



Proceedings

Vol. 2 No. 1

Published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)

SUMMARY OF THE EXPERT CONSULTATION ON IMPLEMENTING THE FOREST PRINCIPLES — PROMOTION OF NATIONAL FOREST AND LAND-USE PROGRAMMES FELDAFING, GERMANY 17-21 JUNE 1996

The expert consultation "Implementing the Forest Principles — Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Programmes" was held in Feldafing, Germany from 16-21 June 1996. Sponsored by Germany, the consultation intended to further the international dialogue on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and to support the work of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development's (CSD) Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF). The IPF work programme focuses on 11 issues clustered into five programme elements. The Feldafing Expert Consultation focused on components of programme element I.1 (Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Plans and Programmes) and programme element II (International Cooperation and Financial Assistance and Technology Transfer for Sustainable Forest Management).

Experts from governments, the private sector, NGOs and international organizations discussed four themes: sectoral planning, policies and the institutional setting; investment programming; national capacity and capacity building; and international cooperation in support of national forest programmes (NFPs). The participants — 31 from developing countries and 36 from developed countries — acted in their personal capacity and their views are reflected in the Report to the IPF.

The Report, which includes "options for actions," will be forwarded to the IPF Secretariat for further consideration during IPF-3 in September 1996 in Geneva and IPF-4 in February 1997 in New York. Among the options suggested for IPF consideration were: preparing a code of conduct involving financial institutions, cooperation agencies and national authorities; developing strategic planning for investments to facilitate funding for SFM; focusing capacity building on local institutions; establishing a forum for international consultation on forests; and enabling the conceptual development and implementation of country-led NFPs.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE IPF AND THE FELDAFING EXPERT CONSULTATION

The Economic and Social Council, in its decision 1995/226, endorsed the recommendation of the third session of the CSD) to establish an *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Panel on Forests to pursue consensus and coordinated proposals for action to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests. The IPF will hold a total of four meetings and will submit final conclusions and policy recommendations to the CSD at its fifth session in 1997. The IPF will consider outputs from several processes and initiatives and draw upon the expertise and resources of relevant organization within and outside the United Nations system, as well as from all relevant parties, including major groups. Meetings of experts sponsored by one or more countries, international organizations or major groups may also contribute to the IPF's work.

Under programme element I.1, the IPF is to consider actions to promote progress through national forest and land-use plans and programmes in implementing the Forest

IN THIS ISSUE

Brief History of the IPF	1
Report of the Consultation	2
Opening Plenary	2
Working Group Discussion	3
Plenary	5
Brief Analysis of the Feldafing Consultation . . .	9
Other Government Sponsored Initiatives	9
Related Proceedings	10
Things To Look For	11
Annex I - Report to the IPF	12

Proceedings <proceedings@iisdpost.iisd.ca> is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <receptionist@iisdpost.iisd.ca>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* ©. As a companion product to the *ENB*, it is designed to provide a reporting service for environment and development meetings. This issue of *Proceedings* is written and edited by Chad Carpenter LLM <ccarpenter@igc.apc.org>, Pam Chasek <pchasek@pipeline.com> and Steve Wise <swise@igc.apc.org>. The Managing Editor is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@dti.net>. Funding for coverage of this meeting has been provided by Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). The authors can be contacted at their electronic mail addresses and at tel: +1-212- 644-0204; fax: +1-212-644-0206. IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in *Proceedings* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD and other funders. Excerpts from the *Proceedings* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of *Proceedings* are automatically sent to e-mail distribution lists (ASCII and PDF format) and can be found in hypertext through the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/> on the Internet. For further information on *Proceedings*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Managing Editor at <kimo@dti.net>.

Principles and Chapter 11 (forests) of Agenda 21, through an open, transparent and participatory process. Under programme element II, the IPF is to explore ways of improving the efficiency and coordination of bilateral and multilateral assistance. Programme element II also includes consideration of ways to address the critical areas relating to the transfer and development of environmentally sound technology and the mobilization of financial resources, including the provision of new and additional resources with a view to assisting developing countries. The mandate under programme element II recalls the Forest Principles and the Rome Statement on Forestry, adopted by Ministers Responsible for Forests in March 1995.

During IPF-1, the Forestry Advisers Group, an informal group representing the advisers of the major bilateral and multilateral donor and financing institutions active in international forestry cooperation, proposed holding national consultations with interested developing countries on the promotion of national forest and land use programmes. This consultative process would establish a broad-based discussion in developing countries on activities related to programme elements I.1 and II.

After an organizational meeting in Germany in January 1996, 21 countries and two regional institutions, supported by the Forestry Advisers Group and international cooperation agencies, participated in the consultative process at the national level to identify national constraints, opportunities and options, as well as priorities for action, and submitted reports on their findings. Based on these reports, a Synthesis Report was prepared as a point of departure for the Feldafing Expert Consultation, which convened to elaborate options for action for the IPF.

REPORT OF THE CONSULTATION OPENING PLENARY

Dr. Heinz Bühler, Director General of the German Foundation for International Development, welcomed participants to Feldafing and the Expert Consultation. In his opening statement, Dr. C. D. Spränger, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, recalled the Forest Principles' inclusion of the global values of forests such as their role in climate. He encouraged participants to keep in mind these values as well as the national ownership and management of forests. Noting Germany's development of the sustainable use of forests, he emphasized the need to reconcile social and ecological views if technical approaches are to succeed.

He said the historical experience of Bavaria could be illustrative. Over-exploitation based on agricultural use contributed to conversion from mixed deciduous to coniferous monoculture forests. Increased agricultural productivity and policy changes have permitted improved management and some reforestation. He said the lesson was that land conversion can be positive if planned in a long-term context and in ways that promote socially coordinated, ecologically reasonable and useful land use.

He emphasized the importance of taking into account the needs of rural people as well as the political will to develop coherent land-use strategies. With these elements forest and land-use planning can provide a framework for development planning. He noted that Germany had committed DM300 million in bilateral funding for conservation and sustainable use of forests.

Dr. W. Gröbl, Parliamentary Secretary of State of the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry, said the current German definition of forest sustainability includes all uses, not only wood but also values including aesthetic, recreational and water and soil conservation, and avalanche and landslide protection. He noted the contributions of increased agricultural productivity and non-wood energy sources to Germany's ability to increase its forested area since the 1950s. Features of current German land-use planning include shared and divided responsibility between federal and länder (states) agencies, coordination of projects by local authorities, and public input along with legal process to protect citizens' rights. He added that each society must determine its own rules according to its own culture, beliefs and traditions.

Co-Chair Dr. Hans Peter Schipulle, Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Germany), stressed that the IPF should build upon lessons learned and focus on practical experiences. The IPF should be as operational as possible and avoid the routine of re-negotiating language agreed by others. Co-Chair Jorge Barba, Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre (Ecuador) said this consultation was intended to exchange information. He also noted the importance of building contacts.

Christian Mersmann, GTZ (Germany), described how this consultative process fits into the ongoing processes and provided background on the IPF. He noted that this consultation should not strive for consensus on the lowest common denominators but should identify the diverse positions on certain issues and forward them to the IPF. While there are many international planning frameworks — and many countries have taken the opportunity to use them — but others cannot handle this number any longer. Also, the financial mechanisms do not match the planning frameworks, but are used in an *ad hoc* manner. He described how the discussion topics had been grouped and said the experts should identify positions, form options and demonstrate to the international forest community that these positions can be expressed.

Tapani Oksanen, Vice President of INDUFOR Oy (Finland), highlighted the objectives of the Synthesis Report: to establish a discussion on promoting national land use and forestry plans and to communicate the results to IPF. The document was compiled in three stages. Meetings with national contacts were held in January 1996 to establish guidelines and possible issues for national consultative processes. National consultations took place through May, with each country designating a task force or existing coordinating body, conducting analysis and meetings, and producing a national report based on a workshop. Reports from 17 countries and two regional organizations were consolidated into a Synthesis Report in May. The report is based on information submitted by Angola, Belize, Cameroon, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam, Zambia, the SADC Forest Sector Technical Coordination Unit and the Central American Council on Forests and Protected Areas. Papua New Guinea and the Philippines submitted reports at the at the Feldafing consultation, and input was also received from several NGOs. Oksanen stressed that the Synthesis Report created some common, subjective definitions for diverse presentations, and that it

should be considered only a working document for this meeting.

He summarized four areas the report addressed related to National Forestry Programmes (NFPs): Sectoral Planning, Policies and Institutional Reforms; Investment Programming, including subsections on concepts and programme financing; National Capacity and Capacity Building; and Cooperation at International Level in Support to NFPs, with subsections on regional and international cooperation. Each section compiled sets of constraints, opportunities and strategies.

Participants then commented on the consultative process and the Synthesis Report. Some questioned whether international frameworks were truly "imposed" by donors and expressed concern about the range of countries included in the report. Dr. Mersmann noted that the authors of the report did not select countries but only included the views of the countries that chose to participate in the consultative process. Some participants also expressed concern that the developed countries did not have significant input into the report and noted a lack of clarity on development activities between donors and developing countries. A Latin American participant said the report reflects the viewpoint of those in the South. He noted the need for a fairer planning framework and said some bodies prefer to finance activities that are not recipient country priorities.

Co-Chair Barba said that planning follows the establishment of policies. He noted that periodic broad-scale national plans may never be implemented. One participant said sectoral planning constraints should mention external factors, specifically market and price conditions for forest products, which may change the results of planning. He called for actions that may lead to sustainable development, not only to conservation. Participants also commented on: valuation of the environment; developing country problems with exports, especially forest products; the capacity of national governments to handle proposed planning exercises; consideration of new policies to achieve desired goals; unresolved IPF issues; and the lack of high-level political will to implement plans and policy reforms.

Participants also discussed a reference in the Synthesis Report to transparency in donor processes. It was noted that some countries expressed the need to understand policies behind donor programmes and for security from abrupt changes in levels of financing. One participant said the level of donor commitments should fall within a mutually agreed framework against which evaluations or periodic reviews can be carried out. Co-Chair Barba noted funding interruptions caused by change in donor agency personnel. Participants also highlighted turnover from national political cycles as a problem not addressed in the Report. The coordination of donor-funded NGO projects with national plans as a means to mitigate a "brain drain" from government agencies to donor-funded NGOs was also mentioned.

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Participants were assigned to four working groups to address different aspects of national forest and land use programmes: sectoral planning, policies and the institutional setting; investment programming; national capacity and capacity building; and international cooperation in support of NFPs. Based on the contents of the Synthesis Report, the working groups discussed, revised and complemented the list of constraints and opportunities and considered strategies and options. The groups were asked to produce "options" for the IPF to consider in the preparation of its recommendations

to the CSD. The level of options could be local, national, regional or international. Participants were asked to ensure that the options were as concrete and practical as possible, made use of lessons learned and referred to instruments, mechanisms, institutions and agreements.

WORKING GROUP I (SECTORAL PLANNING, POLICIES AND THE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING)

Working Group I began its work by attempting to reach a common understanding of concepts involved in "setting the scene" for forestry development in a country. They noted that sectoral planning includes policy definition, legislation, analysis of conflicts, financial and economic instruments, and research information, but also noted the need to avoid rigid and mechanical planning. Participants agreed that the process was cyclical, iterative and varies from country to country. They also agreed that the forestry sector included many components, such as related agriculture and mining issues, and should be defined broadly and be seen as part of a country's overall development.

When discussing constraints on planning, participants suggested that many policy frameworks were internationally "driven," rather than "imposed," and noted that international frameworks were often changed without consulting national policies. Some participants emphasized the need for balance between centralized and decentralized planning and others said the planning process should provide adequate conflict management between NGOs and industrial interests. In discussing opportunities, participants mentioned internationally discussed guidelines, the need to avoid uncoordinated planning exercises, and South-South cooperation.

Regarding constraints to policies and legislation, participants noted the need for overall guidelines, the lack of legal security for using resources, and the absence of a clear discussion on priorities. On gender issues in policies, some delegates stated that this was an issue for national, not forest, policy. Some participants disagreed with the opportunities noted in the Synthesis Report. They said the positive impact of decentralized government has yet to materialize in many countries and that recently-established inter-sectoral agencies in the environment field have no power. They disagreed on whether long traditions and experience gained constituted a substantive issue and whether awareness and interest by decision-makers and the general public were increasing. When discussing institutional reform, many members agreed that: the role of government should be better defined; the resolution of power struggles between agencies requires better leadership; and forests are often not a priority in national development strategies.

Following initial discussions and comments, the group divided into subgroups to develop options.

WORKING GROUP II (INVESTMENT PROGRAMMING)

Working Group II considered, along with the Synthesis Report, the results of the recent Pretoria workshop on financial mechanisms and sources of finance for SFM. Participants engaged in an initial "brainstorming" session and noted considerations missing from the Report, such as: lack of consistency among planning frameworks; lack of a clear concept of the role and potential of actors and funding sources; private investment constraints; poor translation of policies into investment strategies; the importance of ODA for SFM in most developing countries; and the need for

long-term commitments. Many participants stressed that many national programmes and projects do not take into account the atmosphere they are creating for private investments and said NFPs should focus on attracting private investment for SFM. An NGO participant noted that many private companies are hesitant to invest in countries that lack clear land rights for indigenous people, basic biodiversity measures or clear decision-making processes for fear they will be blamed when conflicts arise.

Some participants in the working group offered examples of problems in attracting investments, while others said that most international investments in forestry did not contribute to SFM and noted the need to ensure the direction of investments. Participants also noted the benefits of investments in SFM, such as the recent increase in ecotourism in Costa Rica.

Based on the constraints identified, the group agreed on several policy options: the establishment of a well-structured framework; increased awareness of the strategic value of forests; development of an entire range of ecosystem value; and the role of ODA in facilitating private investment and supporting technology transfer. Some participants stressed the need to encourage joint ventures and other noted that the flow of information on new funding is of the utmost importance to developing countries. One participant proposed that the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change's joint implementation schemes could serve as a way to get funds into the forest sector, but many participants said that this was a very "sensitive" issue.

WORKING GROUP III (CAPACITY BUILDING)

The Group discussed issues related to the allocation of resources, noting that constraints sometimes derived less from a lack of capacity than its distribution to the wrong place at the wrong time. Issues of competition for human resources between local institutions and those in national capitals were considered, with several participants suggesting greater attention to local needs. The role of donors was also highlighted. Some participants suggested that donor-inspired manpower demands could divert trained and talented people from important programmes. They also considered the relationship between short-term donor cycles and commitments and the long-term perspective necessary for institutional change from capacity building. The Group noted the need for attention to gender issues, although some members said that gender discrimination did not exist in their region.

The Group developed options for improved capacity building including: assessing and utilizing existing local knowledge, experts and institutions; government support to local groups' capacity needs; enhancement of existing institutions before establishment of new ones; improving accountability and management systems; improving motivation by retraining and improved salaries; and avoiding donor-imposed manpower allocations.

WORKING GROUP IV (INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION)

The Working Group first discussed whether its deliberations should be divided according to national, regional and international cooperation. Some suggested that each level had unique aspects, while others felt that the international components at all levels would be similar. Some felt that priority should be given to regional actions. Participants agreed that while each country decides on its

own forest policies, international cooperation should provide support for national measures.

They agreed to further divide regional considerations into sections on policy and implementation, while international issues included sections on policy and political will, mechanisms, concepts and effects.

Several participants suggested changing the term "options" into "proposals" as a description of the Group's output to add emphasis to recommendations.

Numerous participants pointed to a lack of international leadership in forest issues. While some pointed to lack of coordination between international bodies, others disagreed on the level of international coordination that could be effective. They also noted lack of country capacity to respond to the requirements of multiple international agreements and that national policies did not always support international agreements.

The Group considered NFPs as a vehicle for coordinating international support for national forestry activities. Participants noted past failures, especially the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, and how country-led NFPs could avoid similar problems. NFPs were considered as a means of mobilizing funding and as one way for countries to reduce the multiple demands of international treaties and programmes.

They discussed establishing a body or process to address the lack of leadership and coordination. Some felt that this body should be intergovernmental, while others stressed that broad participation of non-governmental actors would be critical. A number of participants pointed to a previous effort to organize a consultative body under FAO, noting that it failed because of attempts to restrict participation. Also discussed was whether the body would be most effective as a deliberative, consultative entity, or alternatively established with legal executive status. Some suggested a continuation of a panel like IPF. Others noted that a legal instrument might be necessary if the body was to make or enforce rules.

The Group agreed to recommend an international forum for international coordination and exchange of experience in support of NFPs. The forum would exercise international leadership and be advisory rather than executive. Roles were also discussed for the forum related to a code of conduct, conflict resolution, and harmonizing SFM frameworks and regional forest plans.

Participants pointed out the inability of the forest sector to increase international funding as a constraint on effective implementation of NFPs. The group discussed the possibility that international coordination could enhance the mobilization of funds.

The group discussed the influence that international coordination of donors could have on the mobilization of funds. Some suggested that an international forestry fund could be a solution. Others said the idea had been raised and rejected in the past. Numerous participants agreed that increased international funding was important, but it was agreed that the issue should be left to the Working Group on finance and investment.

Participants briefly discussed technology transfer and considered what they meant by the term. One participant suggested that this meant such things as inventory and monitoring methods, not simply chain saws. Some participants felt that the technology was already available, but others said that licensing fees and costs were

impediments. After suggestions in Plenary on Thursday, the Group reviewed technology transfer again, and decided to add technology transfer to the text on "Supporting and refining the concept of NFPs," a subsection of the final document.

PLENARY

WEDNESDAY, 19 JUNE 1996

The Plenary convened on Wednesday, 19 June 1996, to hear the initial results of the working groups. Carlos Luzuriaga, Forestry Partnership Agreement of Ecuador, reported that Working Group I (sectoral planning, policies and the institutional setting) had defined basic concepts and noted that sectoral programmes incorporate three areas: planning issues, policies and legislation issues and institutional issues. The Group also noted that the forestry sector should be understood in a very broad sense with linkages to other sectors. The Working Group had discussed the constraints and opportunities and divided into subgroups. He noted that planning alone is not the solution to SFM and that other elements must be taken into account, such as conflict resolution among stakeholders. Leaders from the sub-groups also reported on their work.

Faizuddin Mohammed Ahmed, Ministry of Environment and Forests (India), reported that Working Group II (investments) had considered the results of the recent Pretoria workshop on financial mechanisms and the Synthesis Report, and engaged in an initial "brainstorming" session. The Group then classified types of investment as a basis for their work. He noted the Group's statements that public and private investments are needed for sustainable development, that investment in the forestry sector will require long-term commitment, and that, at times, international policies conflict with national objectives.

Solomon Chipompha, Ministry of Forestry (Malawi), reported that Working Group III (national capacity and capacity building), had expanded and regrouped the constraints mentioned in the Synthesis Report and matched them to options. He noted that the Group could not answer some issues and asked other groups for assistance. He asked questions on the impact of institutional reform on capacity building, on investment and supporting services of other sectors. He asked how gender issues were addressed within each working group. He also asked if there were any mechanisms to ensure funding for capacity building and noted that the group could not elaborate on technology transfer.

Milagre Nuvunga, UNDP, reported that Working Group IV (international cooperation) had divided the issue by international and regional levels, looked at major constituents and noted special regional aspects. They also had divided the section on opportunities into regional and global aspects. At this stage, the Group only had time to hold an initial brainstorming session and categorize ideas. The Group will elaborate further in future sessions. She also noted that the Group had highlighted the need for intellectual and executive leadership as well as the importance of an international framework and a forest partnership agreement.

Dr. Christian Mersmann then presented a proposed outline of the report on the consultation. He suggested merging the options into a comprehensive approach to national forest and land use programmes to show this was not a "free-floating" consultation. He proposed a synthesis or prioritizing of options because all options cannot be

presented. One participant noted that the issue of new and additional financial resources was not raised, although he had anticipated its inclusion by Working Group II. He also noted that the consultation had not talked about land use planning and suggested removing it from the title. Dr. Mersmann said the report could mention that the consultation had not discussed the issue, but the title was an official title from IPF. Other participants said that there had been some discussion of land use planning by the working groups. Some participants asked if these consultations had produced new ideas. Dr. Mersmann replied that there were enough new ideas and that concrete notions were needed. One participant said the report should include that the consultation was based solely on inputs from some developing countries.

THURSDAY, 20 JUNE 1996

Plenary convened again on Thursday, 20 June, to hear updates from the Working Groups and to field comments and questions.

WORKING GROUP I: Carlos Luzuriaga, Forestry Partnership Agreement of Ecuador and Marjukka Mähönen, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (Finland) reported on Working Group I (sectoral planning, policies and the institutional setting). The Group proposed an option that every country should establish or improve its NFP as an instrument to guide the overall process for sectoral development, under strong in-country leadership. The option also addresses the national forest planning process, which should, *inter alia*, have well-defined linkages to macro-level policies and to cross-sectoral policies. The group also proposed an option noting the importance of NFPs as the framework for implementing external assistance to forest sector development, and called for agreement on a code of conduct involving international financing institutions and multilateral and bilateral cooperation agencies. The sub-group on forest policy and legislation presented four options: developing mechanisms for international dialogue on global forest policy and further implementing UNCED decisions; encouraging national forest policy formulation; promoting processes for reviewing forest and forestry legislation with special emphasis on land use issues; and promoting instruments and tools for follow-up of the implementation of national forest policies.

Peter Freiherr von Fürstenberg, Ausschuss für Internationale Forstliche Zusammenarbeit (Germany), recalled that members of the Group had said there was nothing new in their discussion, but noted that some new alliances were forming at the country and regional level between groups that once fought against each other, such as NGOs and governments. Regarding forest policy formulation, Jean Clement, FAO, noted that the Group had called for the formulation of a participatory and transparent process, while also asking government to decide the policies. Co-Chair Jorge Barba commented that the policy formation process is a negotiation and that the top-down approach no longer works. He suggested that the process should stress conflict resolution training and that ODA could finance this type of training. He asked if the Group wanted general guidelines or only to encourage countries. Marjukka Mähönen explained the Group's discussion on the option. She said the Group considered the most important aspects to be, *inter alia*, emphasizing decentralization of decision-making, harmonizing forest policy and legislation on all levels, clarifying administrative responsibilities, distributing benefits from forests and other natural resources proportionally

through legislation, and integrating customary rights into the forest policy process.

Ulrich Hoenisch, Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry (Germany) commented that the option on mechanisms for developing international dialogue should include more concrete proposals. He noted that the international community has agreed for years, but there was now an opportunity to act. Representatives answered that the issue was politically difficult and they would discuss it further. Ralph Schmidt, UNDP, asked if the Group had considered that a forest strategy could conflict with strategies contained in the biodiversity, climate or desertification conventions. He noted that there is a danger that the holistic approach to forestry could be weakened if forest policies were divided between strategies that focus on aspects of these conventions.

Steve Nsita, Forest Department (Uganda) raised a question about the leadership of new land-use programmes and noted that in some countries forestry is not the most important land-use issue. Faizuddin Mohammed Ahmed (India) said that forests are not given the importance they should receive and in most States forestry does not have a ministry of its own. The Group should present to IPF that the international community acknowledges the importance of forests. José Luis Salas Zuniga, Consejo Centroamericano de Bosques y Areas Protegidas (Costa Rica), said the consultation should promote a new type of planning, which not covered in sufficient depth in these discussions. Traditional vertical planning has not produced good results and the best option is to plan at the community level.

WORKING GROUP II: Luiz Ros Filho, Ministry for Economic Investments and Financial Mechanisms (Brazil), reported that Working Group II (Investment Programmes) had taken note of the Pretoria Declaration and the report from the workshop on financial mechanisms and agreed that investment in SFM needs complementary public and private funds and requires long-term commitment. He stated that comprehensive national forest strategies that are consistent with macro-economic policies and aware of the value of forests as a capital base can facilitate the mobilization of funds for SFM.

The option on domestic public funding notes that public budget allocations should reflect the national priority given to SFM and that this can be achieved by securing appropriate valuation of forest resources. Ros Filho noted that ODA should be used in a complementary way to supplement public spending for SFM to support capacity building and technology transfer. A comprehensive strategy on private funds should identify and provide information on opportunities for private sector investment and promote its orientation toward SFM. The potential for new and additional resources should be fully explored, so as to integrate the resources into comprehensive national programmes.

Jean Clement, FAO, stated that the primary problem of financing is that forests are exploited economically but the money does not return to the forest. There is considerable private investment in forest products, but what is lacking is a mechanism to collect a large part of the funds to maintain the forests. He also noted that not all forests are economically productive, but economists only look at what can be sold. Anthony Smith, ODA (UK), asked what role the IPF can play in the valuation question, such encouraging national forestry planning to change the way that national accounts value the resources, particularly the non-use resources and traditional resources. As for the conducive environment, does the

existence of an NFP alone amount to a stability or is it an element in establishing a stable environment that gives confidence to the investors. As for national accounting systems and the environment, Ros Filho responded that the UN has begun a process for valuation methods, but noted that the issue is extremely complicated and will require time.

Bai-Mass Taal, UNEP, noted that private investors are only interested in logging and called for increasing ODA to the countries whose forests provide services beyond logging. He suggested categorizing the type of forest before talking about the conducive environment. Benni H. Sormin, Ministry of Forestry (Indonesia), stressed the need to use wisely the money to achieve sustainable forest management and teaching countries to allocate funds within their budgets to achieve SFM. Elias Seraspi, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (Philippines), noted the difficult task of reforming the budgetary system but the group could start by noting that this is a global interest. Putting forestry plans into place can increase awareness and concerns. José Luis Salas Zuniga, Consejo Centroamericano de Bosques y Areas Protegidas (Costa Rica), said reinvestment must also be taken into consideration, as well as small investment in relation to smaller forests for those who need the wood for immediate needs. Local focal points of investment must be taken into account.

WORKING GROUP III: Solomon Chipompha, Department of Forestry (Malawi), summarized the work of Working Group III (Capacity Building). He said the Group categorized constraints from the Synthesis Report related to: external assistance; human resource development, including institutions and use of local knowledge; institutional development; and infrastructure and facilities. Capacity building should be based on an iterative, periodic assessment of national capacity, with the UNDP Forestry Capacity Programme and private sector funding as possible elements. Gender is cross-cutting and needs to be addressed throughout capacity building. Options under external assistance addressed resource distribution, donor commitments and priorities, a code of conduct, and transparency and simplification of donor processes. Those under human resource development concerned improved training and personnel allocation, remuneration, use of existing local knowledge, a decentralized approach and retraining. Institutional development options to redress inadequate management, accountability and infrastructure included participatory management and integration of local knowledge. Options for infrastructure and facilities concerned strengthening agencies, including NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs), and a focus on vocational training.

Benni Sormin, Ministry of Forestry (Indonesia), said the international role in national and local capacity building should be addressed. Co-Chair Barba said the international community can help fund South-South cooperation. Ralph Schmidt, UNDP, said while NGOs and CBOs have advantages for field level work, problems with funding and accountability exist. Steve Nsita, Forest Department (Uganda), suggested that retraining should apply not only to civil servants. He also recommended strengthening mechanisms to transform research into practical training and working knowledge. Kees van Dijk, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries (Netherlands), questioned singling out research from broader concerns of institutional development. Chipompha said the Group meant to address the isolation of NGOs and CBOs relative to research information.

WORKING GROUP IV: Milagre Nuvunga, UNDP, presented the discussion from Working Group IV (International Cooperation), noting that while national action is the key to SFM, the international community's role is to support countries' abilities to achieve SFM. At the national level, the Group recommended that participatory, country-led programmes should be the vehicle for international cooperation. Although past regional programmes have failed, regional approaches are appropriate to address some issues. Regional initiatives should not override national processes and should not be imposed externally, but should be derived from national needs assessments. The regional programmes can be cost effective, attract political and financial support, encourage information and technology transfer, and address transboundary concerns.

At the international level, the Group suggested establishing a forum for international consultations. The forum would provide collaborative intellectual leadership, integrating all stakeholders. Its functions would include: discussions of policy and NFPs; elaboration of a code of conduct; information exchange; and advice and information to other international bodies. Its form and functions would need further definition, although one option would be to place it under the CSD based on the IPF process.

Carlos Puente Iglesias, Embassy of Brazil, said technology transfer was not given sufficient priority. A more constructive approach is needed to achieve conservation, sustainable use and management of forests. He said joint ventures in biotechnology could be an example. Jean Clement, FAO, said the question concerned proper use rather than transfer of technology. Carlos Luzuriaga, Forestry Partnership Agreement of Ecuador, said instruments need to be examined that channel international resources but preserve national decisions and sovereignty. Co-Chair Schipulle said the notion of intellectual leadership by a forum is interesting as a means to create international pressure to keep forest issues on the international agenda. However, to maintain discipline on implementing international principles and standards, there is an argument for keeping the forum on an intergovernmental level while allowing scientific and NGO input. This could be stronger than a purely consultative process, but the coordination function must be at the national level. Nuvunga said the Group did not intend to place executive functions in the forum.

Takeshi Goto, Forestry Agency (Japan), emphasized the local nature of forest issues. He said activities in international cooperation should produce results on the ground, adding that the forum could be an abstract, general body. Nuvunga said the forum would allow countries to speak about forestry in abstract, political and practical terms to address SFM issues. José Luis Salas Zuniga, Consejo Centroamericano de Bosques y Areas Protegidas (Costa Rica), said the forum should also provide for the participation of regional and subregional organizations. Ulrich Hoenisch, Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry (Germany), said a forum is needed and could bring together past failed efforts. The IPF needs to decide if a new instrument is needed. He questioned whether addressing only NFPs in this forum might suggest to land-use planners that forestry may want to establish authority over all land-use planning.

FRIDAY, 21 JUNE 1996

A drafting group, consisting of members of each of the working groups, was formed to combine text from the four groups, incorporating revisions suggested at Thursday's Plenary and in Thursday's working group discussions. On Friday, 21 June 1996, participants discussed the document prepared by the drafting group: "Report to the IPF".

The Report to the IPF contains a preamble, which notes the background and objectives of the consultations. It also contains a section outlining the concept of national forest programmes. The Report notes that the Expert Consultation discussed issues under four major themes — sectoral planning, investment programming, national capacity and international cooperation — and contains the options produced under each theme.

The options for action on sectoral planning, policies and institutional setting notes that two basic options set the frame of reference defined by the Expert Consultation on the issue: the suggestion that each country should establish or improve its own NFP as the instrument to guide and orient the process of sectoral development; and that IPF consider the preparation of a code of conduct involving international financing institutions, multilateral and bilateral cooperation agencies, and national authorities. The section also suggests the encouragement and promotion of national forest policy formulation in the context of national policy development, and states that the regular updating of forest policy should be assured and followed up, taking into account, *inter alia*, close links to macroeconomic planning and participation by the private sector and NGOs and the enhancement of gender issues in forest policy development. The options also suggest revision of the roles, mandates and institutional structures and establishment and/or consolidation of national coordination.

On investment programming, the Report states that the experts took note of the Pretoria Declaration as a valuable input for its work. It also provides options on strategic planning or investment, which note that comprehensive national forest strategies, that are consistent with macroeconomic planning and policy and are aware of the strategic value of forests as a capital base for national sustainable development, facilitate mobilizing funds for SFM. For domestic public funding, public budget allocations should reflect the national priority given to sustainable forest management. The options on ODA state that it should be used in a complementary way to support public spending for SFM, and the options on private funding note that a comprehensive strategy should identify and provide information on opportunities for public sector investment and promote its orientation toward SFM. The options also note that the potential of mechanisms generating new and additional financial resources should be fully explored.

On national capacity and capacity building, the experts identified options on the development of improved approaches to external assistance to capacity building; human resource development; strengthening of local institutions and organizations; and institutional development. On international cooperation in support of NFPs, the experts made suggestions on: supporting and refining the concept of NFPs; development of appropriate regional approaches; and establishment of a forum for international consultation on forests. The option states that in order to increase the effectiveness of international support to NFPs, it was proposed that a new "Forum for International Consultation on Forests" should be established based on the experience of

the IPF. Such a forum would promote international support for the NFP process and should be a consultative body, whose work is supported by technical and scientific advice.

Ralph Roberts, Canadian International Development Agency, said there had been limited discussion of land-use, developed countries' experience with NFPs and technology transfer. The report's preamble should state that it addresses "components of" IPF programme elements I.1 (Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Plans and Programmes) and II (International Cooperation in Financial Assistance and Technology Transfer for Sustainable Forest Management). A reference was added to a workshop to be held in November in Japan on integrated application of sustainable forest management practices.

Fea Boegeborn, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Netherlands), said a reference in the section on the Concept of National Forest Programmes to a comprehensive national forest "strategy" should be replaced with "programme." Co-Chair Schipulle said "strategy" was thought to be broader. Anthony Smith, ODA (UK), said his country had a strategy but no programme. Roberts said NFPs could contain various processes including strategies. The final version adds an explanation that the Feldafing consultation discussed terminology, did not adequately address land use, and, therefore, abbreviates "National Forest and Land Use Programmes" to "National Forest Programmes" (NFPs). It states: "the term was understood to be a generic expression for a wide range of approaches to the process of planning, programming and implementation of forest activities at the national level."

In a section on options for action in Sectoral Planning, Policies and Institutional Setting, Benni Sormin, Ministry of Forestry (Indonesia), suggested changing "stakeholders" to "actors." Takeshi Goto, Forestry Agency (Japan), recommended that a reference to a "code of conduct" be consistent with similar references in other sections. Co-Chair Schipulle said the term was meant to represent an agreement made on specific issues, not one comprehensive code. Text that "an agreement on" a code of conduct should be considered by IPF was changed to "preparation of a code."

Goto said a statement that efforts to reach a common definition of SFM should be "followed by the development of instruments" was not clear. The subsection regarding Development of Instruments to Introduce and Monitor Sustainable Forest Management containing the statement, as well as references to criteria and indicators, voluntary certification, and information management systems and networks, was deleted.

Participants discussed whether the section on Investment Programming's reference to the effects of international trade on the national forest sector should include possible positive effects. At the suggestion of Sormin, a reference to "impacts" was changed to "opportunities and risks."

Participants also discussed a reference to "code of conduct" in the section on National Capacity and Capacity Building. Douglas Kneeland, US Forest Service, said a code of conduct was intended to be an agreement between external agencies and a national government on the "rules of the game." Co-Chair Barba asked whether a reference to a code preventing competition for national expertise and staff was the main issue. The final report deletes the reference to avoiding competition and suggests "establishment of an agreement, perhaps in the form of a code of conduct, between cooperation agencies and the government" as one

means of improving external assistance to capacity building. A reference to "North-South" cooperation in institutional development was added to promoting South-South networking and information exchange.

In the section on International Cooperation in Support of National Forest Programmes, participants discussed the emphasis on NFPs as a vehicle and whether the proposed forum should only address NFPs. Mersmann said Working Group IV had intended to leave the options open, not to restrict the forum only to NFPs or to repeat mistakes made in the Tropical Forestry Action Plans. Frans Richard Bach, National Forest and Nature Agency (Denmark), said concerns about proposing other fora should be addressed and added text that "Modalities of cooperation need to be developed at the national level to help ensure effective NFP planning and implementation." The final report includes that statement and that the options "aim at the promotion of NFPs as the central focus for international cooperation." A statement that the options could address IPF programme elements other than I.1 was removed. Another paragraph stating that "NFPs can be an important means of promoting" SFM was not amended, despite suggestions to change the reference to "play a key role." The report also states that the international community's support should be focused on implementation of country-led NFPs and that the development of the concept of NFPs should continue.

In a subsection proposing establishing a forum for international consultation on forests, participants changed a statement that the forum would be based on "progress made by the IPF" to "based on the experience of the IPF." To permit possible consideration of more than NFPs, participants added that "with an expanded mandate," the forum might be useful for dealing with other IPF programme elements. The final report states that the forum "should be a consultative body, whose work is supported by technical and scientific advice. It should establish collaborative leadership in the forest sector, but not seek to coordinate national process. It should ensure that all actors, including NGOs and the private sector, are integrated into the consultation process."

Participants discussed whether the forum's possible tasks should refer only to NFPs. They also considered whether the tasks should include "to provide a forum for policy discussions." The final text includes that as well as consulting on initiatives and development of NFP concepts and methodologies, the forum would: attempt to enhance cooperation of international agencies on support for development of NFPs, provide a forum for policy discussions; and encourage information exchange on NFP implementation.

A number of participants commented on a paragraph on the form and function of the forum. Douglas Kneeland, US Forest Service, supported by Goto, said the forum should be broader than only governments. Co-Chair Schipulle said he thought the forum could continue the IPF's format, being intergovernmental but including other actors. Several suggestions were made to amend the paragraph. The final report states that among topics needing further definition is the "question of the legal status" of the forum. It also states that "One suggestion was to establish the forum as an intergovernmental body under the aegis of the CSD with the Department of Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development fulfilling the secretariat function."

PRESENTATION ON POLICIES AND STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF ECUADOR'S FORESTRY SECTOR

During the course of the meeting, participants also attended a special presentation on policies and strategies for Ecuador's forestry sector by Chair Jorge Barba. Ecuador's National Forestry Action Plan (NFAP) was elaborated through a participatory planning process including representatives of major forestry institutions. The National Plan is expected to result in: formulation and enforcement of forestry laws and regulations; training of specialists in management of natural resources; monitoring and evaluation of natural resources; participatory planning methodologies at all levels; strengthening of indigenous organizations and farm communities; and technologies for SFM. There are ten strategies for the forestry sector that address, *inter alia*, national land use planning and management; human resource development; and information and monitoring systems. For more information contact Jorge Barba at the Instituto Ecuatoriano Forestal y de Areas Naturales y Vida Silvestre, Ministerio de Agricultura, Quito, Ecuador, tel: +593-2-541-921; fax +593-2-564-037

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE FELDAFING CONSULTATION

After expressing general satisfaction at the results of the expert consultation, several Feldafing participants were either unable to suggest, or perhaps refrained from predicting, how the meeting's results would be received at IPF-3. The question of the ultimate impact of the group's work filtered through several aspects of the discussions, as participants strove to balance a desire to present compelling ideas on activities related to national forest programmes with undefined but acutely felt bounds of political acceptability. So their conclusions, carefully labeled "options," recommended some bold directions the IPF might take related to NFPs and an international forum, but also avoided a major area — land-use planning — that fell within the possible purview of the meeting.

Numerous participants said they felt the IPF represents a change in the international forest policy environment — an opportunity that the Feldafing report was meant to capture. But with input from country-led initiatives being an untested process, and without explicit instructions from the IPF, participants clearly were feeling their way forward. The meeting attempted to nudge concepts familiar in the forestry community into the IPF's view. Experts commented during reviews of the ideas from the working groups that most of these ideas were not new, but if properly related to the IPF objectives and programme elements, would represent new perspectives for the IPF.

Frequent references to participatory processes in, for example, forest programmes, capacity building and development of national policies, appear to apply in the forest sector notions of partnership that are under consideration elsewhere within the sustainable development debate.

Participants repeatedly considered how players other than governments would become involved in national forest programmes. Several participants said that to apply the existing concepts effectively would be an advance, yet a few participants also felt that the discussion restrained itself too much.

The report frankly explains that it does not fully explore land-use planning or programmes, a subject that was a second major component of the meeting's title and working brief. Participants cited several reasons that this subject was not fully addressed (although it received some consideration by the working group on sectoral planning, policies and institutions). One reason was that broad land-use planning was not a focus of country inputs in the Synthesis Report that was the starting point for the meeting. Another was the level of expertise of the Feldafing participants. Like the IPF itself, most were from forestry institutions, which tended to turn the discussions to sectoral rather than cross-sectoral questions. Some participants also said that the omission also reflects the IPF. Since it is unclear what priority or approach the IPF may take toward cross-sectoral issues, participants did not know what to say on the subject. The report's suggestion that the land-use issue requires further discussion at future meetings leaves it either for IPF discussions or other country-led initiatives to pursue. This provides an opportunity for upcoming workshops, but leaves open what kind of expertise might inform cross-sectoral views of forest and land-use programmes at the IPF.

Technology transfer was an element of discussion at Feldafing, but several participants noted that it did not receive as intensive an examination as other issues. Developing countries' requests to underscore the need for technology transfer to support other goals defined at the consultation resulted in additional references in the Report's sections on investments and on supporting and refining the concept of NFPs.

In other cases, the Feldafing consultations edged toward a broad view. The international forum was geared in the meeting's report toward NFP issues, but participants also noted that it could have wider uses. The code of conduct concept was vaguely described, but participants appeared to see it as a tool to address several aspects of donor coordination in the forest sector. And the treatment of NFPs suggested that they be an international priority while allowing for different types of activities, strategies and programmes to fit the definition.

It may be that the consultation itself presages the treatment its ideas will be given in the IPF. The experts attended and spoke in their personal capacities, but they included a number of members of the IPF interagency task force, several IPF delegates and even one head of delegation. They had and used their chances to amend and trim some proposals, so the options in the Feldafing report are in one sense pre-approved by a subset of the IPF. If they choose to, the experts from the Feldafing consultation will be able to explain, defend and promote their recommendations when they rejoin other IPF delegates in September.

OTHER RECENT GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED INITIATIVES

WORKSHOP ON FINANCIAL MECHANISMS AND SOURCES OF FINANCE FOR SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY

The workshop, co-sponsored by UNDP and the Governments of Denmark and South Africa, was held from 4-7 June 1996 in Pretoria, South Africa, and attended by 70 experts from 45 countries. The workshop produced the Pretoria Declaration, which will support and contribute to the

work of the IPF in its Programme Element II: International cooperation in financial assistance and technology transfer. In the Declaration, the experts recognized that forests, including wooded lands, simultaneously provide a wide range of economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits at the local, national, regional and global levels, and that maintaining all types of the world's forests in a healthy state is in the collective interest of present and future generations.

The experts, however, expressed concern about: the lack of follow-up and implementation of the Rio agreements to combat deforestation and to promote sustainable forest management; the unsustainable management of the world's forests; and the unprecedented rate of extensive unplanned deforestation and forest degradation. They also expressed concern about the ability of forests to meet the multiple needs of societies, if current trends and investment practices continue, and about the resource gap to meet the needs of sustainable forest management.

They called upon governments take a number of urgent actions, such as: securing the market value of natural resources capital stock, land-use planning and security of land tenure through policy reforms; creating and promoting a favorable environment for investment in SFM, including macro-economic stability; providing incentives and promoting the use of appropriate technologies to support SFM; and formulating and implementing national forest programmes that include clear action plans and provisions for in-country coordinating mechanisms and monitoring of progress. They also called on donors and the voluntary sector to focus their activities in meeting subsistence needs, building capacity and creating potential industrial opportunities in developing countries, particularly those with low forest cover.

In the report of the workshop, the participants noted that during the last few years many donors have reduced ODA and that forestry ODA has declined in real terms. Meanwhile, private investment flows to developing countries have been rising and are now five times greater than ODA. They note that directing private investment toward sustainable forest management constitutes a critical task. In developing countries the current flows of private investment are highly concentrated on a few countries with export potential, while serious shortages of funds are experienced in countries where forestry is oriented to domestic markets.

It was recognized that vast areas of forests are not being managed sustainably, but there are several promising trends, such as increased participation of local populations in decision-making and the rapid growth of investment in industries based on SFM, including tourism and non-wood forest products. With the reform of policy and regulatory frameworks within which it operates, SFM should generate net revenues, however, many nations need significant external assistance to manage their forest sustainably.

The experts noted that governments have the responsibility to create an enabling environment for investment including: an effective and appropriate regulatory framework; a clearly defined forest policy, which does not conflict with other sectoral policies; and capacity-building in key areas. Regarding undervaluation, they noted that forests are often assigned very low or no market value and that national economic accounting systems currently harbor a fundamental error. They have no capital accounts and hence ignore changes in the value and stocks of resources.

The participants also noted that the governments are "short-changing" themselves and encouraging unsustainable practices by granting fiscal incentives such as tax breaks and

below-market value stumpage fees and rents. They also noted that huge shifts in global capital markets over the last five years suggest that the main issue for capturing private sector funding for forest management is not developing new financial instruments, but linking existing investment flows more directly to SFM.

For more information on the meeting contact: UNDP, One UN Plaza, New York, NY, 10017, tel: +1-212-906-5629; fax: +1-212-906-6973; e-mail: HQ@undp.org.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CERTIFICATION AND LABELING OF PRODUCTS FROM SUSTAINABLY MANAGED FORESTS

This conference, sponsored by the government of Australia, was held from 26-30 May 1996 in Brisbane to advance the international dialogue on the issue of certification and labeling as a means for achieving SFM. Based on the workshop discussions, participants recommended appropriate consideration by the IPF of several conclusions, including: certification and labeling are potentially useful tools among many other to promote SFM and their efficacy needs further evaluation; both performance standards and environmental management systems are complementary and important components for the assessment of SFM; and there is insufficient information to determine the extent of the market demand for certified products.

The conclusions also note that a number of issues merit further consideration and questions that need to be further explored with respect to certification and labeling. These include: costs and benefits; market implications; the scientific basis for defining and measuring SFM; governance and credibility of certification schemes; the roles of governments and international institutions and organizations; consistency with international agreements; harmonization and mutual recognition between schemes; trade impacts; and the role of environmental, economic and social objectives in achieving SFM. For information contact the Conference Secretariat, PO Box 505 Curtain ACT 2605, Australia, tel: +61 6 281 6524, fax: +61 6 285 1336.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

Delegates to both the Feldafing and Pretoria workshops discussed issues related to the undervaluation of forests and problems with national economic accounting and environmental concerns. The following workshops recently considered these problems

CONFERENCE ON INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ACCOUNTING IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

This Conference, held 5-8 March 1996, was organized by the United Nations University and the Economic Planning Agency of Japan, in association with the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth (IARIW). The Conference took stock of practical experience and theoretical research in environmental accounting since the first IARIW Conference on this subject in Baden, Austria (27-29 May 1991), which led to preparation of the UN Handbook on Integrated Environmental and Economic Accounting. While revealing a number of commonalities in the different approaches and case studies, numerous conceptual and methodological issues remain unresolved or controversial, notably the valuation of environmental

degradation. Alternatives discussed included physical (land use) accounts and modeling. For more information contact Peter Bartelmus, UN Statistics Division, DC2-1638, 2 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017. Tel: +1-212-963-4847; Fax: +1-212-963-9851; e-mail: <bartelmus@un.org>.

WORKSHOP ON VALUATION METHODS

The workshop "Valuation Methods for National Green Accounting", which was sponsored by the International Society of Ecological Economics (University of Maryland, USA) and the World Bank, was held from 20-22 March 1996 in Washington, DC. The workshop discussed the problems of green accounting in developing countries with special attention on Latin America. The goal of the meeting was to prepare a practical guide that could help these countries establish a more efficient way of including the natural resource stock and flow in the System of National Accounting proposed by the UN. National experiences were discussed and new ideas on solutions were presented on the problems related to the application of the standard valuation methodologies in diverse socio-economic situations. The papers presented and the results of the workshop will be published, possibly by the World Bank. For more information contact: Monica Grasso or Beatriz Castaneda, Institute for Ecological Economics, University of Maryland, P.O. Box 38, Solomons, MD 20688, USA, fax: +1-410-326-7263, e-mail: mgrasso@cbl.cees.edu. The Institute can also be contacted at College of Life Science, Room 0220, Symons Hall, College Park, MD 20742 USA.

THIRD MEETING OF THE "LONDON GROUP"

The third meeting of the "London Group," an international working group on integrated environmental and economic accounting, was held in Stockholm, Sweden, from 28-31 May 1996. In addition to presentations on developments of the accounting in different countries, the agenda included the topics of: Forest accounts — Physical and monetary measures; Material flow in environmental accounting; and Cost of pollution: Different approaches. The meeting included participants from Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK, US, EUROSTAT, OECD, the World Bank and the EEA.

For further information please contact Gia Wickbom, Statistics Sweden, Box 2024 300, 104 51 Stockholm, Sweden; e-mail: <gia.wickbom@scb.se>.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON FORESTS: The IPF will hold its third session from 9-20 September 1996 in Geneva and its fourth session in 1997 in New York. For more information contact: Elizabeth Barsk-Rundquist. Tel: +1-212-963-3263; Fax: +1-212-963-3463; e-mail: <barsk-rundquist@un.org>. For more information on the IPF, visit the UN Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development (DPCSD) Home Page at <http://www.un.org/DPCSD>. Also visit the Tree Link Time Page at <http://webonu.fastnet.ch>.

GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED INITIATIVES

EXPERTS MEETING ON REHABILITATION OF FOREST DEGRADED ECOSYSTEM: Portugal, Cape Verde and Senegal, in cooperation with the FAO, will sponsor this meeting from 24-28 June 1996 in Lisbon. The meeting will

analyze afforestation, reforestation and restoration of forests, especially in countries with fragile ecosystems affected by drought or desertification. It will identify practical measures for promoting integrated strategies for sustainable forest management. For information contact: Mr. Fernando Mota, tel: +351 1 347 1411 or 347 4358; fax: +351 1 346 9512; or Miguel Jeronimo, Mission of Portugal to the UN, tel: +1-212-759-9444; fax: +1-212-355-1124.

INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS GROUP STUDY ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS AND INSTRUMENTS IN THE FOREST SECTOR: Switzerland and Peru are co-sponsoring this international expert group study on the work carried out by international organizations and multilateral institutions, and under existing legal instruments related to forest issues. The first meeting took place in Geneva from 5-8 March, and the second is scheduled for 24-28 June 1996. For more information contact: Livia Leu Agosti, Mission of Switzerland to the UN, 757 3rd Ave., 21st Floor, New York, NY, 10017. Tel: +1-212-421-1480; Fax: +1-212-751-2104; Italo Acha, Mission of Peru to the UN, 820 2nd Ave., Suite 1600, New York, NY, 10017. TEL: +1-212-687-3367; fax: +1-212-927-6975; or Bernardo Zentilli, Coordinator, Swiss/Peruvian Initiative, 9-11 rue Varembe, PO Box 60, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland. Tel: +41 22 749 2437; Fax: +41-22-749-2454; e-mail: <bzentil@iprolink.ch>.

LONG-TERM TRENDS IN SUPPLY AND DEMAND FOR WOOD PRODUCTS AND POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT: This ongoing activity, sponsored by Norway and managed by the European Forest Institute (EFI) and the Norwegian Forest Research Institute (NISK), is conducted by an international team of experts representing various disciplines from 1 December 1995 to 1 July 1996. The process will prepare a synthesis paper on: factors affecting long-term trends of non-industrial and industrial supply and demand for wood; main trends and prospects in non-industrial and industrial supply and demand for wood; and possible implications for sustainable forest management. The final results will be reported to IPF-3. For more information contact: Mr. Jostein Leiro, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tel: +47 2224 3608, Fax: +47 2224 9580/81; Mr. Svein Aass, Permanent Mission of Norway to the UN, Tel: +1-212-421-0280; Fax: +1-212-688-0554; EFI, Tel: +358 73 252 020; Fax: +358 73 124 393; <<http://www.efi.joensuu.fi>>.

CERTIFICATION OF FOREST PRODUCTS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE:

Germany and Indonesia will host a joint expert working group meeting from 12-16 August 1996 in Bonn. The meeting will address the impact of certification and labeling on trade, market access and the achievement of sustainable forest management. For more information contact: Hagen Frost, German Federal Ministry of Economics, TEL: +49-228-615 3947, FAX: +49-228-615 3993; Rainald Roesch, Mission of Germany to the UN, Tel: +1-212-856-6295, Fax: +1-212-856-6280; or Dr. Untung Iskandar, Indonesian Ministry of Forestry, Tel: +21-5701114, 5730680, Fax: +21-5738732, 5700226.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL SEMINAR ON CRITERIA AND INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT: Finland will sponsor this seminar to be held from 19-22 August 1996 in Helsinki. The seminar will aim at promoting and encouraging national implementation of criteria and indicators and study the feasibility of their further development as well as their comparability and international

compatibility. For more information, contact the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry; ISCI Secretariat, Tel: +358 0 160 2405; Fax: +358 0 160 2430; e-mail: <mmm.agrifin.mailnet.fi>; Internet: <http://www.mmm.fi/isci/home.htm>

SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY AND LAND USE: THE PROCESS OF CONSENSUS BUILDING: Sweden, Uganda and the FAO will organize this seminar scheduled for October 1996 in Stockholm, Sweden as a follow-up to the Feldafing Consultation. The workshop will consist of presentations and discussion of country case studies, discussion of some identified key issues and plenary sessions. Funds have been secured to allow 20 participants from developing countries. About the same number will be invited from international organizations, NGO and developing countries. For more information contact: David Harcharik, Assistant Director-General, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy. Tel: +39-6-5225-3550; Fax: +39-6-25555-5137; e-mail: david.harcharik@fao.org.

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON INTEGRATED APPLICATION OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES: Canada, Japan, the FAO, and one or two developing countries to be identified will jointly host this workshop scheduled for November 1996 in Japan. The precise location and date will be determined later. The workshop will discuss practical applications of policy dialogue conducted within the IPF, with particular emphasis on SFM practices at the field level. For information contact: Takeshi Goto, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-Ku Tokyo 100, Japan. Tel: +81-3-3502-8111 (6212) or +81-3-3591-8449; Fax: +81-3-3593-9565; or David Drake, Natural Resources Canada, 351 St. Joseph Blvd., Hull, Quebec, Canada, K1A 1G5. TEL: +1-819-997-1107, ext. 1947; Fax: +1-819-994-3461; e-mail: ddrake@am.ncr.forestry.ca.

OTHER SEMINARS/WORKSHOPS/EXPERT GROUP MEETINGS

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON THE NON-MARKET BENEFITS OF FORESTS: This symposium, scheduled for 23-29 June 1996 in Edinburgh, Scotland, will be sponsored by the Forestry Commission of the UK. The meeting will explore the latest developments in measuring and valuing the non-market outputs of forestry and examine ways to use the information in making decisions about forest management and in the development and implementation of forestry policy. For more information, contact: Ann Alexander, Forestry Commission, Tel: +44 131 334 0303; Fax: +44 131 334 2819.

FOREST STEWARDSHIP COUNCIL: The Second General Assembly of the Forest Stewardship Council is scheduled for 27-29 June in Oaxaca, Mexico. For more information contact the FSC Headquarters, Tel: +52 951 46905; Fax: +52 951 62110; e-mail: <fsc@laneta.apc.org>. Also contact Sheldon Cohen or Stas Burgiel at the Biodiversity Action Network, e-mail: <bionet@igc.apc.org>.

WORLD COMMISSION ON FORESTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (WCFSD): The independent WCFSD is convening hearings to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to present their differing perceptions on the role of forests and to work toward consensus on integrating developmental and conservation objectives. The second regional public hearing will be hosted by the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) in Winnipeg, Canada, from 29 September-5 October 1996.

For more information contact: WCFSD Secretariat, Geneva Executive Center, C.P. 51, 1219 Châtelaine/Geneva, Switzerland. Tel: +41 22 979 9165/69; Fax: +41 22 979 9060; e-mail: dameena@iprolink.ch; Internet: <http://iisd1.iisd.ca/wcfsd>

SUSTAINING ECOSYSTEMS AND PEOPLE IN TEMPERATE AND BOREAL FORESTS — AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTEGRATING CONSERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY WITH SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC GOALS: This conference is co-sponsored by Canada and the Province of British Columbia and is scheduled for 8-13 September 1996 in Victoria, British Columbia. For more information contact: Conference Secretariat, Connections Victoria Ltd., tel: +1-604-382-0332; fax: +1-604-382-2076; Internet: <http://www.octonet.com/connvic/econmain.html>

XI WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS: The Eleventh World Forestry Congress, with the theme "Forestry for Sustainable Development: Towards the 21st Century," is scheduled for 13-22 October 1997 in Antalya, Turkey. The Congress will consider: position papers prepared by specialists at the invitation of the Organizing Committee; special papers that correspond to each one of the topics of the Congress, also prepared by specialists at the invitation of the Organizing Committee; and voluntary papers, which can be submitted by any person wishing to contribute to the discussion of any of the 38 topics. For more information contact: Mesut Y. Kamiloglu, Ministry of Forestry, Atatürk Bulvarı 153, Ankara, Turkey, Tel: +90 312 4177724, Fax: +90 312 4179160, e-mail: servis.net.tr or Luis Santiago Botero, FAO, Forestry Department, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, Tel: +39 6 52255088, Fax: +39 6 52255137, e-mail: <luis.botero@fao.org>. Also visit the Conference Home Page at <<http://www.fao.org/waicent/faoinfo/forestry/wforcong/>>

ANNEX I

(Editor's Note: This document was provided to Proceedings by the Consultation organizers)

EXPERT CONSULTATION ON IMPLEMENTING THE FOREST PRINCIPLES PROMOTION OF NATIONAL FOREST AND LAND-USE PROGRAMMES

Feldafing, Germany, 16 -21 June 1996

REPORT TO THE IPF

1. PREAMBLE

The Expert Consultation entitled „Implementing the Forest Principles - Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Programmes“ was held in Feldafing, Germany from June 16 to 21, 1996. The Government of Germany contributed to the international dialogue on the sustainable management of forests by hosting this intersectoral event in support of the Intergovernmental Panel of Forests (IPF). The IPF was established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in June 1995 under the aegis of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD). The work programme of the IPF spells out issues, which are clustered around five categories and 11 programme elements. The expert consultation in Feldafing focused its deliberations on components of both programme element I. 1 (Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Plans and Programmes) and programme element II (International Cooperation in Financial

Assistance and Technology Transfer for Sustainable Forest Management).

During the IPF Session 1 in New York in September 1995, it was proposed by the Forestry Advisers Group (FAG) to the Group of 77 and China to hold national consultations with interested developing countries on the promotion of national forest and land use programmes as to establish country-specific positions on the issue. After an organising meeting in Germany in January 1996, 21 countries and two regional institutions supported by members of the Forestry Advisers Group (FAG) and international cooperation agencies participated in the consultative processes at the national level to identify national constraints, opportunities and options as well as priorities for action, and submitted reports on their findings.

On the basis of the above national consultations, a synthesis report was prepared as the point of departure for the Expert Consultation. The information obtained during this consultative process is consequently based on inputs from developing countries only. The synthesis report thus did not intend to provide the experience of developed countries in forest and land-use programmes. The Expert Consultation noted that the Swedish - Ugandan Intersessional Expert Consultation, to be held in Stockholm in October 1996, as well as the Japan - Canada International Workshop, to be held in Kochi, Japan in November 1996, will provide experiences from developed countries.

The synthesis report was a working document and does not necessarily represent the views of the contributors in its entirety. In order to contribute effectively to the deliberations on the respective IPF programme elements, the overall objective of the Expert Consultation was to identify constraints and opportunities, and elaborate options to promote national forest and land use programmes. The issues identified in the synthesis report were further elaborated during the Expert Consultations and used as tools to make progress in the identification of options for action.

The report of the Expert Consultation, incorporating „options for action“ are forwarded to the IPF Secretariat for further consideration by the lead agencies to prepare for the substantive and final discussions on the issues during IPF Session 3 in September 1996 in Geneva and IPF Session 4 in February 1997 in New York. The report of the meeting in Feldafing will also be made available as a conference room document for the IPF sessions.

75 experts from 29 developing and developed countries were invited to the Consultation. Of these 31 from developing and 36 from developed countries actually participated. They acted in their personal capacity and this report reflects their views. The participants came from governments, the private sector, non-governmental and international organizations.

The Expert Consultation was opened with keynote addresses by Dr. C.D. Spranger, Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development and Mr. W. Gröbl, Parliamentary Secretary of State of the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry. Mr Jorge Barba (Ecuador) and Dr. Hans Peter Schipulle (Germany) acted as Co-Chairmen.

2. RESULTS OF THE EXPERT CONSULTATION

2.1 THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES

The concept of National Forest Programmes (NFPs) has been widely discussed during the past decade, especially in

the context of the formulation and implementation of National Forestry Action Programmes (NFAP), Forestry Master Plans and Forest Sector Reviews. These frameworks have been promoted by various international institutions and cooperation agencies as a means of achieving sustainable forest development, especially in developing countries. The importance of such planning and implementation frameworks for all countries is also recognised in UNCED Agenda 21, Chapter 11 on Combating Deforestation.

The Expert Consultation raised the point of the terminology of „National Forest and Land Use Programmes“. As stressed during the IPF Session 2 in Geneva and consequently expressed in the co-chairmen's report of the meeting, this term needs clarification. It was pointed out in Feldafing that the issue of land use had not been adequately addressed during the preparations of the meeting. In the following text the above term is abbreviated to „National Forest Programmes (NFPs)“ reflecting the content and scope of the deliberations in Feldafing. However, it was felt that the land-use issue requires further discussion at future meetings.

In this context the term NFP was understood to be a generic expression for a wide range of approaches to processes of planning, programming and implementation of forest activities at the national level.

The discussions in the Expert Consultation were carried out based on the understanding that the following four major themes capture the work of the Expert Consultation:

(i) Sectoral planning, policies and the institutional setting; focusing on issues and options related to the overall process of definition of sectoral goals, policies and policy instruments, institutional settings and the broad operational concept for the implementation of sectoral development, including external involvement.

(ii) Investment programming; focusing on the mobilisation of local, national, and external financial resources necessary for the implementation of NFPs, and including both private and public sector financing.

(iii) National capacity and capacity building; focusing on the effective use and development of the national capacity to plan, implement and monitor NFPs, including public sector institutions as well as non-governmental organisations and the private sector.

(iv) International Cooperation in support of NFPs; including national, regional, and international levels.

The results of the Expert Consultation are presented under the same general headings.

2.2 OPTIONS FOR ACTION

2.2.1 Sectoral Planning, Policies and Institutional Setting

In its discussions the Expert Consultation stressed that sectoral planning, policy revision and institutional reform are periodic processes encompassing various stages. It was also fully recognised that these processes should be country-driven, based on the sovereign right of each country to use its forest resources in accordance with its own policies and development needs. The Expert Consultation noted that the experience gained in the implementation of the National Forestry Action Programmes, as well as the Forest Sector Reviews and the Forestry Master Plans provides a solid basis for the identification of the options concerning sectoral planning, policies and revision of institutional settings. Furthermore, the constraints have been extensively discussed in several major evaluations and assessments carried out both at the national and international levels.

The following two basic options set the frame of reference defined by the Expert Consultation on the issues of sectoral planning, policies and institutional setting:

(a) Establishment and improvement of the national forest planning process

It was suggested that each country should establish or improve its own NFP as the instrument to guide and orient the process of sectoral development, under strong in-country leadership. The goal of NFPs is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of forest resources to meet local, national and global needs, through fostering national and international partnerships for the benefit of present and future generations. NFPs should aim at increasing the economic value of forest products and services, and be realistic in terms of its financial and economic feasibility.

The process should build on national planning capacity, and be based on the following characteristics adapted to the situation of each country in terms of their application:

- (i) well defined linkages to macro level policies and policy processes,
- (ii) closely linked to cross-sectoral policies and issues, including land-use policies,
- (iii) high-level political commitment and broad-based support,
- (iv) participatory and decentralised planning approaches, including use of indigenous knowledge,
- (v) identification and management of conflicts between relevant actors.

(b) Securing commitments to the implementation of NFPs

It was suggested that IPF acknowledge the importance of NFPs as the framework for the programming and implementation of external assistance to forest sector development to make it an integral part of national development; respecting the objectives, strategies, implementation arrangements, mechanisms and priorities established by each country. Therefore, the preparation of a code of conduct involving international financing institutions, multilateral and bilateral cooperation agencies as well as national authorities should be considered by IPF. The code of conduct could be endorsed by countries and international institutions and the adherence to it by all relevant actors, including the private sector, monitored by a transparent process.

Other options related to policies and institutional setting are:

(c) Promotion of national forest policy formulation

National forest policy formulation should be encouraged and promoted in the context of national policy development. The regular updating of forest policy should be assured and followed up, taking into account the following key aspects in the policy formulation process: (i) forest policy formulation should be closely linked to national macroeconomic planning, (ii) forest, agricultural and environmental policies should be harmonised, (iii) private sector and NGOs should be partners in the national forest policy process, (iv) broad local participation should be encouraged and facilitated in forest policy dialogues, (v) gender issues should be enhanced in forest policy development and related fields, (vi) forestry expertise and knowledge should be incorporated into environmental agencies, and (viii) relevant international experience and principles should be taken into account in policy formulation.

(d) Harmonisation of forest and other land-use related legislation

In order to address the needs of the societies, countries should consider reviewing forest and other land-use legislation. The review processes should focus especially on: (i) promoting decentralisation of decision making by issuing the relevant legislation, (ii) harmonisation of forest and other related legislation at all levels of the administration, (iii) clarifying responsibilities of various levels of administration, (iv) ensuring that benefits from forests and other natural resources are proportionately distributed in accordance with the forest policy, (v) integrating customary rights and regulations on forest land use into the forest legislation process whenever relevant and existing, and (vi) promoting legal security on access to, and use of, land and forests.

This process should be carried out at national, provincial and local levels and stimulate consensus building, formation of new alliances and consultative processes in forest policy and legislation review and implementation.

(e) Revision of roles, mandates and institutional structures

Governments that have not done so should consider initiating a process of review and, if needed, redefinition of the roles and mandates of the major forest related actors, including the administrations at national, provincial and local levels, and the non-governmental sector (non-governmental organisations, community based organisation and the private sector). The process should aim at focusing government functions on (i) policy formulation including legislation, (ii) the provision of administrative services including promotion and facilitation, and (iii) supervision and control. Other functions could be shared with or delegated to the non-governmental sector, including (i) productive activities, (ii) monitoring and evaluation, (iii) technical services, (iv) research and (v) coordination of local-level activities.

In addition to improving or redefining roles and mandates of the various actors, a process should be started to strengthen their political and institutional status and performance. The governmental sector should focus on (i) elimination of overlaps, (ii) creating linkages with other relevant sectors, (iii) promotion of public participation, (iv) reduction of bureaucratic procedures, (v) adequate resource allocation, including manpower and infrastructure, and (vi) decentralisation with clear coordination mechanisms. The non-governmental sector should focus on (i) identification of responsibilities to be taken over, and (ii) promotion and capacity building of institutional structures, including manpower and infrastructure, in order to enable them to be active partners in the NFP.

(f) Establishment and/or consolidation of national coordination

Governments might consider establishing a national body responsible for intersectoral coordination related to forest sector activities. Such a body could assure (i) the involvement of the relevant national actors in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of the NFP, (ii) avoidance of duplication of programmes, (iii) consistency of national, provincial and local actions, and (iv) the effective coordination of the international involvement in the sector. In addition the coordination mechanism could function as an instrument to reflect the commitments between the national and international levels by promoting transparent dialogue between the actors.

2.2.2 Investment Programming

The experts took note of the Pretoria Declaration and the report on the "Workshop on Financial Mechanisms and Sources of Finance for Sustainable Forestry", and considered their valuable input for its work. They agreed that investment in SFM needs both public and private funds in a complementary way and requires long-term commitment.

The following options should be considered:

(g) Strategic planning for investments

Comprehensive national forest strategies (NFPs), that are consistent with macroeconomic planning and policy and are aware of the strategic value of forests as a capital base for national sustainable development, facilitate mobilising funds for sustainable forest management from various sources.

Strategies have to consider the effects of the external economic environment, including the opportunities and risks of international trade on the national forest sector.

Strategies should be based on a participatory process involving all actors, identifying their roles and establishing priorities. This contributes to building up partnership, which facilitates the implementation of the strategies.

The development of these strategies should also include the identification of a wide range of funding sources including public and private, both domestic and foreign. These processes can draw upon the principles outlined in the statement of the Pretoria workshop. In this context, the group recommended significant improvement of the access to information about possible funding sources and related experiences. Countries could be invited to share their experiences on the schemes of forest related economic indicators to promote investment and improved resource valuation and revenue collection

This procedure would lead to the identification of the most appropriate funding sources to implement the various elements of the national strategies.

(h) Domestic public funding

Considering the importance of domestic funding, public budget allocations should reflect the national priority given to sustainable forest management (SFM). This can be achieved by securing appropriate valuation of forest resources, including payments for ecological services of forests and the incorporation of externalities.

An efficient revenue system is fundamental and should ensure that a sufficient part of forestry revenues are directed to forestry agencies active in SFM.

Public funding should create an environment which promotes investments in every step of the value chain (from forest development to primary and secondary processing and distribution) in order to retain added value from forest resources in the countries.

(i) Official development assistance

ODA should be used in a complementary way to supplement public spending for SFM in a way that provides substantial support in particular for capacity building, technology transfer and catalysing other sources of financing.

International cooperation supporting the implementation a comprehensive national strategy should also encompass concepts like community based forestry, alternatives for people making unsustainable use of forest resources, bufferzone management, poverty alleviation etc.

(j) Private funding

The comprehensive strategy should identify and provide information on opportunities for private sector investment and promote its orientation towards SFM.

Appropriate mechanisms should be developed, including covering transaction costs, offsetting market development risks, compensation for the incorporation of externalities, guarantee schemes, etc. Through market based instruments, sustainable practices benefiting the poor and providing alternatives for them should be rewarded and unsustainable practices discouraged.

Macroeconomic stability, proper policy and regulatory framework and an established land tenure system are conducive to attracting responsible private investment.

(k) New and additional financial resources

The potential of mechanisms generating new and additional financial resources (e.g. GEF, Joint Implementation) should be fully explored, so as to integrate the resources into comprehensive national programmes.

2.2.3 National Capacity and Capacity Building

It was stated by the Expert Consultation that before embarking on a capacity building programme, a country should assess its existing capabilities to plan, implement and monitor an NFP on all levels of society. Priorities for strengthening existing institutions, or building new institutions or infrastructure, should be based on this assessment. It should be iterative (periodically repeated and updated) and participatory, involving key local, national and international actors. In addition, gender issues should be considered in all capacity building programmes.

The Expert Consultation identified the following options related to national capacity and capacity building:

(l) Development of improved approaches to external assistance to capacity building

Improvements are often needed in the manner in which external assistance resources are directed towards capacity building. As harmonisation and coordination in donor programmes is often lacking, this may lead to the creation of parallel organisations and the irrational use of funds and manpower.

The development of improved approaches should focus specifically on: (i) establishment of long-term donor commitments for assistance to capacity building, based on a national interinstitutional mechanism for monitoring changes in the forestry sector, (ii) respect for the national priorities and use of national / local expertise when possible, (iii) establishment of an agreement, perhaps in the form of a code of conduct, between cooperation agencies and the government, (iv) the establishment of a transparent mechanism to enable cooperation agencies and key national actors to interact on a regular basis and to coordinate external assistance in the forestry sector, and (v) simplification and harmonisation of cooperation procedures.

(m) Human resource development

In many countries, human resources are not adequate or not effectively utilised. Improvements are needed in training, education and the deployment of human resources to ensure that the appropriate skills and expertise are allocated according to national needs and priorities.

The development of human resources should focus specifically on the following issues: (i) reorienting and/or strengthening of existing training institutions taking a multidisciplinary approach, (ii) establishment of new training institutions only where deficiencies exist, (iii) establishment of

systems for the assessment of manpower and training needs, (iv) review of curricula of training institutions according to the results of the needs assessment, (v) reallocation of manpower according to optimal deployment. In addition, national governments should put in place an appropriate remuneration-, welfare- and incentive-system in order to retain manpower and improve efficiency.

(n) Strengthening of local institutions and organisations

Local level capacities, infrastructure and facilities are often weak, because a disproportionately high share of resources is allocated to national level programmes, while locally active institutions and organisations are inadequately supported. Local knowledge is often not adequately incorporated in capacity building programmes.

More capacity building should be directed to local levels, focusing on: (i) assessment of existing (local) knowledge to improve its utilisation, (ii) development of mechanisms for the optimal use of existing institutions and organisations at local levels, (iii) facilitation of formal and informal capacity building activities of local institutions, NGOs and community groups through a decentralised approach, and (iv) development and intensification of retraining systems for civil servants and others working at the local level to promote interaction with the local actors. In addition, local institutions and organisations (including non-governmental and community-based organisations) should be strengthened so that they can provide the necessary infrastructure for capacity building, especially vocational education.

(o) Institutional development

Effective use of human resources can be limited by inadequacies in institutional management systems, the lack of accountability as well as insufficient infrastructure. The focus of institutional development should be on the establishment of administrative and accountability systems, including financial management systems, that emphasise participatory management.

Institutions related to research, extension and forest administration need to be strengthened, taking a cross sectoral approach and promoting networking through North-South as well as South-South cooperation and information exchange. Training in conflict resolution and mediation techniques should be enhanced and incorporated in the curricula.

In many countries, forest sector research is not integrated in forest sector planning and administration, hence the results of research are not effectively applied to solving problems on the ground. The following key issues should be the focus of capacity building in forestry research: (i) integration of isolated research institutes in research networks, and (ii) integration of local knowledge and values in research, using participatory planning methods.

2.2.4 International Cooperation in Support of National Forest Programmes

The Expert Consultation emphasised that national action is the key to sustainable forest management. Modalities of cooperation need to be developed at the national level to help ensure effective NFP planning and implementation. Support to national efforts can be augmented by action at regional and international levels. But such support must be in service of national needs and must be developed at the appropriate level. The following options aim at the promotion of NFPs as the central focus for international cooperation.

(p) Supporting and refining the concept of NFPs

NFPs are expected to play a key role in promoting sustainable forest management. It was stressed that, in accordance with Agenda 21 and the Forest Principles, sustainable forest management is the overall objective of the forest sector and the responsibility of each country. NFPs can be an important means of promoting sustainable forest management. In order to support the NFP process and refine the concept - on which considerable work has been done (i.e. *Basic Principles and Operational Guidelines for National Forest Programmes*, FAO) - it was suggested that:

(i) The support of the international community should be focused on the implementation of country-led NFPs. This would allow international institutions and partner governments to interact with all appropriate levels within a country.

(ii) Discussions to update the concept of NFPs should continue, leading in the short term to the publication of a widely accepted joint concept on how to prepare and implement NFPs. This could be a living document. In order to provide conceptual guidance, regular consultations in appropriate fora should deal with issues that need further elaboration, such as:

approaches to the implementation of policies, strategies and actions to operationalise NFPs

transferring technology and streamlining financial mechanisms and using their respective comparative advantages

developing additional instruments for implementing NFPs, e.g. Forest Partnership Agreements. The consultations should seek and consolidate the views of all relevant actors, including the private sector and NGOs.

(q) Development of appropriate regional approaches

It was stressed that the regional level has proven to be appropriate for dealing with a range of issues and actions related to forests. However, the formulation of regional policies and the implementation of regional programmes have often been inadequately based on existing national priorities.

It was acknowledged, that the regional level can provide significant advantages when countries use coordinated regional positions in international fora and use regional mechanisms to support national processes. In both cases regional action must derive from each country's assessment of its needs and the ability of the region to act effectively in its support. This means that regional approaches should not be developed in a political vacuum or imposed by external institutions. The point of departure should always be national requirements.

It was suggested that regional approaches would be most effective in the following areas: (i) development of technical institutions to take advantage of economies of scale, (ii) exchange of experiences and technologies on the policies, strategies and actions related to the implementation of NFPs, (iii) establishment of transboundary programmes involving the pooling of national efforts to tackle common concerns, (iv) as a forum for resolving other practical problems of the region, and (v) participation in international fora and processes, where national positions shared by countries of a region can be presented in a coordinated way.

Focusing on such areas is more likely to be cost effective and attract the political and financial support of countries of the regions, and the international community, needed to ensure success.

(r) Establishment of a forum for international consultation on forests

It was recognised that the IPF will consider in depth, including through the work of the Swiss-Peruvian IPF intersessional activity, the question of institutional structures (Programme Element V.1). However, it was noted that there is a lack of international policy dialogue and clear leadership on forest issues. At the same time, understanding of the complexity of forest issues has increased, resulting in rapid changes in the international agenda and shifting priorities of cooperation agencies. This has led to a greater burden on national authorities in establishing and implementing NFPs.

In order to increase the effectiveness of international support to NFPs, it was proposed that a new "*Forum for International Consultation on Forests*" should be established based on the experience of the IPF. This Forum, with an expanded mandate, might also be used for dealing with action on issues raised in other programme elements of the IPF.

Such a forum would promote international support for the NFP process. It should be a consultative body, whose work is supported by technical and scientific advice. It should establish collaborative leadership in the forest sector, but not seek to coordinate national processes. It should ensure that all actors, including NGOs and the private sector, are integrated into the consultation process. The main tasks of the Forum would include:

(i) to consult on:

the further development of the concept and methodologies of NFPs, streamlining the application of policy instruments, financial mechanisms and forest related technology transfer;

NFP related international initiatives. This would help avoid conflicting demands on countries from development institutions. A code of conduct among international institutions, cooperation agencies and NGOs in order to achieve acceptance of NFPs as the relevant framework for actions at the national level was referred to. The Forum might be able to consider this issue;

(ii) to enhance cooperation among international agencies on support for development of NFPs;

(iii) to provide a forum for policy discussions;

(iv) to encourage exchange of information on experiences with the implementation of NFPs;

In addition to discussing these issues directly related to NFPs, national action would also be assisted, if the Forum could give advice to and interact with international institutions, conventions bodies and other fora dealing with forest related issues and work for better understanding of the concept of sustainable forest management.

The form and function of the Forum need further definition, including the question of legal status, funding and secretarial support. One suggestion was to establish the Forum as an intergovernmental body under the aegis of the CSD with the Department of Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development fulfilling the secretariat function taking advantage of the positive experiences gained in the IPF process, which is planned to end in 1997.

It was suggested that the multilateral organisations, collaborating presently in the Inter-Agency Task Force in service of the IPF, should play a similar role for the proposed Forum. In addition to their input at the international level, the

multilateral organisations, including the World Bank, could use the mechanism of Country Strategy Notes (CSN). The instrument of the CSN was endorsed by a resolution of the UN General Assembly in 1994 and is meant to pool the activities of the multilateral institutions at the national level. This instrument could be used effectively in support of NFPs.

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The Expert Consultation on the Promotion of National Forest and Land Use Programmes elaborated a set of options for action as required by the IPF guidelines for intersessional events. During its deliberations, a number of additional cross-cutting issues emerged.

In the last decade, a multiplicity of new and innovative initiatives has emerged from the global, regional and national discussions on forest issues. These have led to an increased burden on countries. During the consultative process, that prepared this expert consultation, it was accepted that improved understanding of the complexity of forest issues should lead to broader concepts of forest management. However, it was stressed that existing concepts, mechanisms and instruments for managing the forest sector would be adequate to take this into account, if they were applied in a coherent and coordinated manner. Lessons learned from past experiences must now be applied in order to avoid institutional competition, ineffective use of human capacity and uncoordinated spending of scarce financial resources.

The IPF process provides an excellent opportunity to foster consultations on the issue at the international level to assist developing countries to take these issues forward.

National strategies are the point of departure for action to achieve sustainable forest management. Looking outward, the regional and international levels must provide adequate support to this process. To achieve this, an effective structure for debate, consultation and coordination at the international level is needed. In the national context the acceptance of country specific priorities and strategies, as well as participation of all actors, must be secured. There was strong support to innovative structures of partnerships for the joint management of forest resources and decentralised decision-making. This process would attract private investment and allow more effective allocation of public funding to the forest sector.

The existing capacity and competence, which are often undervalued and/or under-utilised in developing countries, should be taken as a point of departure as to match development measures with the ability of national and local institutions, including NGOs and the private sector.

If support to country-led forest strategies is to be effective, there must be a long-term commitment of all partners to cooperate on this basis. An agreement, possibly in the form of a code of conduct, could provide a mechanism to achieve reliable compliance with these commitments.

Feldafing
21 June 1996

More complete coverage of the Feldafing Expert Consultation, including this report and photos, can be found at the following location on the Internet:
<http://www.iisd.ca/linkages/proceedings/feldafing.html>