



## SUMMARY OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS FORUM ON FORESTS: 11-23 JUNE 2001

The first session of the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF-1) took place from 11-23 June 2001, at UN Headquarters in New York. Over the course of the two-week meeting, delegates discussed and adopted decisions on the UNFF's multi-year programme of work (MYPOW), the Plan of Action (PoA) for the implementation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and Intergovernmental Forum on Forests proposals for action, and the initiation of the UNFF's work with the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. Delegates also adopted a statement on the programme budget implications of the MYPOW and decided on the date, venue and provisional agenda UNFF-2.

The first week of UNFF-1 got off to a slow start, focusing largely on procedural issues and organizational matters. During the second week, delegates worked long hours, meeting throughout the day and in evening sessions to try to resolve contentious issues. Until the final hours of the meeting, it was unclear whether UNFF-1 would succeed in fulfilling its obligation to adopt the MYPOW. While UNFF-1 did successfully complete its agenda, it did so by the skin of its teeth almost 24 hours behind schedule, ending after noon on Saturday, 23 June 2001.

### A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNFF

The possibility of developing international forest policy and a mechanism to coordinate such policy was discussed during preparations for the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), but delegates eventually agreed only to adopt the "Non-legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests," also known as the "Forest Principles," and Chapter 11 of Agenda 21, "Combating Deforestation."

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS:** In 1995, the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), at its third session, established the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) to continue the intergovernmental forest policy dialogue. During its two-year mandate, the IPF developed some 150 negotiated proposals for action on issues relating to sustainable forest management (SFM).

However, delegates could not agree on a few major issues, including financial assistance and trade-related matters, or whether to begin negotiations on a global forest convention. The fifth session of the CSD, in April 1997, and the 19th Special Session of the UN General Assembly, in June 1997, endorsed the IPF's outcome and recommended a continuation of the intergovernmental policy dialogue on forests. Subsequently, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) established the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) to continue this work under the auspices of the CSD.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL FORUM ON FORESTS:** The IFF met four times between October 1997 and February 2000, with its deliberations resulting in approximately 120 proposals for action on a range of topics, including: promoting, facilitating and monitoring the implementation of the IPF proposals for action; financial resources; trade and environment; transfer of environmentally sound technologies; issues needing further clarification; and forest-related work of international and regional organizations and under existing instruments. At its fourth and final session in February 2000, the IFF

### IN THIS ISSUE

|   |    |
|---|----|
| A Brief History of the UNFF .....                     | 1  |
| UNFF-1 Report .....                                   | 2  |
| Multi-Year Programme of Work .....                    | 3  |
| Development of a Plan of Action for the               |    |
| Implementation of the IPF/IFF Proposals for Action .. | 7  |
| Initiation of the Work of the UNFF with the           |    |
| Collaborative Partnership on Forests .....            | 9  |
| Date, Venue and Provisional Agenda for UNFF-2 ...     | 10 |
| Statement of Programme Budget Implications            |    |
| of the Draft Decision on the MYPOW .....              | 10 |
| Friday, 22 June, Plenary .....                        | 11 |
| Closing Plenary .....                                 | 11 |
| Second Session of the UNFF .....                      | 11 |
| A Brief Analysis of UNFF-1 .....                      | 11 |
| Things to Look For Before UNFF-2 .....                | 12 |

This issue of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org> is written and edited by Rado Dimitrov <rado@iisd.org>, Laura Ivers <laurai@iisd.org>, Leila Mead <leila@iisd.org> and Kira Schmidt <kiraschmidt@earthisland.org>. The Digital Editor is Franz Dejon <franz@iisd.org>. The Editor is Pamela S. Chasek, Ph.D. <pam@iisd.org> and the Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. The Operations Manager is Marcela Rojo <marcela@iisd.org> and the On-Line Assistant is Diego Noguera <diego@iisd.org>. The Sustaining Donors of the *Bulletin* are the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Government of Canada (through CIDA), the United States (through USAID), the Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape (SAEFL), the United Kingdom (through the Department for International Development - DFID, and the Foreign & Commonwealth Office), the European Commission (DG-ENV), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Government of Germany (through German Federal Ministry of Environment - BMU, and the German Federal Ministry of Development Cooperation - BMZ). General Support for the *Bulletin* during 2001 is provided by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Austria, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Norway, the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Environment of Finland, the Government of Australia, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Japan Ministry of Environment (through the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies - IGES). The *Bulletin* can be contacted by e-mail at <enb@iisd.org> and at tel: +1-212-644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted by e-mail at <info@iisd.ca> and at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada. The opinions expressed in the *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 non-commercial publications only and only with appropriate academic citation. For permission to use this material in commercial publications, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists and can be found on the Linkages WWW server at <http://www.iisd.ca>. Free subscriptions available at <http://iisd.ca/enb/email.asp>. The satellite image was taken above New York ©2001 The Living Earth, Inc. For information on the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, or to arrange for reporting from your conference or workshop send e-mail to <kimo@iisd.org>.



concluded its deliberations and issued its final report, which included a recommendation for an international arrangement on forests. Delegates agreed to recommend the establishment of the UNFF and to invite the relevant international organizations, institutions, and instruments and UN organizations to participate in a Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF). In April 2000, delegates at CSD-8 endorsed the IFF's conclusions and proposals for action and invited the ECOSOC President to initiate informal consultations on options for placing the UNFF within the intergovernmental machinery of the UN system.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNFF:** On 18 October 2000, ECOSOC adopted resolution E/2000/35, outlining an international arrangement on forests and establishing the UNFF as a subsidiary body of ECOSOC.

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

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

- (a) facilitate and promote the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action as well as other actions that may be agreed upon; catalyze, mobilize and generate financial resources; and mobilize and channel technical and scientific resources;
- (b) provide a forum for continued policy development and dialogue to foster a common understanding of SFM and to address forest issues and emerging areas of priority concern in a holistic, comprehensive and integrated manner;
- (c) enhance cooperation as well as policy and programme coordination on forest-related issues among relevant international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments;
- (d) foster international cooperation, including North-South and public-private partnerships, as well as cross-sectoral cooperation at the national, regional and global levels;
- (e) monitor and assess progress at the national, regional and global levels through reporting by governments, and regional and international organizations, institutions and instruments, and, on this basis, consider future actions needed; and
- (f) strengthen political commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests through: ministerial engagement; liaising with the governing bodies of international and regional organizations, institutions and instruments; and promoting action-oriented dialogue and policy formulation related to forests.

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

The resolution also states that the UNFF will operate under the rules and procedures of ECOSOC and that it should, *inter alia*: be open to all States and operate in a transparent and participatory manner; build upon the transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, IPF and IFF; and ensure the opportunity to receive and consider input from representatives of major groups, in particular through the organization of multi-stakeholder dialogues.

The resolution states that the UNFF will meet on an annual basis for up to two weeks and have a high-level ministerial segment for two to three days, as required. It indicates that the UNFF may convene *ad hoc* expert groups for scientific and technical advice. It also requires the first substantive meeting of the UNFF to adopt a MYPOW and develop a PoA for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

**UNFF ORGANIZATIONAL SESSION AND INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS ON THE MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK:** The UNFF organizational session and the informal consultations on the MYPOW took place from 12-16 February 2001, in New York. At the organizational session, delegates agreed that the UNFF Secretariat would be located in New York, and agreed that the first and fifth substantive sessions of the UNFF will be held in New York, with the three intervening sessions to be held in Geneva and San José, Costa Rica. This arrangement also includes a provision clarifying that if any ministerial segment is held during the intervening period, it will take place in San José, with the two other meetings in Geneva. Delegates also addressed progress towards the establishment of the CPF and agreed to the duration of the Bureau members' terms. They also elected the following Bureau members: Chair, Amb. Mubarak Hussein Rahmtalla (Sudan); Vice-Chairs, Amb. Slamet Hidayat (Indonesia), Alexey Kornienko (Russian Federation) and Gustavo Suarez de Freitas (Peru); and Rapporteur, Knut Øistad (Norway).

The purpose of the informal consultations was to exchange views on the MYPOW in order to facilitate the UNFF Secretariat's preparation of a Secretary-General's report on the MYPOW for consideration at UNFF-1.

### UNFF-1 REPORT

Chair Mubarak Hussein Rahmtalla opened UNFF-1 on Monday, 11 June. Patricio Civili, Assistant Secretary-General, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), presented a review of international forest-related work since UNCED, identifying key lessons learned and challenges, including the need to: formulate a realistic agenda; mobilize political and financial support; generate and sustain support for the CPF; and build capacity. Chair Mubarak described the UNFF as the most concrete institutional legacy of Agenda 21, identified the tasks for UNFF-1 and noted the importance of multi-stakeholder dialogues. Hosny El-Lakany, CPF Chair, reported on the establishment of the CPF and on efforts to broaden the CPF's membership to include the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), in addition to the members of the Inter-agency Task Force on Forest (ITFF). He noted that the GEF has agreed to join the CPF and that the CPF will develop its work plan following the adoption of the MYPOW.

**ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS:** Delegates adopted the session's provisional agenda (E/CN.18/2001/4) and agreed to its organization of work, which proposed that delegates begin drafting decisions on the MYPOW and the PoA during the first week of UNFF-1.



Delegates agreed to grant observer status to the Center for International Forestry Research, the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), and the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (E/CN.18/2001/9).

They also agreed that the Bureau, with the assistance of the Secretariat and on the basis of written inputs and views expressed in Plenary, would provide the first draft decisions on the MYPOW, PoA and the initiation of work with the CPF.

Jag Maini, UNFF Coordinator, introduced the session's documents: the Secretary-General's report on the MYPOW (E/CN.18/2001/5); the Secretary-General's report on the development of the PoA (E/CN.18/2001/6); and the Secretariat's note on the initiation of the CPF's work (E/CN.18/2001/7). Regarding the MYPOW, he explained that the report suggests a MYPOW based on the UNFF's functions as set out in ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, with each function divided into programme elements, and specific tasks for each UNFF session. He noted that the report also suggests a thematic focus for each UNFF session. Regarding the PoA, Maini underscored that countries are the primary focus, although other actors, including the CPF, public-private partnerships, donors and major groups, would assist countries in achieving the PoA's objectives.

Regarding the CPF, Maini noted that it is modeled after the ITFF and mandated to support the UNFF's deliberations, enhance cooperation and coordination, strengthen political commitment to sustainable forest management (SFM), and facilitate implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action through the PoA.

UNFF delegates established two working groups: Working Group 1 on the MYPOW, chaired by Knut Øistad (Norway); and Working Group 2 on the PoA and initiation of work with the CPF, chaired by Slamet Hidayat (Indonesia). Working Group 1 began its work on Thursday, 14 June, and Working Group 2 began its work on Monday, 18 June. Both groups met throughout the second week, holding four evening sessions and working throughout the night on the final day of UNFF-1. Working Group 1 also established a number of contact groups, chaired by Rob Rawson (Australia), during the course of the meeting.

**OPENING REMARKS:** A number of delegates delivered opening remarks on Monday, 11 June. Specific remarks relating to the MYPOW, CPF and PoA are incorporated in the summary of the discussions on these topics below.

In general, delegations emphasized the need for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action rather than further dialogue, called for an action-oriented PoA with concrete targets and timetables, and expressed satisfaction with the establishment and initial progress of the CPF. Iran, on behalf of the G-77/China, noted the special needs of low forest cover countries (LFCCs) and emphasized the need for provision of adequate financial resources. Brazil said technology transfer, finance and trade should be cross-cutting issues considered at every UNFF session, and cautioned against premature creation of an *ad hoc* group on the parameters of a legally-binding mechanism on forests. The Russian Federation supported establishing such a group. Australia underscored the importance of adopting criteria for evaluating effectiveness at UNFF-1.

Norway underscored the importance of major group involvement. Cuba reiterated that action on forests should be based on, *inter alia*, balance between forest preservation and use to sustain national economies, and provisions for international financing and transfer of environmentally sound technologies (ESTs). Costa Rica highlighted the potential utility of regional forest strategies and the need for a standardized system for monitoring, assessment and reporting. Fiji, on

behalf of the Pacific Island Forum, stressed the value of forests for both monetary and subsistence economies. Ghana urged greater private sector involvement and capacity building for monitoring, assessment and reporting.

The Global Forest Policy Project remarked that during the recent ITTO meeting, Malaysia and Brazil identified the UNFF as the appropriate forum to address illegal logging. Brazil responded that difficulties in enforcing forest legislation must be addressed before illegal logging can be discussed. Malaysia said effective reduction and control of illegal logging depends on factors outside national governments and the forestry sector. Friends of the Earth International stressed addressing underlying causes of deforestation and called for a permanent, independent mechanism to review implementation.

### **MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMME OF WORK**

The MYPOW proved to be the most contentious of the decisions negotiated at UNFF-1, and divergence in views over language on, *inter alia*, its structure, monitoring, assessment and reporting, *ad hoc* expert groups, and involvement of major groups forced delegates into informal-informal consultations during the early morning hours on Saturday. It was uncertain whether there would even be agreement on the MYPOW until the final hours, and there was even talk of a resumed session to complete the work.

Delegates delivered general remarks on the MYPOW in Plenary sessions from Monday to Wednesday, 11-13 June. Sweden, on behalf of the EU, stressed that the MYPOW should translate objectives, functions and tasks into concrete activities over the next five years. He emphasized the importance of a manageable agenda, and suggested that each session deal with one cross-cutting issue and two priority issues. The G-77/China, Brazil, Malaysia and Peru emphasized the importance of addressing technology, capacity building, finance and trade as cross-cutting issues at each UNFF session. China said the MYPOW should focus on major issues outstanding from IPF/IFF. New Zealand stressed the need to discuss new and emerging issues. The US emphasized that the MYPOW is implementation by countries, and that international actions by the CPF and UNFF should be merely in support of national policies. Costa Rica emphasized the need to establish criteria to measure progress, and supported using existing experience and monitoring systems to develop them. Ghana said the MYPOW should focus on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, particularly removal of impediments to implementation of national forest programmes (NFPs). The Global Forest Policy Project supported a list of criteria for measuring the success of the MYPOW and the entire UNFF.

Based on delegates' general remarks, the Bureau produced a draft decision on the MYPOW, which the Chair introduced to the Plenary on Thursday, 14 June. Delegates delivered initial comments on the draft decision in Plenary, then began negotiations on the draft in Working Group 1 on Thursday, 14 June. Throughout the second week of UNFF-1, delegates conducted negotiations on a compilation text prepared by the Bureau, both in Working Group 1 and in contact groups, and finally, in informal-informal consultations Friday night and into Saturday. The final text of the MYPOW decision, adopted by the Plenary on Saturday, 23 June, as well as highlights from the negotiations, are outlined below.

**PREAMBLE:** Delegates debated at length whether and how to refer to issues of financial resources, technology transfer, capacity building and trade, as well as a legal instrument, in the preamble. Several delegations, including Switzerland, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, did not support references to finance. The EU and the US also opposed references to finance, trade, technology transfer and



capacity building as cross-cutting issues. Nigeria emphasized that the UNFF must address these issues, as they are critical in enabling implementation in developing countries. The EU noted that there was as yet no agreement on what cross-cutting issues are, and suggested using “means of implementation” instead, as in Agenda 21. Delegates agreed to stress that the MYPOW should embody ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, with concrete activities to be undertaken by the UNFF over the next five years, aimed at fulfilling the UNFF’s principal functions, as well as to address the means of implementation and common items for each UNFF session. Delegates agreed to reference paragraph 9 from the ECOSOC resolution, which says the UNFF should complete its consideration of taking steps to devise approaches towards appropriate financial and technology transfer support to enable implementation of SFM, as a priority in the MYPOW.

One of the most contentious issues that was the subject of informal-informal consultations until the end of UNFF-1 was a paragraph recognizing the importance of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, including the importance of international trade of timber and non-timber forest products in both developed and developing countries in all types of forests, including LFCCs, for realization of the MYPOW’s aims. The G-77/China supported its inclusion, while the US and EU opposed it. Delegates agreed to retain the paragraph, with the inclusion of the references to international trade in wood and non-wood products.

The EU, with Switzerland and Canada, proposed referring also to the resolution’s paragraph on developing a legal framework. China and Brazil opposed the reference. The final text of the preamble does not include a reference to a legal framework.

**Final Text:** The preamble recalls: the main objective of the international arrangement on forests is to promote the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests and to strengthen long-term political commitment to this end; the ECOSOC resolution’s statement that the UNFF will work on the basis of a MYPOW, drawing on elements of the Rio Declaration, the Forest Principles, Chapter 11 of Agenda 21, and the IPF/IFF proposals for action; ECOSOC resolution paragraph 9 on approaches towards appropriate financial and technology transfer support; and ECOSOC resolution paragraph 4(a) on a transparent and participatory UNFF.

The preamble further stresses that the MYPOW should embody ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, with concrete activities to be undertaken by the UNFF over the next five years, aimed at fulfilling the UNFF’s principal functions, in particular implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action at national, regional and global levels, and providing a forum for policy guidance and coordination, as well as to address the means of implementation and common items for each UNFF session. It recognizes the importance of financial resources, technology transfer and capacity building, and of international trade in wood and non-wood products in both developed and developing countries, in all types of forests including those in least developed countries (LDCs) as well as LFCCs and countries with fragile ecosystems, for the realization of the MYPOW’s aims. It also takes note of the Secretary-General’s report on the MYPOW (E/CN.18/2001/5); and decides to adopt the MYPOW for 2001-2005.

**STRUCTURE:** This section addresses the structure of future UNFF sessions and the elements to be discussed, and identifies means of implementation and common items to be addressed at all UNFF sessions. Delegates debated this section until the early morning hours of Saturday. Debate revolved around which elements would be discussed at which session, as well as which issues would be discussed at all UNFF sessions. The EU, the US, Switzerland, Canada and New

Zealand supported the thematic focuses proposed in the Bureau’s draft (E/CN.18/20001/5): forest conservation, protected areas and environmental services; international trade and investment in support of SFM; forests and human needs; and consideration of progress made and future action needed. However, the EU opposed reference to LFCCs. Brazil stressed that the three pillars of sustainable development should be considered together. The G-77/China presented alternative text and a table, which proposed discussing the cross-cutting issues of finance, technology transfer, capacity building and trade at each session. Japan and others opposed inclusion of trade as a cross-cutting issue. The Republic of Korea proposed deleting all references to cross-cutting issues.

Delegates agreed that cross-cutting issues would be discussed in relation to the thematic elements for each session, and that sessions should focus on elements that are similar in substance for manageability and to maximize the use of experts. It was suggested that cross-cutting issues be divided into two categories: means of implementation, including finance, technology transfer and capacity building; and common items, which would include, *inter alia*, emerging issues, lessons learned and CPF participation.

Regarding proposed elements for each subsequent UNFF session, the EU, New Zealand and Japan supported including international trade and SFM, and adding criteria and indicators (C&I) to one of the sessions. Japan supported including C&I under common items, and, with Canada and the Russian Federation, said monitoring, assessment and reporting should be a common item. Regarding UNFF-5, Canada, with the Russian Federation, Poland, Hungary, the US and Switzerland, proposed including a recommendation on the parameters for developing a legal framework on forests. Brazil requested bracketing all elements unless trade was included as a common item.

The G-77/China supported, and the EU opposed, deleting two paragraphs on emerging issues. The EU suggested that the first emerging issue be forest law enforcement. The G-77/China proposed, while the EU, Japan and Canada opposed, deleting a paragraph on cross-sectoral considerations.

**Final Text:** This section decides that the MYPOW should reflect the overall objectives of SFM, and that each UNFF session will address the principal functions as outlined in ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, with particular emphasis on the IPF/IFF proposals for action. It notes that all the IPF/IFF proposals for action are included in an attached table as elements, common items or means of implementation.

It states that the UNFF sessions will focus on the following elements:

- UNFF-2: combating deforestation and forest degradation; forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems; rehabilitation and conservation strategies for LFCCs; rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, promotion of natural and planted forests; and concepts, terminology and definitions;
- UNFF-3: economic aspects of forests; forest health and productivity; and maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs;
- UNFF-4: traditional forest-related knowledge; forest-related scientific knowledge; social and cultural aspects of forests; monitoring, assessment and reporting and concepts, terminology and definitions; and C&I of SFM; and
- UNFF-5: review of progress and consideration of future actions; consider, on the basis of the assessment referred to in paragraph 2(e) (monitoring and assessing progress) of the ECOSOC



resolution, with a view to recommending to ECOSOC and through it to the General Assembly, the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests; and review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests, as referred to in paragraph 17 (reviewing effectiveness) of the ECOSOC resolution.

This section further decides that the means of implementation, including technology transfer, capacity building and finance, will be addressed during each of the UNFF sessions, in the context of the discussion of the elements for that session.

It also decides that the following common items will be addressed during each UNFF session: multi-stakeholder dialogues; enhanced cooperation and policy and programme coordination, *inter alia*, with the CPF; country experiences and lessons learned; emerging issues relevant to country implementation; intersessional work; monitoring, assessment and reporting; implementation of the PoA; promoting public participation; NFPs; trade; and enabling environment.

Finally this section: decides that cross-sectoral considerations might be explored, as appropriate; invites intersessional work, such as *ad hoc* expert groups and country-led initiatives, to support the UNFF deliberations; and refers to an attached table, which outlines the structure of the UNFF sessions.

**MONITORING, ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING:** On monitoring, assessment and reporting (MAR), delegates debated a paragraph listing the areas comprising the UNFF's MAR function. They generally did not support a US proposal to emphasize MAR of progress in implementation "by countries" of the proposals for action. Delegates also debated whether the UNFF's MAR function should include: review of the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests, as proposed by the EU and supported by Canada; review of the effectiveness of the UNFF's own progress in achieving its objectives, as advocated by the US; or simply referencing the MYPOW section on "Review," as proposed by the G-77/China and New Zealand. These sub-paragraphs were negotiated in the informal-informals on the final night of the session. The final text does not include the reference to country implementation and simply calls for "review of the effectiveness."

Delegates accepted G-77/CHINA-proposed text calling on CPF member organizations to make easily accessible information on financial resources and EST to support national capacity building for collecting and reporting forest-related information in developing countries, but Nigeria and the G-77/China objected to proposals by the Russian Federation to add countries with economies in transition, and by the US not to specify categories of countries. Delegates agreed to refer to developing countries but not economies in transition. On a paragraph on presenting lessons learned, achievements and obstacles to implementation at each UNFF session, the US and EU supported, and the G-77/China opposed, "including opportunities for independent reporting." Delegates agreed to omit the reference.

**Final Text:** This section recognizes that MAR are among the UNFF's principle functions, and stresses the importance of the use of regional and national C&I for SFM as a basis for reporting on SFM. It decides that the UNFF's MAR function comprises the following areas: progress in implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action; progress towards sustainable management of all types of forests; and review of the effectiveness. The final text also calls on CPF member organizations to facilitate efforts, including those by countries, to report on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and to make easily accessible information on financial resources and EST to support national capacity building for collecting and reporting forest-

related information in developing countries. The section on MAR further: invites reporting from countries, regions, organizations and processes based on a credible, voluntary reporting system with a focus on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action; and decides that a representative selection of lessons learned, achievements, as well as obstacles to implementation should be presented and discussed at each UNFF session, as organized by the Secretariat in consultation with the Bureau.

**HIGH-LEVEL SEGMENTS:** In negotiations on this section, delegates debated a paragraph on the focus of the first ministerial segment at UNFF-2. The US urged that the endorsement of the PoA be "a" focus of the segment, while the G-77/China preferred that adoption of the PoA be "the" focus. They agreed that, "*inter alia*, an important focus" of the segment will be to endorse the PoA as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. New Zealand supported, and the G-77/China and Canada opposed, US-proposed text stating that the first ministerial segment will provide an opportunity to make a high-level commitment to country goals and strategies for implementing the proposals for action.

**Final Text:** The final text of this section:

- recognizes that clear strategic direction and strong political commitment to SFM are key to the successful fulfillment of the UNFF's mandate;
- decides that, in order to demonstrate political leadership and commitment and provide guidance to the UNFF, the first ministerial segment will be held at UNFF-2 and the second at UNFF-5;
- decides that, *inter alia*, an important focus of the first ministerial segment will be to endorse the PoA adopted at UNFF-1 as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development through its Preparatory Committee;
- notes that the first ministerial segment will provide an opportunity for countries to declare their commitment to country goals and strategies to implement the IPF/IFF proposals for action; and
- welcomes with appreciation the Government of Costa Rica's offer to host UNFF-2 and the first ministerial segment in San José from 4-15 March 2002.

**INTERSESSIONAL WORK BY AD HOC EXPERT GROUPS AND COUNTRY-LED INITIATIVES:** This section recognizes the need for intersessional work to inform, as well as provide scientific advice and advance the objective of the UNFF. It was the subject of intensive debate at UNFF-1, in contact groups and informal-informal consultations until the final hours of the session. Delegates debated, but did not agree on, specific titles, composition, terms of reference, scheduling and reporting of *ad hoc* expert groups. Delegates also discussed financial implications of establishing expert groups, and were informed that once groups were decided, the Budget Division would determine the budgetary implications. Delegates agreed to meet informally Costa Rica prior to UNFF-2 to further discuss expert groups.

In general, delegates agreed to establish three expert groups addressing MAR, finance and transfer of ESTs, and parameters for a legal framework. New Zealand proposed that the groups be open-ended, but others opposed. The G-77/China proposed including trade in the expert group on finance, but many developed countries opposed. The US suggested that issues of governance be addressed in the group discussing finance. With the US and Canada, the G-77/China supported establishing the group on finance at UNFF-1, and reporting at UNFF-2. Japan proposed establishing the group at UNFF-3, and the EU suggested forming it at UNFF-2, to report at UNFF-4. On MAR, many delegates supported establishing the group at UNFF-1, but



disagreed on when it should report. The EU, New Zealand, Canada, the US and Switzerland proposed reporting at UNFF-2, while the G-77/China proposed reporting at UNFF-4. Malaysia said that the criteria for MAR should be decided before the group is established. The Global Forest Policy Project supported establishing the group as soon as possible. On parameters of a legal framework, the G-77/China, New Zealand, Brazil and the US proposed establishing the group at UNFF-4, to report at UNFF-5, with Cuba noting that this schedule would prevent debates on a legal framework from interfering with implementation. Switzerland, Poland, Hungary, the Russian Federation, Canada and Japan suggested establishing the group at UNFF-3, to report at UNFF-4. The EU proposed establishment at UNFF-3 and reporting at UNFF-4 or UNFF-5.

Regarding financial implications of the expert groups and a reference to the statement of programme budget implications (PBI) submitted by the Secretary-General (E/CN.18/2001/L.4), the US said the language did not guarantee that the UNFF's costs will be covered, and called for text asking that any expert groups organized by the Secretariat be funded from extrabudgetary resources. Developing country delegates expressed concern that this could result in a shortfall of funding for the groups, and another delegate suggested a paragraph on voluntary extrabudgetary contributions from the ECOSOC budget.

Early Saturday morning during the Closing Plenary, the G-77/China, supported by Nigeria, opposed reference to issues of governance in the expert group addressing finance and ESTs. The US and the EU supported the reference. After informal consultations, delegates agreed to delete references to both governance and trade.

**Final Text:** This section recalls ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, in particular paragraphs 4(k) (expert groups) and 13 (budget) and the Statement of the PBI (E/CN.18/2001/L.4) of the draft decision in the MYPOW. It also recognizes the need for intersessional work to inform, as well as to provide scientific and technical advice and advance the UNFF's objective in an open and transparent manner pursuant to the ECOSOC resolution, and decides to recommend the convening of three *ad hoc* expert groups, which will address: approaches and mechanisms for MAR; finance and ESTs; and consideration of, with a view to recommending, the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework.

The final text also decides that the specific titles, composition, terms of reference, scheduling and reporting of these *ad hoc* expert groups will be adopted during open-ended informal consultations in San José prior to the opening of UNFF-2 and endorsed at UNFF-2; invites member States and CPF members to submit suggestions for consideration at the informal consultations; and welcomes timely convening of country-led initiatives facilitated by the UNFF through the Secretariat, the CPF and other actors.

**INVOLVEMENT OF MAJOR GROUPS:** Delegates debated at length both the issue of involvement of major groups at UNFF-1 as well as the text of this section of the MYPOW. In Plenary on Thursday, 14 June, delegates engaged in lengthy discussion on whether NGOs would be permitted to make interventions on the draft decisions. Delegates noted the open and participatory nature of the IPF/IFF process and many supported the active participation of NGOs in UNFF deliberations. After extended debate, delegates agreed that NGOs would be allowed to make comments on general issues but not on the draft decisions, which were to be negotiated by governments alone.

In negotiations on this section of the MYPOW, a paragraph on facilitating major groups' participation proved contentious. The G-77/China recommended that the dialogues be held based on CSD practice. The EU preferred "based on the experience from the CSD." The G-77/

China added "within the rules of procedure of the UN." Delegates agreed that such participation should be facilitated under the rules of procedure of ECOSOC functional commissions and build upon the transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, IPF and IFF.

The US urged that the UNFF work to facilitate integration of multi-stakeholder participation at the national level as well as in the UNFF, but the EU and G-77/China said this is the task of governments, not the UNFF. The final text contains a compromise by noting the importance of transparent and participatory practices, including multi-stakeholder participation at the national level.

The US, supported by New Zealand and opposed by the G-77/China, proposed to allow for NGOs to be accredited directly by the UNFF on an exceptional basis. A draft decision submitted by the Bureau, entitled "Participation of NGOs that do not have consultative status with ECOSOC at the sessions of the UNFF," was introduced by Chair Mubarak during Plenary on Friday afternoon, 22 June. It stated that the UNFF recommended to ECOSOC the adoption of the following draft decision: "The ECOSOC, recalling resolution 2000/35, that the UNFF should build upon the transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, the IPF and the IFF, and that supplementary arrangements established by the Council in its decision 1993/215 will apply for the UNFF, decides to invite forest-related NGOs, without consultative status with the Council, on an exceptional basis and as an interim measure, to attend UNFF-2, provided that these organizations have started the process for consultative status in accordance with ECOSOC resolution 1996/31, before 31 December 2001."

Following the introduction of the above draft decision in Plenary, the G-77/China noted that delegates in Working Group 1 and its contact group had divergent views on this issue, and said they did not believe the UNFF should set a new precedent on NGO participation. He underscored that there was no agreement to have a draft decision on this issue. Chair Mubarak referred the document to Working Group 1, and delegates negotiated this issue in the informal-informal consultations in the final hours of UNFF-1. Finally, they agreed to include text in the MYPOW section on major groups.

**Final Text:** This section stresses the importance of involvement by major groups, as identified in Agenda 21, in the UNFF's work, and notes the value of inputs from major groups associated with forest management at national, regional and global levels. The final decision also:

- notes the value of multi-stakeholder dialogues to furthering UNFF's purpose and objectives, in particular implementation of SFM at national, regional and global levels;
- notes the importance of transparent and participatory practices, including multi-stakeholder participation at the national level; requests the UNFF Secretariat to work with the NGO Unit of DESA to expedite submission to the NGO Committee of applications for accreditation by major groups within the relevant ECOSOC rules of procedure;
- decides that opportunities for participation of major groups should be facilitated at each session, under the rules of procedure of ECOSOC's functional commissions, building upon the transparent and participatory practices established by the CSD, IPF and IFF;
- decides that multi-stakeholder dialogue will be held at each UNFF session; and
- invites relevant stakeholders in accordance with ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, paragraph 4(c) of practices to contribute to discussions in each session, including, *inter alia*, case study



experiences, underlining the need to encourage balanced stakeholder participation of developed and developing countries, to give meaningful inputs to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and the intergovernmental forest policy dialogue.

#### **ENHANCING COOPERATION AND COORDINATION:**

Delegates discussed this topic on Thursday, 21 June, and reached agreement on the final text with little debate.

**Final Text:** The final text welcomes the establishment of the CPF to support the UNFF in its work; decides that the UNFF should develop and maintain contacts, cooperate, as well as make active efforts to develop synergies with CPF members, the CSD and other ECOSOC functional commissions, and various other relevant international and regional processes and organizations, institutions and instruments; and invites participation by CPF members and other international and regional processes and organizations, institutions and instruments at each UNFF session.

**REVIEW:** This section addresses the criteria to review the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests. The Global Forest Policy Project supported a list of criteria by which the success of the UNFF could be measured, but the US expressed doubt that that an agreement on criteria could be reached at UNFF-1. A contact group met and discussed Canadian-proposed text on reviewing the effectiveness of the UNFF. Delegates agreed that it was premature to discuss an attached table on benchmarks or points of reference to assess the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests related to the six functions of the UNFF. Some urged inclusion of language on the dynamic and evolving nature of the UNFF. There was significant debate over whether a set of criteria or benchmarks for reviewing effectiveness should be adopted at UNFF-2. Some felt that UNFF-2 was too early for the adoption of criteria and said setting a deadline for criteria contradicts the dynamic and evolving nature of the UNFF process, while others felt that review criteria was necessary for implementation. Regarding a proposed list of issues on which to assess effectiveness, delegates agreed that it should only be an indicative list of examples to be modified at a later session.

**Final Text:** The section:

- recalls ECOSOC resolution 2000/35, in particular paragraph 17 (on reviewing the effectiveness of the UNFF), recognizing that the UNFF should be dynamic and adapt to evolving conditions;
- stresses the principal functions of the UNFF, in particular, facilitating and promoting implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action, and in this context, implementation of UNFF decisions as key bases for reviewing progress; and
- recognizes the need to identify the criteria at UNFF-2 against which to assess the effectiveness of the international arrangement on forests in a systematic and objective manner.

The section also recognizes that the criteria might, *inter alia*, take into consideration effectiveness in terms of the following:

- implementing the PoA;
- strengthening synergies between the UNFF and other international bodies;
- reporting by governments, as well as by regional and international organizations, institutions and instruments;
- involving major groups;
- fostering international and cross-sectoral cooperation at all levels including public-private partnerships;
- facilitating and promoting implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action;
- addressing the means of implementation-finance, transfer of ESTs

and capacity building in developing countries, including LFCCs and other countries with fragile ecosystems; and

- strengthening political commitment to the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests.

The section also decides that more specific criteria should start to be considered, with a view to being adopted, if possible at UNFF-2, taking into full account that priority should be given to the substantive agenda of that session.

#### **DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN OF ACTION (POA) FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IPF/IFF PROPOSALS FOR ACTION**

During general remarks on Monday, 11 June, and Wednesday, 13 June, several delegates, including the G-77/China, the EU, Brazil and Australia, urged adoption of the PoA at UNFF-1. Ghana suggested that the CPF identify mechanisms to coordinate donor support in the forestry sector. The G-77/China stressed that the PoA should include clearly defined timetables and targets. The EU emphasized that the PoA should work through existing instruments, as the UNFF does not have an operational mandate. Uganda described five years as a "painfully slow lifespan" for the PoA's implementation. Switzerland reiterated that the PoA implementation is largely the responsibility of countries, but acknowledged the need for human and financial resources, particularly for LDCs.

Throughout the second week, delegates met in Working Group 2, chaired by Slamet Hidayat, to conduct negotiations on a draft decision on the PoA prepared by the Bureau. Delegates considered options on how to proceed with the PoA and when to adopt it, either at UNFF-1 or UNFF-2, or the adoption of a "framework" or "interim" PoA at UNFF-1, with the PoA to be completed and adopted at UNFF-2. Finally, delegates agreed to a proposal by Australia to develop a concise draft decision adopting the PoA, with the PoA itself as an annex.

Throughout discussion of the draft decision, delegates debated whether proposed measures should be aimed at implementation of the PoA or of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. In the end, they agreed only to refer to implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals throughout the document.

**DECISION ON THE PLAN OF ACTION:** Debate on the preamble centered on whether to make reference to addressing the special needs of specific groups of countries. The EU supported recalling the Third UN Conference on LDCs and the programme of action resulting from it. The G-77/China opposed, questioning whether linking the UNFF to the LDC process would be appropriate, and supported text recognizing the special needs of LFCCs. The EU suggested qualifying especially those LFCCs that are LDCs. The US and New Zealand opposed giving higher priority to any one group of countries. Compromise text was proposed, recognizing the needs and concerns of developing countries, LDCs and LFCCs and other countries with fragile ecosystems, but was later deleted, since delegates could not agree on the inclusion of preambular text specifying the special needs of LFCCs and referring to the Tehran process on LFCCs. However, delegates were able to agree to compromise text on LDCs and LFCCs in the PoA under the section on "Activities of the CPF and its members."

On recognizing the role of trade, debate centered on how to describe trade, with the G-77/China, Brazil and South Africa supporting reference to "fair and equitable" trade and whether its role would be recognized in relation to implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action or the PoA. Japan proposed using language from



the IFF-4 report recognizing the mutually supportive role of trade and environment policies. Australia proposed, and delegates agreed simply to recognize the important role of trade in the achievement of SFM.

Delegates agreed that the PoA would provide input to the World Summit on Sustainable Development, but debated what additional inputs would be. The US proposed that commitments made by ministers at UNFF-2 may also be a part of the input, with the G-77/China preferring to leave text on inputs more open. Delegates agreed to Canada's proposed text inviting ministers to consider other inputs including specific commitments, as appropriate.

**Final Text:** The decision:

- recalls that ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 gives the UNFF a mandate to develop a PoA for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, which will address financial provisions;
- recalls the IPF/IFF reports and their proposals for action aimed at the national, regional and global levels by countries, relevant international, regional and sub-regional organizations, including the CPF, as well as the private sector and other major groups, as identified in Agenda 21;
- stresses the importance of providing financial resources from a variety of sources, including public, private, domestic and international, as well as the importance of institutional and capacity building in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, in implementing the PoA;
- recognizes trade has an important role in achieving SFM;
- emphasizes the need to devise approaches toward facilitating technology transfer to developing countries as well as countries with economies in transition to support the effective implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action;
- emphasizes the importance of good governance and an enabling environment for SFM at the national, sub-regional, regional and global level; and
- recognizes that the identification of priority areas at the national level is the responsibility of countries themselves.

The final text decides to adopt the PoA of the UNFF to guide more effective and coherent implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action as it appears in the annex, and invites all relevant participants to work with the UNFF to implement the PoA. It also invites ministers to endorse it at UNFF-2 and to consider transmitting it as one of the inputs to the World Summit on Sustainable Development. It further invites ministers to consider any other inputs, including specific commitments, as appropriate, as contributions to the Summit's Preparatory Committee.

**ANNEX (PLAN OF ACTION OF THE UNFF):** Regarding text on the PoA as a response to a call for action for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, the EU supported specifying implementation "at various levels." Regarding text stating countries' responsibility for implementation, the G-77/China stressed the importance of global and regional level support to facilitate implementation.

**Final Text:** The Annex states that the PoA is a holistic and comprehensive response to the call for action with the aim of advancing the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action in the context of SFM at various levels. It states that the responsibility for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action directed at the national level lies with countries, and that the PoA is also directed to the international, regional and sub-regional levels. The implementation of the PoA will require: the establishment of national focal points, effective cooperation among CPF members, bilateral donors and countries, and public-private partnerships; and active stakeholder participation. It states that UNFF activities, including country-led initiatives and other

intersessional work, will facilitate and promote the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, as outlined in the MYPOW, and that the target of the PoA is progress on implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and demonstrable progress towards SFM by 2005.

**Activities at the National Level:** The G-77/China, EU, US, Switzerland and others supported text recognizing that identification of priority action at the national level is each country's responsibility. The US stressed that countries should set their own targets, goals and timetables. Australia proposed deciding that countries "will" report their plans for implementation and encourage financing, technical assistance and capacity building. Others, including Canada, Indonesia and Brazil, cautioned against setting common policy parameters for all countries, with the US noting that the UNFF could not dictate country implementation.

**Final Text:** The PoA states that countries will set their own priorities, targets and timetables for the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, and systematically assess and analyze the IPF/IFF proposals for action in the national context. It also states that countries will develop or strengthen, as appropriate, NFPs, as defined in the IPF/IFF proposals for action or other integrated programmes, and, on a voluntary basis, report progress toward implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action to the UNFF as soon as possible. It further states that countries will endeavor to involve relevant stakeholders in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action at the national level.

**Activities of the CPF and its Members:** Debate focused on how the CPF could assist the PoA, with delegates recalling that the UNFF is not able to direct the CPF. A contentious issue was reference to initiatives that address the needs of LFCCs and other fragile ecosystems, with the G-77/China supporting the text as well as reference to follow-up to the Tehran process on LFCCs, and the EU opposing the specification of LFCCs. On the final night of UNFF-1, delegates met in informal-informal consultations to try to resolve the matter. Eventually, compromise was reached by modifying the paragraph to also refer to the special concerns of LDCs.

**Final Text:** The PoA invites the CPF and its members to:

- support the work of the UNFF;
- present a concrete and coordinated proposal to assist in implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action;
- identify and mobilize various financial opportunities in agencies' mechanisms, institutions and instruments for supporting the implementation of the PoA in developing countries;
- consider their collective and individual contributions to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action; and
- recognize that the PoA should address, *inter alia*, the needs and concerns of developing countries, especially LDCs, LFCCs and other countries with fragile ecosystems, for example through follow up to the Tehran Process and the Third UN Conference on LDCs.

**Elements:** Debate centered on whether the 16 elements listed in the Secretary-General's report on the development of the PoA were an "appropriate basis" or "basic framework" for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. The US proposed, and others agreed, to describe them as "an important tool."

**Final Text:** The PoA states that the following 16 elements are an important tool for the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action:

- formulation and implementation of NFPs;
- promoting public participation;
- combating deforestation and forest degradation;





- traditional forest-related knowledge;
- forest-related scientific knowledge;
- forest-health and productivity;
- C&I of SFM;
- economic, social and cultural aspects of forests;
- forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems;
- MAR and concepts, terminology and definitions;
- rehabilitation and conservation strategies for LFCCs;
- rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests;
- maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs;
- financial resources;
- international trade and SFM; and
- international cooperation in capacity building and access to and transfer of ESTs to support SFM.

**Financial Resources and other Means of Implementation:** The EU supported text emphasizing the primary importance of domestic resources, while the G-77/China supported adding text urging developed countries to increase official development assistance (ODA).

**Final Text:** The PoA states that the provision of technical assistance, technology transfer, capacity building and financial resources, particularly to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, is essential to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and is needed to strengthen the capacity of relevant institutions and instruments engaged in this implementation. It further states that financing, technical assistance and capacity building for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action will be provided via bilateral and multilateral cooperation, including member organizations of the CPF, stakeholders, and domestic resources, and urges all relevant actors to give greater priority to SFM in allocating resources. It urges developed country governments to increase the quality and quantity of ODA, and to fulfill their commitments to reach the agreed ODA target of 0.7% of GNP. It further states that financial issues should be an integral part of the UNFF's work to identify ways in which various forms of finance can best support the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. It also states that the buying and selling of wood and non-wood forest products and services, including across international borders, has a profound effect on SFM, and in this context, trade should be an integral part of the work of the UNFF.

**Targets:** Delegates initially discussed a list of example targets, and proposed adding or deleting various possible targets. Australia proposed simply stating that the PoA's target is substantial progress on implementing the proposals for action and demonstrable progress on SFM by 2005.

**Final Text:** The text states that the PoA is an evolving process, and that targets and timetables are important in reflecting progress in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. It stipulates that targets will be set by individual countries, within the framework of national forest processes, as appropriate, and organizations at appropriate levels. It states that concrete process-oriented targets for the PoA should be considered with a view to being adopted, if possible, at UNFF-2.

**Activities Related to Reporting:** The EU said that reporting and evaluation should be based on voluntary reports and targets set by individual actors. The US proposed requesting countries to make voluntary commitments relating to their targets and timetables at UNFF-2. Japan suggested that this include both implementation of agreed

proposals and progress toward SFM. The G-77/China supported that voluntary reporting also include reports from sub-regional and regional groups and processes.

**Final Text:** The PoA states that:

- reporting on progress in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action is based on voluntary reporting, including by regional and sub-regional processes, drawing upon existing formats, as appropriate;
- such reporting should include achievements and identify gaps and obstacles to implementation, *inter alia*, on means of implementation; and
- such reports may be prepared in consultation with stakeholders and would start at UNFF-2.

It also states that: relevant stakeholders are encouraged to provide reports on their contributions to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action; the PoA will be complemented by activities at the country, sub-regional, regional and organizational levels and by relevant stakeholders; and countries, CPF members and relevant stakeholders are invited to make proposals and commitments for the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action at each session. Finally, the PoA will be reviewed and updated, as appropriate, consistent with ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 and the MYPOW.

#### **INITIATION OF THE WORK OF THE UNFF WITH THE COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP ON FORESTS**

In their opening statements on Monday, 11 June, delegations expressed satisfaction with the establishment and initial progress of the CPF. In Plenary on Wednesday, 20 June, they delivered general statements on initiating the UNFF's work with the CPF. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat said the CPF would be asked to contribute to the CBD's upcoming pilot assessment on the interlinkages between climate change and biodiversity. The Center for International Forest Research (CIFOR) highlighted its role in providing objective scientific input to governments, and said its participation in the CPF gives it an opportunity to receive guidance from the UNFF on research priorities. DESA underscored its commitment to fostering synergies with the CSD.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) highlighted the new NFP Facility, designed to supply catalytic inputs to support developing countries' efforts in implementing NFPs. The GEF accepted the invitation to participate in the UNFF's work through membership in the CPF. ITTO noted a recent decision by its governing body that authorizes the ITTO to co-sponsor UNFF country-led initiatives. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) noted that its Programme on Forests (PROFOR) will soon be re-established as a collaborative arrangement between the FAO, the World Bank, bilateral cooperation agencies and NGOs, and will be hosted administratively by the World Bank. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) said that its support to the UNFF will focus on the following areas: underlying causes of deforestation; forest conservation and protected areas; and the needs and requirements of LFCCs.

The World Bank noted that its new forest strategy will emphasize: harnessing forests for reducing poverty; integrating forest utilization into sustainable development; and protecting global forest values. The EU said CPF membership should remain limited for the sake of efficiency, and stressed the need for two-way interaction between the CPF and the UNFF. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) informed delegates of the work of the Intergovernmental Committee on the World Heritage Convention. The Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE) encouraged collaboration between MCPFE and the UNFF.



**DECISION ON INITIATING WORK WITH THE CPF:** On Thursday and Friday, 21-22 June, Working Group 2 conducted negotiations on a draft decision initiating the UNFF's work with the CPF.

The G-77/China, the Russian Federation, Canada and the EU supported text stating the CPF will work under the guidance of the UNFF. The US expressed reservations, noting the primacy of guidance from the governing councils of the CPF member organizations. The G-77/China proposed, and the US opposed, that the CPF "assist" rather than "facilitate" country efforts at implementation. As a compromise, delegates decided to invite the CPF to "facilitate and/or assist" country implementation.

Delegates debated the CPF's role in relation to country implementation efforts. The G-77/China opposed, and the US and EU supported, text on the establishment of a CPF network to facilitate cooperation among a wide range of parties. Following a compromise suggestion made by the Russian Federation, the final document invites the CPF to cooperate, interface, and communicate with relevant stakeholders "within the framework of an informal network." Nigeria opposed, but the group eventually adopted, a US-proposed reference to the use of C&I in assisting MAR. The document also incorporates a US preference that instead of reporting on the state of the world's forests, the CPF ensures that information is accessible from existing databases.

**Final Text:** The preamble reiterates that the CPF should receive guidance and feedback from the UNFF, in accordance with guidance provided by the governing bodies of its member organizations. The preamble also, *inter alia*, emphasizes the important role of the CPF in supporting the UNFF in achieving its objectives, and in enhancing cooperation and coordination among its member organizations at national, sub-regional, regional and international levels. It stresses the need for the CPF to operate in an open, flexible and transparent manner; notes that the Secretariats of the GEF and the CCD have accepted to join the CPF; and invites the Secretariat of the FCCC to join.

The decision, *inter alia*:

- invites CPF member organizations to identify practical means of mobilizing their strengths and resources to support country-level implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for action;
- invites the CPF to consider the need to make enhanced cooperation among organizations, institutions and instruments as one of its main priorities;
- calls on governments to mobilize technical and financial resources necessary to allow the CPF to work effectively;
- recommends keeping the CPF membership limited, for the sake of efficiency; and
- supports CPF efforts to cooperate, interface, and communicate with relevant stakeholders within the framework of an informal network.

The decision also invites the CPF and its member organizations to:

- facilitate the MYPOW and the implementation of the PoA;
- facilitate and/or assist country efforts at implementation;
- continue implementing the IPF/IFF proposals for action targeted specifically to its member organizations; and
- report its progress at each UNFF session.

CPF member organizations are requested to:

- assist the UNFF in MAR, including through the use of C&I for SFM;
- support the UNFF's intersessional work;
- facilitate UNFF efforts to achieve common understanding of forest-related terms, concepts and definitions;
- reduce duplication in country reports required by CPF member

organizations;

- make easily accessible and available information on financial resources and ESTs, as well as on the state of forests; and
- facilitate countries' capacity to provide forest-related information.

Finally, the decision invites the CPF to: develop a work plan and success criteria to review the effectiveness of its work, and to present them at the UNFF-2; provide expertise and advisory services to the UNFF; and participate actively in the ministerial segments of the UNFF.

#### **DATE, VENUE AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE SECOND SESSION OF THE UNFF**

On Saturday, 23 June, delegates adopted the draft decision on the date and venue of UNFF-2. The decision states that the UNFF recommends to ECOSOC the adoption of a draft decision, stating that ECOSOC, bearing in mind paragraph 4(i) (that the UNFF may hold its sessions in venues other than UN Headquarters) of ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 of 18 October 2000, decides that the first high-level ministerial segment of the UNFF will be held during UNFF-2 and welcomes, with appreciation, the offer of Costa Rica to host UNFF-2 from 4-15 March 2002.

Delegates also adopted the provisional agenda for UNFF-2, which is scheduled to include implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action and the PoA, common items for each session, and a high-level ministerial segment. The provisional agenda includes discussion of:

- means of implementation (technology transfer, capacity building and financing for SFM);
- progress in implementation on, *inter alia*, combating deforestation and forest degradation, forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems, rehabilitation and conservation strategies for LFCCs, rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests; and
- common items for each session, including a multi-stakeholder dialogue, enhanced cooperation and policy and programmes coordination, country experiences and lessons, emerging issues relevant to country implementation, intersessional work, MAR, promoting public participation, NFPs, trade, and an enabling environment.

#### **STATEMENT OF PROGRAMME BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT DECISION ON THE MYPOW**

On Tuesday, 12 June, Ali Khamis, Chief of Economic, Social and Human Rights Service, UN Budget Division, briefed delegates on the implementation of budget arrangements for the UNFF. He noted that the financial provisions for the UNFF were not incorporated in the Secretary-General's proposals for the 2002-2003 biennium budget, which were prepared in August 2000, because consultations on the establishment of the UNFF were ongoing. He explained that, following the adoption of ECOSOC resolution 2000/35 in October 2000, a statement by the Secretary-General (E/2000/L.33) was issued on how the Budget Division would proceed with its implementation. He said E/2000/L.33 indicates the UNFF would be funded through a PBI Statement, an *ad hoc* procedure designed to respond to new requirements. He explained that sufficient resources would be available once the UNFF adopted a draft decision on the MYPOW.

On Saturday, 23 June, delegates adopted a PBI Statement of the draft decision on the MYPOW (E/CN.18/2001/L.4). This document states that, should the Forum adopt the decision concerning its programme of work, PBIs would arise. The document estimates that requirements would amount to US\$2.25 million under the programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. In accordance with established



procedures and practices, if ECOSOC approves the recommendations, the Secretary-General would propose that the General Assembly at its 56th session include the necessary provision in the regular budget for the biennium 2002-2003.

#### **FRIDAY, 22 JUNE, PLENARY**

On Friday, 22 June, delegates met briefly in an afternoon Plenary session to hear updates from the Chairs of Working Groups 1 and 2 on the progress of negotiations on the MYPOW, PoA and CPF decisions. Chair Mubarak introduced three documents: Statement of Programme Budget Implications of the draft decision on the MYPOW (E/CN.18/2001/L.4); a draft decision submitted by the Bureau on participation of NGOs that do not have consultative status with ECOSOC at the UNFF's sessions; and a draft decision on the venue of UNFF-2.

Warren Sach, Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division, addressed delegates' questions on PBIs. In response to Cuba's inquiry as to whether the proposed budget included costs for the establishment of expert groups, Sach said the budget was comprehensive and included provisions for staffing and related costs, expert groups and consultants. The G-77/China asked where necessary funding would come if expert groups were established before the next biennium. Sach responded that provisions for the current year draw on the Trust Fund and are adequate to cover the convening of *ad hoc* expert groups. The US expressed disappointment on the UNFF budget for the 2002-2003 biennium, and said the budget was not consistent with the General Assembly's adoption of the ECOSOC resolution last year. She stated that resources for this activity should be provided through redeployment from lower priority areas of the budget, in full accordance with existing budgetary rules and practices. She asked that her statement be reflected in the final report of UNFF-1. Chair Mubarak agreed that the ECOSOC resolution was unanimous regarding the financial implications of the UNFF.

Regarding the draft decision on participation of NGOs without ECOSOC consultative status, the G-77/China noted that delegates in Working Group 1 and its contact group had divergent views on this issue, and said they did not believe the UNFF should set a new precedent on NGO participation. He objected to the introduction of a draft decision on this matter. The Chair referred the document to Working Group 1. Ultimately, the draft decision was dismissed, and delegates reached a compromise to address this matter in the MYPOW decision's section on Involvement of major groups.

Delegates then discussed the schedule of work for the day, and agreed to postpone the closing Plenary so the Working Groups could continue to meet throughout the day to address unresolved issues and finalize the decisions on the MYPOW, PoA and CPF.

#### **CLOSING PLENARY**

Chair Mubarak convened the closing Plenary at 10:45 am on Saturday, 23 June. He introduced the draft decision on the MYPOW, as well as the Statement of PBIs of the draft decision on the MYPOW (E/CN.18/2001/L.4). Regarding a paragraph recommending the convening of three intersessional *ad hoc* expert groups, including one on "finance and transfer of ESTs and trade and related issues of governance," the G-77/China remarked that delegates in the informal-informal consultations had agreed not to include "issues of governance." The US and the EU said they understood that delegates in informal consultations had agreed to keep this language. The G-77/China said delegates had agreed to include language on an enabling environment and good governance in the structure section, but not in the *ad hoc* expert groups section. Delegates then broke into informal consultations for approximately twenty minutes. Chair Mubarak then

proposed, even though he understood it was difficult for certain countries, in particular Brazil, that the reference to "trade and related issues of governance" be deleted. Brazil said, despite the fact that in her recollection this was not the result of delegates' long informal-informal consultations, she could go along with the Chair's proposal in the spirit of compromise, provided that no further changes to the MYPOW would be made.

Delegates then adopted the draft decision on the MYPOW, the PoA, the CPF and the dates and venue for UNFF-2, as well as the Statement of the PBIs of the MYPOW. Delegates also approved the draft provisional agenda for UNFF-2. Rapporteur Knut Øistad introduced, and delegates adopted, the draft report of UNFF-1 (E/CN.18/2001/L.3). Chair Mubarak requested delegates to advise the Chair to write a letter to ECOSOC to be forwarded to the General Assembly regarding decisions taken at UNFF-1.

In closing remarks, Jag Maini noted that UNFF-1 would be the last meeting he would attend in his role as UNFF Coordinator. He thanked governments for the financial support they had provided for various initiatives and the CPF for strengthening the Secretariat's work through secondments.

Chair Mubarak thanked Maini for his devotion and commitment to SFM. The US extended special gratitude to Maini, noting that his retirement from the UNFF Secretariat will be a great loss. She lauded his work, noting that it had always been for the trees. Nigeria thanked Maini for making a difference for forests, commenting that "God gave him a gift and he gave that gift to nature."

Chair Mubarak expressed confidence that the MYPOW will advance the implementation of agreed action on forests as long as it receives adequate support from organizations, and thanked the CPF members for their technical and financial support. He also thanked the Secretariat and the Bureau for their hard work. The G-77/China and EU also expressed their gratitude to the Chair, the Bureau and the Secretariat, and lauded the successful outcome of UNFF-1. Chair Mubarak gavelled UNFF-1 to a close at 12:20 pm on Saturday, 23 June.

#### **SECOND SESSION OF THE UNFF**

Chair Mubarak opened UNFF-2 at 12:21 pm on Saturday, 23 June, for the purpose of electing the new Bureau members: Ositadanma Anaedu (Nigeria); Alexey Kornienko (Russian Federation); Patricia Chaves (Costa Rica); and Knut Øistad (Norway). He explained that the regional representative from Asia had not yet been identified and would be officially elected when UNFF-2 resumes in 2002. He declared the UNFF-2 suspended at 12:25 pm.

#### **A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF UNFF-1**

After a grandiose opening and a complacently slow first week, UNFF-1 culminated into a nerve-racking all-night fiasco that blighted any illusions of consensus on the *raison d'être* of the UNFF. Informal consultations throughout the night and into Saturday morning were deadlocked over basic matters of the MYPOW's content and structure: trade and whether to give special status to LFCCs. While at the beginning many believed that the UNFF-1 agenda would not require a two-week meeting, the seemingly straightforward task of charting the UNFF's course for the next five years through the MYPOW proved nearly insurmountable, and the session finished 24 hours late. In short, UNFF-1 did not instill confidence that it will be the Forum to strengthen the political will to address the long-standing and deep divides that have plagued the international forest policy debate for nearly a decade.



## THE ROOTS RUN DEEP

As a newly established body, the UNFF offers countries the opportunity to open a new chapter in the history of international forest policy. At the outset of UNFF-1, delegates eager to leave the IPF/IFF "talk shops" behind and finally focus on implementation were upbeat and congenial, maintaining a good tone in the spirit of cooperation and staying clear of controversial issues. However, beneath the soil, complex and familiar differences continue to run deep on the issues left pending from the IPF process – financial resources, trade and environment, technology transfer, and underlying causes, such as issues of governance and illegal trade. National sovereignty concerns remain important for developing countries and competing economic interests continue to motivate developed countries. While developing countries negotiated skillfully and earned prominent places for finance, technology transfer and capacity building in all of UNFF-1's decisions, they were delicately balanced with "as appropriate" and references to countries' individual responsibilities. But then again, nobody really expected that these deep divisions would be miraculously bridged with the establishment of a new forum.

Divisions within the G-77/China prevented member States from maintaining a solid front on issues of trade and LFCCs, with some members feeling hostage to the special interests of the LFCCs. The G-77/China's push to give LFCCs special status overshadowed some other members' priority issues, such as trade. Some developing countries perceived that the issue of trade had been used a bargaining chip to gain special status for LFCCs. As a result, trade will not be considered in an expert group where important decisions will be taken, leaving some high forest cover developing country delegates feel slighted.

## A MANDATE FOR DEBATE?

After years of IPF and IFF discussions on what course to take, observers would expect countries to have developed at least a common concept of the path through the thicket. In fact, there are conflicting interpretations of the purpose of the UNFF, what it is supposed to achieve, and the relationship between its Plan of Action and its Multi-Year Programme of Work. Furthermore, with no operational mandate, the UNFF itself can neither develop nor implement forest policy on the ground.

Some view the UNFF as a body for implementing policy, including at the international level, with some more willing than others to give the UNFF the power to supervise countries. Others, including developing countries, prefer a bottom-up approach that focuses on national forest policies insofar as it upholds their sovereign rights to devise their own policies and use their forests as they see fit.

Seeking to bridge wide gaps, countries came down to the lowest common denominator, progressively stripping the MYPOW and PoA of substantive content. The decision documents of UNFF-1 are masterpieces of Machiavellian diplomacy. With meticulously chosen words, they contain all the right ideas but commit no one to do anything about them. On a national level, countries are free to set their own priorities and not to report on progress if they choose not to. On the international level, the PoA only "invites," but does not commit, organizations to mobilize resources and address the needs of developing countries. The more committal "requests" to the CPF are reserved for activities such as monitoring and reporting that do not involve policy action.

As a result, the UNFF does not specify what policy targets countries should pursue, when to achieve them, how to finance them, or to whom and when to report the results. In short, there is no clear mandate nor accountability for implementing the proposals for action. The question arises: why was an international arrangement created if it

leaves everything for countries to implement, allows them to choose whether and how to do so, provides no financial assistance, and has no right to hold them accountable?

Many delegates openly acknowledged that nothing very specific came out of UNFF-1, some with satisfaction and others with resentment. While many are eager to start afresh with the UNFF and get down the business of implementation, there have been suspicions that pro-convention delegates are stealthily trying to undermine the process, hoping this will give impetus to develop the only remaining alternative -- a legally-binding convention on forests.

## A GLIMPSE OF THE FUTURE

It is difficult to draw clear conclusions about the UNFF at this point. The Forum could offer fruitful opportunities for effective cooperation, strategies and action. It is possible that UNFF debates will eventually stimulate national policies and trigger action by the CPF member organizations. Some countries stake their hopes on the CPF, which they see as the most significant result of the IFF. The UNFF work could catalyze substantive action by the CPF member organizations. However, as many pointed out, action through the CPF requires political will and clear guidance by the UNFF. Some developments in UNFF-1 suggest this is unlikely to materialize.

Failure to make progress toward solving the long-standing differences between the North and the South indicates that few countries have an interest in a strong UNFF. Yet, few can afford the domestic political costs of not acting on a prominent environmental issue such as forests. Thus, the UNFF could end up being the institutional excuse for governments to explain to their constituencies why they do not have an international forest policy. In short, another "talk shop."

Recurrent debates on the basic purpose of the UNFF suggest that the UNFF process is still early in the stage of conceptual development rather than in the stage of implementation. Whether countries will resolve their differences on key issues remains an open question. In the meantime, action on the ground remains up in the air.

## THINGS TO LOOK FOR BEFORE UNFF-2

**SECOND MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE ON THE PROTECTION OF FORESTS IN EUROPE (MCPFE) WORKSHOP ON NFPS:** This workshop will take place from 2-3 July 2001, in Lillehammer, Norway. The aim of the workshop will be to further clarify meanings and dimensions of basic principles and elements of National Forest Programmes (NFPs) and to elaborate recommendations for NFPs in the Pan-European context. For more information, contact: MCPFE Liaison Unit, Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-7702; fax: +43 1-710-7702 13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net/Basic/FS-Up-coming-Meetings.html>

**RESUMED SIXTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE:** The resumed COP-6 (as outlined under COP-6 decision FCCC/CP/2000/L.3) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change will be held from 16-27 July 2001, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int>

**FOREST MODELING FOR ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT, FOREST CERTIFICATION AND SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT:** This meeting will be held from 12-18 August 2001, in Vancouver, Canada. For more information, contact: Valerie LeMay, Dept of Forest Resources Management, University of British



Colombia, Vancouver, Canada; tel: +1-604-822 4770; fax: +1-604-822-9106; e-mail: forestmd@interchange.ubc.ca; Internet: <http://www.forestry.ubc.ca/forestmodel>

**17TH INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON FOREST AND NATURAL RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT:** This US Department of Agriculture Forest Service seminar will be held from 26 August–13 September 2001, in Fort Collins, Colorado, US. The focus will be on strategies and methods to develop, manage, and conserve natural resources for the sustained delivery of goods and services to meet the full range of human needs. For more information, contact: Ann Keith, tel: +1-970-490-2449; fax: +1-970-490-2449; e-mail: IFS@cnr.colostate.edu; Internet: <http://www.fs.fed.us/global/is/isfam/welcome.htm>

**INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON FORESTS AND FORESTRY IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES:** This workshop will be held from 12-14 September 2001, in Debe, Poland. It is being jointly organized by the Government of Poland, MCPFE and UN-ECE/FAO. For more information, contact: Alexander Buck, MCPFE Liaison Unit, Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-77-02; fax: +43 1-710-7702 13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net/Basic/FS-Up-coming-Meetings.html>

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ADVANCING COMMUNITY FORESTRY:** This conference will be held from 25-28 September 2001, in Chiang Mai, Thailand. The focus will be on “Innovations and Scaling up Experiences.” For more information, contact: Somsak Sukwong, Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC), Bangkok, Thailand; tel: 662-940-5700; fax: 662-561-4880; e-mail: [ftcss@ku.ac.th](mailto:ftcss@ku.ac.th); Internet: [http://www.recoftc.org/conference2001\\_welcome.html](http://www.recoftc.org/conference2001_welcome.html)

**WORKSHOP ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF PAN-EUROPEAN INDICATORS FOR SFM:** This workshop will take place in Copenhagen, Denmark, from 24-25 September 2001, and is being convened by the Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE). For more information, contact: Ewald Rametsteiner, MCPFE Liaison Unit, Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-7702; fax: +43 1-710-7702 13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net/Basic/FS-Up-coming-Meetings.html>

**2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT REGIONAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS:** Regional preparatory meetings for the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development will be held between September and November 2001. The European regional meeting will be held from 24-25 September in Geneva, Switzerland. The Africa regional meeting will be held from 15-18 October in Nairobi, Kenya. The Latin American and Caribbean regional meeting will be held from 23-24 October 2001 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The West Asia regional meeting will be held from 23-25 October in Cairo, Egypt. The Asia and Pacific regional meeting will be held in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, from 27-29 November. For more information on all the preparatory regional meetings, contact: Hiroko Morita-Lou, DESA, New York; tel: +1-212-963-8813; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: [morita-lou@un.org](mailto:morita-lou@un.org); Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

**CONFERENCE ON TROPICAL FORESTRY RESEARCH IN THE NEW MILLENNIUM:** This meeting, entitled “Tropical Forestry Research in the New Millennium - Meeting Demands and Challenges,” will be held from 1-3 October 2001, in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. For more information, contact: Kenanga Simon, Asian Strategy & Leadership Institute, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia; Internet: <http://www.frim.gov.my/100years/CFFPR2001.htm>

**FIFTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UN CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION:** COP-5 is scheduled to meet from 1-12 October 2001, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: UNCCD Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-2800; fax: +49-228-815-2898/99; e-mail: [secretariat@unccd.int](mailto:secretariat@unccd.int); Internet: <http://www.unccd.int>

**INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR “FORESTRY MEETS THE PUBLIC”:** This meeting will be held from 8-11 October 2001, in Ruttihubelbad, Switzerland. For more information, contact: Martin Buchel, Swiss Forest Agency, Berne, Switzerland; tel: +41-31-324 7783; e-mail: [martin.buechel@buwal.admin.ch](mailto:martin.buechel@buwal.admin.ch)

**MCPFE EXPERT LEVEL MEETING:** This meeting will be held from 22-23 October 2001, in Vienna, Austria. The meeting will discuss next steps towards the Fourth Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (May/June 2003, Vienna). For more information, contact: Peter Mayer, MCPFE Liaison Unit, Vienna, Austria; tel: +43-1-710-77-02; fax: +43 1-710-7702 13; e-mail: [liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at](mailto:liaison.unit@lu-vienna.at); Internet: <http://www.minconf-forests.net/Basic/FS-Up-coming-Meetings.html>

**SEVENTH CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE UN FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE:** COP-7 is scheduled to take place from 29 October-9 November 2001, in Marrakech, Morocco. For more information, contact: the UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: [secretariat@unfccc.int](mailto:secretariat@unfccc.int); Internet: <http://www.unfccc.int/>

**31ST SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL TIMBER COUNCIL:** This meeting will take place from 29 October-3 November 2001, in Yokohama, Japan. For more information, contact: the International Tropical Timber Organization; Yokohama, Japan; tel: +81-45-223-1110; fax: +81-45-223-3111; e-mail: [itto@itto.or.jp](mailto:itto@itto.or.jp); Internet: <http://www.itto.or.jp>

**WTO FOURTH MINISTERIAL MEETING:** The World Trade Organization fourth ministerial meeting will be held in Qatar from 9-13 November 2001. For more information, contact: WTO; tel: +41-22-739-5111; fax: +739-57-83; e-mail: [enquiries@wto.org](mailto:enquiries@wto.org); Internet: [http://www.wto.org/english/news\\_e/meets.doc](http://www.wto.org/english/news_e/meets.doc)

**SEVENTH MEETING OF THE CBD'S SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE:** SBSTTA-7 will meet from 12-16 November 2001, in Montreal, Canada. For more information, contact: CBD Secretariat, Montreal, Canada; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; e-mail: [secretariat@biodiv.org](mailto:secretariat@biodiv.org); Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org>

**SECOND PREPARATORY SESSION FOR THE 2002 WORLD SUMMIT ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:** This meeting will take place from 28 January-8 February 2002, at UN Headquarters in New York. It will review the results of national and regional preparatory processes, examine the main policy report of the Secretary-General, and convene a Multi-stakeholder Dialogue. For more information, contact: Andrey Vasilyev, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-5949; fax: +1-212-963-4260; e-mail: [vasilyev@un.org](mailto:vasilyev@un.org); Internet: <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; Major groups contact: Zehra Aydin-Sipos, DESA; tel: +1-212-963-8811; fax: +1-212-963-1267; e-mail: [aydin@un.org](mailto:aydin@un.org).

**SECOND SESSION OF THE UNFF:** UNFF-2 will take place in San José, Costa Rica, from 4-15 March 2002. For more information, contact: the Secretariat; tel: +1-212-963-6208; fax: +1-212-963-3463; e-mail: [vahanen@un.org](mailto:vahanen@un.org); Internet: <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/forests.htm>