessional initiatives have sparked a renewed interest in forests at the national level and helped increase the momentum of the international dialogue on forests.

NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES (NFPs): NFPs, a new idea for many delegations, proved problematic for countries that fear impingement on private property rights. Difficulties over national control of forests were witnessed in the process of formulating a "Consumer Statement" on achieving sustainable forest management (SFM) by the year 2000 during the International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA) 1994 negotiations. There the phrase "national" forests was inserted specifically to limit the commitment made to encompass only forests under direct national government control, which for some countries comprises only a small percentage of total forest cover. Private ownership of forest land is also problematic for public participation: one country called for language specifying that increasing public participation in decision-making for SFM only applies to public forests.

It is ironic that some countries calling for recognition of a country's "unique circumstances" push developing countries, through their aid programmes, toward more private land ownership and less state control. This may ultimately undermine the ability of countries that now have the "unique circumstance" of national control over forests to be able to formulate NFPs and maintain a holistic approach into the future.

VALUATION: Valuation of forest benefits appears to be a sensitive issue both for countries with strong interests in protecting private property rights and those with interests in ensuring full capture of the economic benefits of their forests. This was exemplified by the fact that several delegations expressed concern regarding the Secretary-General's report, many claiming some non-timber related elements of this issue are outside the mandate of the CSD and more appropriate for consideration by the Convention on Biological Diversity or the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Countries interested in protecting property rights could well view valuation as an economic impediment to conducting "business as usual." Countries rich in forest resources, however, may fear being exploited by other countries. A common sentiment on the issue did emerge during the discussions. Virtually all countries were in agreement that additional methodologies should be developed and tested.

TRADE AND ENVIRONMENT: Trade and environment relating to forest products, and certification in particular, continues to generate interesting debate. Many developing country producers remain concerned that certification will be used as a trade barrier, and disagreement remains as to whether harmonization or country certification should be promoted at this stage. However, delegates from all camps seem more open to exploring transparent, participatory and non-discriminatory certification as a tool to make trade and environment mutually supportive. The IPF has brought together the often divergent interests of developing and developed countries and industry and environmental NGOs to conduct substantive discussions on certification. Where other fora under which this issue has been discussed have been less transparent and participatory, this open and iterated dialogue has been unfolding at the same time that certification has been maturing as a practicable tool in the marketplace. These two developments have contributed to forging consensus on the usefulness of certification as a tool to promote SFM.

FOREST CONVENTION: Discussions on a possible convention or other legally-binding instrument finally emerged from backstage onto the UN floor at IPF-3, but met with mixed reviews. UNCED produced the Forest Principles but no legally-binding agreement. Some observers applauded the several delegations that favored a forest convention. Other delegations offered more cautious support, but welcomed the opportunity to continue discussions on the topic. Two major timber-producing

countries, however, were solidly against any form of legally-binding agreement at the present time.

Some observers questioned whether IPF-3 discussions on a possible forest convention would stall the Panel's momentum on other issues. One observer noted that the number of delegations favoring a code of conduct for private companies provided a good indication of future support. Others cautioned that a convention may be a placebo rather than a panacea for the problems facing forests. They expressed concern that the motivation for many delegations springs from fear of lost markets rather than lost forests. While lack of support from all timber producers effectively eliminates the possibility of immediate initiation of a convention, many observers will be watching closely as the issue moves to center stage at IPF-4.

NGO PARTICIPATION: NGOs today have achieved an unprecedented level of participation in UN fora. Many observers point to the CSD's vanguard role in expanding the range of actors participating in the international policy-making process and this has unquestionably carried over into the IPF. The participation of NGOs in the IPF has continued to push the limits of official UN rules on participation. During IPF-3 NGOs were permitted not only to make interventions on the floor during official negotiations, but also to make direct comments on the texts and on other delegations' proposals. NGO comments were even incorporated into the revised draft negotiating texts alongside government proposals to which many delegations objected. As the IPF moves closer to negotiating text, it is possible that NGOs may not have the high degree of latitude that they have been given thus far. While the IPF's expansion of UN rules on NGO participation is welcomed by many as much-needed and long overdue, some feel that NGOs should not engage in such negotiations because they do not represent a known constituency and, therefore, their accountability may be in question.

While the degree to which NGOs will be able to participate in IPF-4 remains to be seen, their participation in this forum has provided invaluable contributions to a broad consensus-building process on forest issues and has blazed the trail for NGOs to make similar inroads in other policy-making fora.

TOWARD IPF-4: Considering the state of affairs after IPF-3, it becomes clear that both the Bureau and the delegates have their work cut out for them during the intersessional period, if IPF-4 is to be a success. Several issues will require attention, not the least of which is the present state of the document emanating from IPF-3. Heavily bracketed and annotated text will remain alive until IPF-4 to allow the Secretariat to distill the broad range of views and incorporate the findings of intersessional activities. The resulting document to be used for negotiation should be produced by the Secretariat in a timely fashion, to allow sufficient time for translation. The report's timely translation could effect not only the speed with which delegates are able to digest and discuss the document, but also attitudes toward the process in general. Some observers wonder, in light of the onerous work load and the truncated time available, whether the IPF will be able to produce any substantive recommendations for the CSD.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR

FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS: The fourth session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests is scheduled from 11-14 February 1997 in New York. The meeting may be extended until 21 February, if resources are available. For information contact: Elizabeth Barsk-Rundquist, tel: +1-212-963-3263; fax: +1-212-963-1795; e-mail: barsk-rundquist@un.org. For information on the IPF, try the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) Home Page at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD>.

WORLD COMMISSION ON FORESTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WCFSD): The independent WCFSD will convene hearings to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to present their differing perceptions on the role of forests and to work toward consensus on integrative developmental and conservation objectives. The second regional public hearing will be hosted by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) in Winnipeg, Canada, from 30 September-2 October 1996. For more information contact: WCFSD Secretariat, Geneva Executive Center, C.P. 51, 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 979 9165/69; fax: +41 22 979 9060; e-mail: dameena@iprolink.ch; Internet: <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/wcfsd>.

WORLD CONSERVATION CONGRESS: The meeting of IUCN members, partners, and other conservationists, will take place at the Palais de Congress, Montreal, Canada from 12-24 October 1996. The three-and-a-half day workshop programme aims to find new and innovative ways to tackle the challenges that face the Earth, to harmonize views and action plans and to formulate tangible ways to move ahead and make a difference. Contact Ricardo Bayon, Special Assistant to the Director General, 28 Rue de Mauverney, 1196, Gland, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 999-0001, fax: +41 22 999-0002; e-mail: rib@hq.IUCN.ch. Also try <http://w3.iprolink.ch/iucnlib> or <http://www.IUCN.org>.

EXPERT MEETING ON SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY AND LAND USE: THE PROCESS OF CONSENSUS BUILDING: Sweden and Uganda will host this seminar from 14-18 October 1996 in Stockholm, Sweden as a follow-up to the German seminar. The workshop will consist of presentation and discussion of country case studies, discussion of some identified key issues and plenary sessions. For more information contact: David Harcharik, Assistant Director-General, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, tel: +39 6/5225-3550; fax: +39 6/5225-5137; e-mail: david.harcharik@fao.org.

THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY: COP-3 is scheduled for 4-15 November 1996 in Buenos Aires with a Ministerial Segment from 13-14 November 1996. For more information contact: CBD Secretariat, World Trade Centre, 413 St. Jacques Street, Office 630, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1N9, tel: +1 (514) 288 22 20; fax: +1 (514) 288 65 88; e-mail: biodiv@mtl.net.

FIFTH GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FORUM: GBF-5 is scheduled for the weekend before COP-3, from 2-3 November 1996 in Buenos Aires, Argentina. For information on submitting abstracts or attending the forum contact: Jeffrey McNeely, Chief Scientist, IUCN-The World Conservation Union, 28 Rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland, tel: +41 22 999-0001; fax: +41 22 999-0025; e-mail: m@hq.iucn.org.

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON INTEGRATED APPLICATION OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: Canada, Japan, Mexico, Malaysia, FAO and ITTO will jointly host this workshop from 22-25 November 1996 in Kochi, Japan. The workshop will discuss practical applications of policy dialogue conducted within IPF, with particular emphasis on SFM practices at the field level, and will consist of presentations in plenary by experts, discussions in sub-groups and plenary discussion on the range of possible practical applications. For information contact: Takeshi Goto, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku Tokyo 100, Japan, tel: +81-3-3502-8111 (6212) or +81-3-3591-8449; fax: +81-3-3593-9565; or David Drake, Natural Resources Canada, 351 St. Joseph Blvd., Hull, Quebec, K1A 1G5, Canada, tel: +1-819-997-1107, ext. 1947; fax: +1-819-994-3461; e-mail: ddrake@am.ncr.forestry.ca.

INTERNATIONAL MEETING ON INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES AND FOREST DWELLER COMMUNITIES AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF FORESTS: This initiative, led by Consejo Indigena de la Cuena Amazonica (COICA) and sponsored by Denmark and Colombia, will be held in Leticia, Colombia from 9-13 December 1996. The workshop will address concerns raised under IPF programme element I.3, traditional forest-related knowledge. For information contact: Antonio Villa, General Forest Director, Ministry of the Environment of Colombia, tel: +(571) 284-7026; fax: +(571) 283 9141; or Bjoern Blau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark, tel: +(33) 92 16 89; fax: +(33) 92 16 89.

COMMISSION ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: The Intersessional meeting for the CSD, which will address preparations for the Special Session of the UN General Assembly, is scheduled 24 February-7 March 1997. The fifth session of CSD-5 is scheduled for 7-25 April 1997. The Special Session of the UN General Assembly is scheduled for 9-13 June 1997. For information on the CSD contact: Andrey Vasilyev, UN Division for Sustainable Development, tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: vasilyev@un.org. Also try the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) Home Page at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD>.

ELEVENTH WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS: The Congress, with the theme "Forestry for Sustainable Development: Towards the 21st Century," is scheduled for 13-22 October 1997 in Antalya, Turkey. The Congress will consider: position papers prepared by specialists; special papers that correspond to each one of the topics of the Congress and voluntary papers. For more information contact: Luis Santiago Botero, FAO, Forestry Department, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, tel: +39 6/5225 5088; fax: +39 6/5225 5137; e-mail: luis.botero@fao.org. Also try the Conference Home Page at <http://www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/forestry/wforcong/>.