

Please provide to following details on the origin of this report

Contracting Party	Estonia
National Focal Point	
Full name of the institution:	Ministry of the Environment, Republic of Estonia
Name and title of contact officer:	Liina Eek, senior conservation officer
Mailing address:	Toompuiestee 24 Tallinn 15171, Estonia
Telephone:	+372 6 262877
Fax:	+372 6 262901
E-mail:	<u>leek@ut.ee</u>
Contact officer for national report (if different)	
Name and title of contact officer:	
Mailing address:	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
E-mail:	
Submission	
Signature of officer responsible for submitting national report:	
Date of submission:	

Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the types of stakeholders who have been actively involved in its preparation and on material which was used as a basis for the report

This report has been prepared on the basis of information compilation made by Mart Klvik, member of the Roster of Experts on Forest Biological Diversity of the CBD, and established on consultations with the members of the sectoral (forestry) expert-group for preparation and implementation of the CBD NBSAP.

Decision IV/7 on Forest biological Diversity

1. What is the relative priority afforded to implementation of this decision by your country?					
a) High		b) Medium	x	c) Low	
2. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?					
a) Good		b) Adequate		c) Limiting	x
				d) Severely limiting	

3. Has your country assessed the status and trends of its forest biological diversity and identified options for its conservation and sustainable use? (Decision IV/7, paragraph 12)	
a) no	
b) assessment underway (please give details below)	
c) assessment completed (please give details below)	X
d) not relevant	

<i>If a developing country Party or a Party with economy in transition -</i>	
4. Has your country requested assistance through the financial mechanism for projects that promote the implementation of the focused work programme on forest biological diversity? (Decision IV/7, paragraph 7)	
a) no	X
b) yes (please give details below)	

Programme element 1: Holistic and inter-sectoral ecosystem approaches that integrate the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking account of social and cultural and economic considerations

5. Has your country identified methodologies for enhancing the integration of forest biological diversity conservation and sustainable use into an holistic approach to sustainable forest management at the national level? (Work Programme, paragraph 13)	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	X
d) not applicable	
6. Has your country developed methodologies to advance the integration of traditional forest-related knowledge into sustainable forest management, in accordance with Article 8(j)? (Work Programme, paragraph 14)	
a) no	X
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not applicable	

7. Has your country promoted cooperation on the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological resources at all levels in accordance with Articles 5 and 16 of the Convention? (Work Programme, paragraph 15)	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	X
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not applicable	
8. Has your country promoted the sharing of relevant technical and scientific information on networks at all levels of protected forest areas and networking modalities in all types of forest ecosystems? (Work Programme, paragraph 17)	
a) no	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	x
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not applicable	

Programme element 2: Comprehensive analysis of the ways in which human activities, in particular forest-management practices, influence biological diversity and assessment of ways to minimize or mitigate negative influences

9. Has your country promoted activities for an enhanced understanding of positive and negative human influences on forest ecosystems by land-use managers, policy makers, scientists and other relevant stakeholders) (Work Programme, paragraph 29)	
a) minimal activity	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	x
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	
10. Has your country promoted activities to assemble management experiences and scientific, indigenous and local information at the national and local levels to provide for the sharing of approaches and tools that lead to improved forest practices with regard to forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 30)	
a) minimal activity	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	x
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	
11. Has your country promoted activities with the aim of providing options to minimize or mitigate negative and to promote positive human influences on forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 31)	
a) minimal activity	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	x
d) not relevant	

12. Has your country promoted activities to minimize the impact of harmful alien species on forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 32)	
a) minimal activity	x
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	
13. Has your country identified means and mechanisms to improve the identification and prioritisation of research activities related to influences of human activities, in particular forest management practices, on forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 33)	
a) minimal activity	
b) yes - limited extent (please give details below)	x
c) yes - significant extent (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	
14. Does your country hold research results and syntheses of reports of relevant scientific and traditional knowledge on key forest biological diversity issues and, if so, have these been disseminated as widely as possible? (Work Programme, paragraph 34)	
a) not relevant	
b) some relevant material, but not widely disseminated	
c) significant material that could be more widely disseminated (please give details below)	x
d) yes - already widely disseminated (please give details below)	
15. Has your country prepared case-studies on assessing impacts of fires and alien species on forest biological diversity and their influences on the management of forest ecosystems and savannahs? (Work Programme, paragraph 35)	
a) no - please indicate below whether this is due to a lack of available case-studies or for other reasons	x
b) yes - please give below any views you may have on the usefulness of the preparation of case-studies for developing a better biological understanding of the problem and/or better management responses.	

Programme element 3: Methodologies necessary to advance the elaboration and implementation of criteria and indicators for forest biological diversity

16. Has your country assessed experiences gained in national and regional processes, identifying common elements and gaps in existing initiatives and improving indicators for forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 43)	
a) minimal activity	
b) yes - limited assessment made (please give details below)	x
c) yes - significant assessment made (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	
17. Has your country carried out taxonomic studies and inventories at the national level which provide for a basic assessment of forest biological diversity? (Work Programme, paragraph 43)	
a) minimal activity	x
b) yes - limited assessment made (please give details below)	
c) yes - significant assessment made (please give details below)	
d) not relevant	

3.c.

By the late nineties thematic sections on protection and sustainable use of biodiversity in policy and development documentation of several sectors have appeared. Forestry has been one of the most active sectors among others. Biodiversity has become the key word in the Estonian Forest Policy (*State Herald I 1997, 47, 768*). Estonian Forestry Development Programme has prepared a reference paper for biodiversity policies in managed forests (*Külvik, M. (Editor). 1998. Biodiversity management strategy for commercial forests in Estonia. Estonian Forestry Development Programme. Tartu. 173 p.*) Preparations of the Estonian Forestry Development Plan, inclusively elaborated in biodiversity aspects have been started in 1999 and are to be adopted by the Parliament by 2001. This is a national policy instrument where forestry development tasks are formulated and based on which these will be realised during 10-year periods. However, a comprehensive country-wide assessment of the status and trends of its forest biological diversity are sofar missing in Estonia.

5.c.

Estonia has attempted to identify methodologies for enhancing the integration of forest biological diversity conservation and sustainable use into an holistic approach to sustainable forest management at the national level. In cooperation with Finland the Estonian Forestry Development Programme has launched. The raised a number of projects in the *Work Programme, paragraph 13*, like Estonian Forest Conservation Network (code name EC1), Biodiversity Management Strategy for commercial Forests in Estonia (EC2), Sustainable forestry criteria and indicators in Estonia (EC3) and Strategy for Sustainable Management of Estonian forested wetlands.

7.b.

Estonia has promoted some cooperation on the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological resources at national level including NGO-s, academic and private sector during the preparation of the Estonian Forest Policy as well as Estonian Forestry Development Programme. Bilateral cooperation with

the Nordic Countries, especially with Finland and Denmark, *inter alia* in the sphere of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, have been meaningful for incorporating "new thinking" in Estonian forestry policies and practices in 90ies.

8.b.

Estonia has promoted the sharing of relevant technical and scientific information on networks of protected forest areas through the Estonian Forest Conservation Area Network. Project. During the period 1999-2001 the network project has assessed the nature and value of already existing forest conservation areas and identify new forest areas, which should be put under strict protection. The goal has been to include all the different forest types in Estonia in the network. The project is a follow-up on the Estonian Forest Policy, which says that at least 4% of the total forest area corresponding to 80-90.000 hectares of forest should be strictly protected.

9.b.

Several processes and activities in Estonia have promoted in some extent an enhanced understanding of positive and negative human influences on forest ecosystems, like the new forest policy process or the Estonian Forestry Development Programme activities. Some analysis in forest sector has been made by the National Biodiversity Country Study and as well in the National Biodiversity Strategy.

10.b.

Current policies have promoted several activities to assemble sustainable forest management experiences, mostly scientific, less departing from indigenous or local information. The nature-friendly logging timing, woodland key habitats approach, leaving behind deadwood or abundant woody debris can be listed as tools among improved forest practices.

11.c.

As a meaningful promotion activities with the aim of providing options to minimize or mitigate negative and to promote positive human influences on forest biological diversity the Estonian Forest Policy process in general as well the forestry segment of the national biodiversity process can be listed.

13.b.

Estonia has identified means and mechanisms to improve the identification and prioritisation of research activities related to influences of human activities on forest biological diversity in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Chapter 4.6 and Objective 5.

14.c.

The research results and syntheses of reports of scientific and traditional knowledge on key forest biological diversity issues have been disseminated relatively widely but not as much as needed. As an example the findings of the Estonian Forest Conservation Area Network project have been distributed fairly well both among professionals (manuals) and wider public (leaflets, posters) or the publication on Estonian Woodland Key Habitats have distributed to each and every private owner in the country. At the same time results of the several projects have been forgotten to communicate among stakeholders and public.

15.a.

In Estonia have assessed impacts of fires on forest biological diversity only as one of the component of general forest ecosystem, and within traditional forest research agenda.

16.b.

There are several national (Estonian National Monitoring Programme with its subprogrammes) and some regional (Baltic State of Environment Indicators, Helsinki process indicators) processes, which include forest biological diversity related indicators. However, identifying common elements and gaps in existing initiatives and improving indicators for forest biological diversity has not yet established as clear task sofar at the national level.