



NOTIFICATION

Madam/Sir,

**Forest Biological Diversity: Potential Priorities
for the proposed expanded programme of work**

The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) at its seventh meeting requested (Recommendation VII/6 paragraph 2) the Executive Secretary to seek comments from the Parties, the SBSTTA Bureau and members of the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group, to prepare a report for consideration by the Conference of the Parties (COP) at its sixth meeting, identifying:

1. Elements in the work programme adopted by decision IV/7 of relevance to the expanded work programme, and how these may be incorporated in the expanded programme of work, also taking into account the multi-year programme of work and plan of action of the United Nations Forum on Forests;
2. Potential actors, a suggested timeframe and possible ways and means for implementation of the activities proposed, as well as indicators of progress in implementation, taking into account the potential for collaborative work with other bodies, in particular the United Nations Forum on Forests and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests.

The seventh meeting of SBSTTA also requested (Recommendation VII/6 paragraph 3) the Executive Secretary to invite Parties to submit their views and suggestions for potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity taking into account the chapeau of the annex to the present recommendation to be incorporated into an information document and report to the COP at its sixth meeting.

To: all CBD National Focal Points



Further to my notification 2001-12-05/02, whereby CBD National Focal Points were invited to provide comments, views and suggestions as requested in recommendation VII/6, I am pleased to announce, that submissions were provided by two Parties (Australia, The European Union) within the acceptable timeframe for incorporation into the documents for the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. These submissions are available as an information document (UNEP/CBD/COP/6/INF/27) and can be found on our web site at: <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/meetings/cop/cop-06/information/cop-06-inf-27-en.doc> Later, a third Party, Japan, provided comments. Comments were also provided by Ms. Paula Warren in her capacity as SBSTTA Bureau member and by Dr. John Parotta, on behalf of the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO).

I am very pleased to convey herewith these comments, contained in the Annexes to this letter. Thank you for your cooperation and continued support to the work of the Convention.

Please accept, Madam/Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Yours sincerely,

[signed]

Hamdallah Zedan
Executive Secretary

List of Annexes:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Annex I | Japan's view on potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity (SBSTTA) Recommendation VII/6 - Annex) |
| Annex II | Comments on priorities within the forests work programme (Ms. Paula Warren) |
| Annex III | IUFRO Comments on the CBD Expanded Programme of Work on Forest Biological Diversity– Priority setting (Dr. John Parotta) |

Annex I

JAPAN

11 March 2002)

Dear Mr. Zedan,

With regard to paragraph 3 of VII/6 “Forest biological diversity” (UNEP/CBD/COP6/4), requesting the Executive Secretary to invite Parties to submit their views and suggestions for potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity, please find the attached Japan’s view.

Sincerely yours,

Seiichi Urauchi, Second Secretary

Japan’s view on potential priorities for the proposed expanded programme of work on forest biological diversity (SBSTTA recommendation VII/6 annex).

Proposal: Illegal logging (Element 2- Goal 1- Objective 4) should be included as a priority issues in the expanded work programme on forest biological diversity.

Reason:

Illegal logging problems are gaining international concerns as a substantial deterrent to efforts toward sustainable forest management. At the G8 Okinawa Summit held in Japan in July 2000, the G8 leaders adopted a communiqué stating, “We will also examine how best we can combat illegal logging, including export and procurement practices.” At the “Forest Law Enforcement and Governance: East Asia Ministerial Conference” held in Indonesia in September 2001, participating countries adopted a ministerial declaration which stated that all countries, exporting and importing, had a role and responsibility in the elimination of illegal logging and associated illegal trade. Further, at the 31st International Tropical Timber Council held in Japan in November 2001, the ITTC adopted a decision “Forest Law Enforcement in the Context of Sustainable Timber Production and Trade” which included practical actions by ITTO against illegal logging problems.

Recognizing these international commitments, illegal logging, which substantially degrades forest biological diversity, should be discussed as a priority issue at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Annex II

COMMENTS ON PRIORITIES WITHIN THE FORESTS WORK PROGRAMME

Paula Warren, 16 January 2002, (see additional comments at the end of this annex)

Status of these Comments

These comments are being provided in my capacity as Bureau member, and taking into account the perspective I gained while chairing Working Group I at SBSTTA 7.

Philosophical Basis for Prioritising

The work programme incorporates material related to a range of players. In my view:

1. The global community has a role in establishing some overall global priorities, given that forest biological diversity is the heritage of all mankind. The work programme itself does not clearly establish those in terms of outcomes, although recommendation VII/6/1(e) signals a priority for primary forests. This is a gap that COP should address.
2. Parties must develop their own priorities, in accordance with their particular circumstances, but reflecting the need to respond to some key imperatives. This is a key role for NBSAPs, but priorities may also be set in national forest strategies, development strategies, etc. But the work programme should provide clear guidance on certain elements that should be part of such strategies.
3. The elements of the work programme which would be implemented by the international community should be prioritised according to how much the work will assist with the implementation of priorities set nationally, or how much they will assist in the achievement of the global priority outcomes.
4. There should be a focus on those activities which will:
 - Address the most immediate causes of forest biodiversity loss, particularly for those biodiversity values of greatest importance, and for those types of loss that will be irreversible.
 - Have the greatest chance of success, and be most cost-effective.
 - Build future capacity for forest biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, by addressing underlying causes of loss and institutional/social weaknesses.

Key National Priorities

The following are the programme elements which I consider should be part of any NBSAP or other national strategic approach:

Dealing with land use changes, to reduce effects of fragmentation, fire, etc

Elements PE1/G1/O1/i, PE1/G2/O6/all, PE1/G2/O4/a

Parties should establish clear priority activities for dealing with this issue, drawing on the suggestions in these programme elements, but tailored to their particular circumstances.

Addressing alien species impacts

Elements PE1/G2/O1/all, but especially a

The interim guiding principles and the results of SBSTTA 6 provide clear guidance on the key elements for a national strategy on this issue.

Restoration

Elements PE1/G3/O1/a,b, PE1/G3/O2/a, b

Where priority components of forest biodiversity have been severely degraded or are threatened, these should be subject to appropriate protection, recovery and restoration activities.

Protected areas

Elements PE1/G3/O3/all

Every NBSAP should include appropriate activities to ensure that the country develops and maintains an effective, representative network of protected areas.

Developing sustainable use approaches, that will address all three objectives of the Convention

Elements PE1/G4/O1/all, PE1/G4/O2/b,c, PE1/G4/O3/all, PE1/G5/O1/all

Parties should establish clear priority activities for dealing with this issue, drawing on the suggestions in these programme elements, but tailored to their particular circumstances. It is clear that all countries need to derive products from forests or plantations (wood, fuel, etc), and developing ways to ensure an adequate flow of products while conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services is therefore a critical issue for NBSAPs to address.

Identifying and addressing the underlying causes of forest biodiversity loss

Elements PE2/G1/O1/a,b, PE2/G1/O2/a,c,f,g, PE2/G1/O3/a,b,c,d,e,g,h, PE2/G2/O1/all, PE2/G3/O1/all, and where relevant PE2/G1/O4/b,c,d,e (illegal logging)

Parties should establish clear priority activities for dealing with this issue, drawing on the suggestions in these programme elements, but tailored to their particular circumstances.

Capacity building – knowledge, assessment and monitoring

Elements PE3/G1/O2/all, PE3/G1/O3/a, PE3/G2/O1/all, PE3/G3/O1/all

Overall this work should have a low priority, but the NBSAPs should clearly identify those gaps in knowledge and techniques which are critical to achieving the other priorities.

There are a number of programme elements, notably PE1/G2/O2 (pollution), PE1/G2/O4/c and G2/O5/a (reinstating natural disturbances), and PE1/G2/O4/d,e,f,g,h (fire control) that will be a priority for some countries.

Key International Priorities

The following are the programme elements which I consider should be treated as priorities by international bodies, regional bodies, donors, etc

Liaison group on harvest of non-timber resources

Elements PE1/G4/O2/a

The discussions in SBSTTA 7 indicated that this is a high priority area to be addressed, and that a liaison group was an appropriate way to make progress.

Addressing the international movement of illegally harvested products

Elements PE1/G4/O2/d, PE2/G1/O4/?

Enhancing the ability for importing countries to support efforts at the national level to reduce the illegal harvest of timber and other forest products is clearly a priority. I am not convinced that the activities provided in the work programme are an effective way to achieve this, but the objectives are a priority.

Donor body support for implementation of national priorities

Elements PE2/G1/O2/d,g,i

Improved coordination and effectiveness of international bodies

Elements PE2/G1/O2/b, PE2/G2/O1/h

These are a priority provided the work is focused on achieving improved performance in the support of national implementation.

Ms. Paula Warren
Policy Analyst
Department of Conservation
P.O.Box 10420
59 Boulcott Street
Wellington, New Zealand
e-mail: pwarren@doc.govt.nz

Additional comments; given by Paula Warren at the Workshop on forests and biological diversity (Accra, Ghana, 29.1. 2002)

Prioritising the Proposed CBD Forest Work Programme

A possible framework

Factors for Prioritising

Efficacy

How much will the goal, objective or action contribute to reducing forest Biodiversity loss or achieving restoration of forest Biodiversity? How valuable is the affected Biodiversity (e.g. in terms of uniqueness)?

Feasibility

How likely is it that the action would be successfully carried out? Is the CBD in a position to either undertake the action or persuade or facilitate another body to do so?

Urgency

How imminent is the Biodiversity loss that the goal, objective or action would address?

Cost-effectiveness

How cost-effective is the action in comparison to other ways to achieve the objective, or other actions achieving other objectives?

Capacity building

Will the action provide additional long-term benefits, in terms of capacity building?

Integration

Does the action integrate with existing processes or plans, hence resulting in synergy?

Priorities for Actions at the National Level

The global community has a role in identifying key global priorities, that national actions should contribute to where they are relevant to the particular country. For example, SBSTTA-7 identified maintaining primary forests as a key priority.

The global community may also identify some key goals, objectives or actions that should be included in any national programme (e.g. having a protected area network).

Subject to these global imperatives, national priorities should be set in NBSAPs, and reflect local circumstances and capacities.

Priorities for Actions at the International Level

These should be those actions which most contribute to the achievement of the global priorities, or of national priorities.

Annex III

IUFRO Comments on the CBD Expanded Programme of Work on Forest Biological Diversity– Priority setting

Dr. John Parrotta, 30 January 2002

1. IUFRO believes that the use of the best available science and scientific expertise should be used in the development of strategies and specific elements in the programme of work for both international and national-level activities. The work of the AHTEG and its contribution to the expanded work programme is a good example of how the synthesized results of research can contribute very positively in this regard. Periodic synthesis of available scientific information as key topics will continue to be needed and should be encouraged both at the international and national level. **On most of the topics/issues in the work programme there is already extensive information (including on-line and off-line databases) and literature that could be put to good use if summarized and presented in a forum needed by the users, particularly policy makers.** Credible international research organizations such as IUFRO can help to streamline this process either directly or indirectly by using its extensive network of member institutions to identify individuals with high levels of competence and knowledge of their fields to produce and disseminate useful technical documents that will help avoid failure in the implementation of action items and avoid duplication of effort. Contributions of this type need not involve meetings (which are very costly) but can be developed by expert groups using modern telecommunications systems (esp. e-mail & teleconferencing).

There are many Activities in the proposed work program to develop concepts, best practices guidelines, collect case studies etc...that could be effectively and cheaply accomplished in this way – the results of these, and pre-existing studies/syntheses relevant to the work programme, should be made widely available through the Clearing-House Mechanism and other electronic forms (websites). An indicative list of Activities in the Work Programme in this category includes:

Program Element 1. Goal 2. Objective 1 – Activity (b); Objective 2 – Activity (a); Objective 4 – Activity (b); Objective 5 – Activity (a); Objective 6 – Activity (d). Goal 3. Objective 1 – Activity (c).

2. Using criteria very similar to those proposed by the Secretariat in UNEP/CBD/COP/6/17/Add.1 (para. 18), I have used a priority rating system (0 to 3) to evaluate the specific activities in the expanded work programme. Items receiving higher rating are viewed as those likely to make a significant positive impact on the problems being addressed at the national, subnational and, most importantly, local levels. Many items receiving lower ratings (0-1) were in most cases not seen as unimportant but rather activities that could be performed at the international and national level by international and local experts through mechanisms discussed above and therefore done cheaply and not requiring significant international funding support.

3. Prioritization: Although COP 6 should consider the full proposed work programme, clearly some prioritization is needed, particularly for Activities requiring international support. The stratification of priorities into national and international categories would be very useful. In our view the following areas of work are considered to be of the highest priority: (rated 2-3).

Activities with highest priority (ratings 2-3)

Element 1	ive	ies
G1 – Application of ecosystem approach	1	e, g-i
G2 – Reduce threatening processes and factors...	4	d-h
	6	b-c
G3 – Protect, recover and restore FBD	1	a=b
	3	all (a-f)
G4 – Promote sustainable use	1	all (a-h)
	2	all (a-d)
	3	all (a-f)
	4	all (a-h)
Element 2		
G1 – Enhance institutional enabling environment	1	c
	2	all (a-i)
	3	all (a-h)
	4	all (a-f)
G2 – Address socioeconomic failures	1	all (a-i)
G3 – Public education, participation	1	all (a-g)
Element 3		
G4 – improve infrastructure for data and information management	1	a

1. Implementation: in the document describing the “who”, “when”, “Performance measures” and “timeframe”, IUFRO is included as an “actor” in a number of activities. We welcome the opportunity to contribute our skills and knowledge towards accomplishing the objectives of these activities at the international, regional and national levels. IUFRO’s existing networks of scientists and member institutions are presently focused on many of these activities – we are also in a good position to recommend individual scientists from IUFRO member organizations (research institutes, university forest science departments, international research and development organizations...) to assist countries in carrying out their work on CBD priority areas.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on behalf of IUFRO – if you need further information, input or clarification please let me know.

Dr. John Parrotta
Coordinator – IUFRO Division 1
National Program Leader,
International Science Issues

USDA Forest Service, Research and Development
E-mail: jparrotta@fs.fed.us