

ANNEX I

Annex to the Review of the MCPFE

Task 1 Document analysis



**International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis
(IIASA)**

■Schlossplatz 1
■A-2361 Laxenburg,
■Austria

■Phone: +43 2236 807 0
■Fax: +43 2236 71 313
■Web: <http://www.iiasa.ac.at> ■

Project leader: Ewald Rametsteiner, IIASA
Author: Terrence Fell

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	3
Tables	4
1. Introduction to Task 1	5
2. Methodology and Work Plan	5
3. Results	6
3.1 The Strategic Positioning of the MCPFE	6
3.2 The Relevance of the MCPFE	8
3.3 The Added Value of the MCPFE	10
3.4 The Effectiveness of the MCPFE	12
3.5 The Efficiency of the MCPFE	14
4. Concluding Remarks	16
5. Bibliography	17

List of Abbreviations

CEI-Bois	The European Confederation of Woodworking Industries
CEPI	Confederation of European Paper Industries
CEPF	Confederation of European Forest Owners
CoE	Council of Europe
ECNC	European Centre for Nature Conservation
EFI	European Forest Institute
ELM	MCPFE Expert Level Meeting
ELO	European Landowners' Organisation
ENFE	European Network of Forest Entrepreneurs
EOMF	European Observatory for Mountain Forests
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FERN	The Forests and the European Union Resource Network
FoE	Friends of the Earth
IFPC	International Forest Policy Context
IO	Intergovernmental Organisation
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests Process
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests Process
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organisations
MSG	Multi-Stakeholder Group
PEBDLS	Pan-European Biological Diversity and Landscape Strategy
PEEN	Pan-European Ecological Network
PEFC	Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification Schemes
PEOLGS	Pan-European Operational Guidelines
SiC	Signatory Country
UEF	Union of European Foresters
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Economic Development
UN/ ECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
WP	MCPFE Work Programme
WS	MCPFE Work Shop
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Tables

Table 3.1	The Position of Global, Pan-European/Regional Peers and Bodies as well as Stakeholders in the EU in Relation to Forest Topics
Table 3.2	Forest Topics in Relation to Frequency of Mentions in Global, Pan-European/Regional and EU-level Organisations, Bodies and Stakeholders.
Table 3.3	Relevance of MCPFE as Determined by Signings, Reporting and Participation (1993-2007)
Table 3.4	Added Value of MCPFE Resolutions (1990-2007)
Table 3.5	Effectiveness of the MCPFE, its Resolutions and Activities (1995-2008)
Table 3.6	Efficiency of the MCPFE (1990-2007)

1. Introduction to Task 1

The aim of the MCPFE review as a whole is to provide the basis for decisions on the future strategic direction of the MCPFE. The main focus of the MCPFE review is the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the MCPFE. In achieving its objectives The expected result of the strategic review is a concise report on its findings, including a set of concrete recommendations for action based on these findings. The geographic scope of the review is global (international bodies and processes) to local. The geographic focus is the pan-European region. The time scope is 1990 to the present.

Task 1 document analysis should contribute to the overall review by reviewing the establishment and evolution of the MCPFE process over time on the basis of available documentation, including changes in structures and modalities of operation, MCPFE commitments made and their implementation, and reports documenting impacts of the MCPFE.

The document review should form a basis for the MCPFE review tasks 2 and 3. This will permit subsequent tasks to be carried out on a solid knowledge base about the strategic positioning and role of the MCPFE. Attention will be paid, in particular, to the added value and relevance of the MCPFE and its effectiveness as well as efficiency in progressing towards its stated aims, challenges and achievements.

2. Methodology and Work Plan

The MCPFE is part of a larger international forest policy context (IFPC) and has as its main objective to protect European forests while simultaneously balancing the economic, social, ecological and cultural aspects of SFM. The MCPFE interacts with other forest organisations and both addresses and delivers resolutions on how best to achieve this objective. A formula for a successful MCPFE process is to have a strategic position that is not just relevant, but also adds value in an effective and efficient manner to achieving common forest and forest-related objectives in the IFPC.

The document analysis includes documents from a total of 28 intergovernmental organisations (including the MCPFE) and stakeholders linked with 109 documents. Fourteen of these (IOs, as well as the UNCED) are active globally and three in the pan-European/regional arena. The European Commission and ten stakeholders are active in the EU. Thirty eight of the documents that are issued by intergovernmental organisations and bodies at the pan-European/regional context come from the MCPFE (see Annex for more details).

The texts of the selected documents have undergone a search based on key words that relate to the MCPFE's strategic positioning, relevance, added value, effectiveness and efficiency. Organisations are grouped into three categories depending on whether they are active globally or within the pan-European/regional and/or EU geographical contexts. The

information collected from the word search is then entered into an excel data file for analysis. A data file has been created for each component of the document analysis.

Concerning the time period covered (1990-2008) the documents that describe the position of EU stakeholders date back as far as 1995. The documents from pan-European/regional and global intergovernmental organisations, on the other hand, date as far back as 1972.

3. Results

3.1 The Strategic Positioning of the MCPFE

Most organisations included in the document analysis are active at the global, pan-European/regional and EU-levels of the IFPC. The most notable peer organisations and other bodies at the global level are the World Bank, UNFCCC, UNCBD, UNCED, UNFF, ITTO and FAO/EFC. At the pan-European/regional level of the IFPC one can find intergovernmental organisations such as the UNEP, UN/ECE, Council of Europe and MCPFE. Finally, the EU-level of the IFPC is different from the other levels since, besides the European Commission, it includes mostly stakeholders. The most prominent among these (with regards to the documents analysed) are the CEPF, CEPI and the environmental NGO, FERN (see Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 The Position of Global, Pan-European/regional Peers and Bodies as well as Stakeholders in the EU in Relation to the Forest Topics they Address

Level	Few	Average	Many
Global	UNFCCC, FoE	World Bank; UNCED, UNCBD, ITTO, IUCN, FAO/EFC	IPF/IFF/UNFF
Pan-European/regional	UN/ECE	UNEP, Council of Europe	MCPFE
EU	CEI-Bois, ELO	ECNC, UEF	European Commission, CEPF, CEPI, FERN,

Global organisations like the UNCBD and FAO/EFC address an average amount of forest topics (5-8) common to the **international forest policy context** (IFPC). The MCPFE deals with many forest topics (>9) that are similar to those addressed at the global level by, the IPF/IFF/UNFF (see Table 3.1). The European Commission and stakeholders like the CEPF, CEPI and FERN also address many topics. On the other hand, organisations and stakeholders like the UNFCCC, UN/ECE, CEI-Bois and the ELO address few forest-related topics (<5).

Five topics are frequently mentioned in the documents from **global** IOs in the last 20 years. These are sustainable forest management (SFM), its socio-economic and cultural aspects, international cooperation, measures to monitor forests and cross-sectoral policy cooperation. The global and **pan-European/regional** levels of the IFPC are also characterised by the same forest and forest-related topics. However, national forest programmes (after 1993) are mentioned more often at the pan-European/regional level than other levels (where it is mentioned only in the context of the IPF/IFF). The opposite is the

case concerning the topics of C&I and governance, which are not mentioned as frequently at the pan-European level.

Table 3.2 Forest Topics in Relation to Frequency of Mentions in Global, Pan-European/Regional and EU-Level Organisations, Bodies and Stakeholders. In bold are topics not addressed by the MCPFE (1990-2007)

	Low frequency	Average frequency	High frequency
GLOBAL	Wood as a renewable resource, economies in transition	Legal framework, NFPs, C&I, biodiversity, climate change	SFM; local communities, international cooperation, research, cross-sectoral cooperation
PAN-EUROPEAN/REGIONAL	Wood as a renewable resource; C&I, legal framework, economies in transition, tourism	Research; cross-sectoral cooperation, biodiversity, climate change	SFM; local communities, NFPs, international cooperation
EU	Property rights, cross-sectoral cooperation, C&I	Financing; political support, international cooperation, research, climate change, biodiversity, NFPs	Wood as a renewable resource; SFM, local communities, better coordination, legal framework

Of interest here is that wood as a renewable resource is mentioned more frequently by EU stakeholders than other organisations and bodies. Even the need for new legal arrangements (mostly to combat illegal logging) has been mentioned more frequently by stakeholders in the EU. Cross-sectoral cooperation, C&I are not major topics at this level. Better coordination between the EU, governments and stakeholders, political support for forest owners and education are, therefore, topics not addressed by the MCPFE, and are linked mostly with stakeholders in the **EU**.

Most topics have been addressed by the MCPFE since the early 1990s. The **MCPFE** addressed SFM and its socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects in 1993, 1998 and 2003 (H1, L1, V2 and V3). The topic of cross-sectoral cooperation was addressed in 2003 (V1) and again in 2007 (W1 and W2). Contrary to the general trend, the MCPFE gives the topics of biodiversity and climate change a high priority by directly addressing them in no less than four resolutions (H2; V4, H4 and V5). Finally, aiding economies in transition and promoting wood as a renewable resource (the least frequently mentioned topics at the global and pan-European/regional level of the IFPC) were addressed by the MCPFE in 1993 (H3) and 2007 (W1). The MCPFE addresses the same topics as the UNFF, UNEP, Council of Europe and European Commission in its resolutions particularly concerning all aspects of SFM, biodiversity, climate change and the promotion of wood as a renewable resource. The MCPFE does not so much duplicate these organisations' work, but functions as a conduit to facilitate changes in national forest structures and the policies of stakeholders in line with global and pan-European/regional conventions and policies.

The topics in Table 3.2 can also be divided into core **forest** and **forest-related** categories. Forest topics dominate the IFPC and deal directly with SFM, interaction local communities, the promotion of wood and legal frameworks. Forest-related topics deal indirectly with forests. Examples of such topics are climate change, biodiversity, land use, tourism and aiding economies in transition. Although forest-related topics are mentioned as

mush as forest topics in the documents, they do not have the same priority as forest topics. However, the exceptions are climate change and biodiversity, which remain the most frequently mentioned forest-related topics at all levels of the IFPC.

The **time period** prior to the establishment of the MCPFE (1972-1989) is characterised by a focus on protecting wildlife, conserving fauna and reducing transboundary air pollution. All of these topics were addressed by the MCPFE between 1990 and 1998. Topics such as SFM, economic viability, climate change and biodiversity dominate the agenda of the MCPFE between 1990 and 1998. This changed between 1998 and 2007 where focus is now on a more cross-sectoral approach with an emphasis on, in particular, water and energy.

The main comparative advantage of the MCPFE is that it is a multi-topic political body with the ability to incorporate topics like biodiversity and climate change. The MCPFE also has the advantage of prioritising which topics are of relevance for European forests. However, as the document analysis will show this does not mean that the MCPFE is effective in facilitating the implementation of its resolutions.

It can be considered a weakness of the MCPFE that it did not address the need for legal arrangements to combat, for example, illegal logging. Moreover EU-level topics like property rights (including the issue of restitution of property in former centrally planned economies in Eastern Europe), political support for forest stakeholders and better coordination between European political institutions and stakeholders have yet to appear in MCPFE commitments.

3.2 The Relevance of the MCPFE

The relevance of the MCPFE is determined by a number of indicators. One is the extent to which its declarations and resolutions are signed and later implemented by countries. Another indicator of MCPFE relevance is reporting on the implementation of MCPFE resolutions. There were no reporting requests from the MCPFE prior to 2003. However, reports have been collected from signatory countries in 2003 and 2007. If signatory countries reported on both occasions relevance is considered high and on one occasion or none, average to low. Because of the fact that there are only two reporting occasions this indicator is not robust. However, it does give a tentative account of the MCPFE's relevance. Participation at MCPFE conferences will also be used as an indicator of relevance. There are four categories of participants: politicians, civil servants, peer organisations and stakeholders. Whether or not the MCPFE has relevance in this aspect depends on the number and status of the participants as well as changes in national forest structures. Therefore, the development in number of signatory countries will also indicate the MCPFE's relevance.

In general all MCPFE resolutions have been **signed** by between 35 and 40 potential signatories. Therefore, their overall relevance is high. Three exceptions can, however, be discerned in the data. Initially, two of the Strasbourg resolutions (S3 and S4) have had a relatively low rate of signings. In fact, only 33 countries signed these two resolutions compared with the 39 countries that signed SI and S2. Furthermore, all of the Vienna

resolutions have been signed by more than 40 countries. Finally, all of the Helsinki resolutions with the exception of H4 were signed by the participating countries (for more details see Annex).

Table 3.3 Relevance of MCPFE as Determined by Signings, Reporting and Participation (1993-2007)

Impacts	Relevance of MCPFE		
	Low	Average	High
Initial signings	S3, S4	S5, H4	S1, S2, S6, H1, H2, H3, L1, L2, V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, W1, W2
Reporting (2003/2007)	Denmark, Andorra, Malta, Monaco, Moldova, B&H, FYP Montenegro, Serbia	Czech Republic, Estonia, Portugal, Spain, Iceland, Turkey, Belarus, Albania	Most signatory countries
Participation (1993-2007)	Civil servants(1993) Civil servants (1998) Politicians (1998) Peers (2003/2007)	Politicians (1993) Politicians (2007) Peers (2003/2007) Stakeholders (1998/2003/2007)	Politicians (2003) Civil servants (2003) Civil servants (2007) Peers (1998/2003/2007) Stakeholders (1998/2003/2007)

It is apparent that most signatory countries viewed the Helsinki, Lisbon and Vienna resolutions as relevant (Table 3.3). However, some signatory countries have not reported on their progress with implementing the resolutions in 2003 and 2007. This can, for instance, be explained by the secession of Montenegro from Serbia in 2006 and the fact that countries like Monaco and Andorra do not have large areas of forests like, for example, Sweden and Finland and, therefore, the topic does not have a high priority on their political agenda. Spain, Portugal and the Czech Republic have only reported on one occasion. This has bearing for the relevance of the MCPFE since these countries could indicate a diminished political will to report on both occasions (2003 and 2007). This development coincides with a decrease in participation by high ranking politicians at the Warsaw conference in 2007.

Participation at MCPFE conferences also indicates its relevance. High participation is equated with a high relevance factor and vice versa. Participation in the time period between the establishment of the MCPFE in 1990 and the Lisbon conference in 1998 is good. Thirty four **politicians** attended the Helsinki conference in 1993. Their attendance decreased a little by Lisbon 1998 to 29. However, the 2003 Vienna conference saw a surge in the amount of politicians (49) participating at the MCPFE conference. By the next conference the number of political participants had fallen to 37. Seventeen ministers attended the conference in 1993. By 1998 this number had increased to 20 and peaked at 22 in Vienna 2003. Between the Lisbon conference in 1998 and the Warsaw conference in 2007 the participation of politicians continued to increase. This positive trend has changed, however. Twelve ministers (ten less than in Vienna) attended the Warsaw conference. However, deputy ministers and secretaries of state along with ambassadors and attaches have increased to substitute ministers over time (Table 3.3).

The most prominent types of **civil servants** that participate at the four latest MCPFE conferences are advisors, councillors and experts. These are followed by directors, director generals, heads of department as well as division and section heads. The numbers of civil

servants in attendance have increased steadily between 1990 and 1998 from circa 90 at the Helsinki conference to almost 100 at the Lisbon conference. However, after continuing to increase in 2003, with over 140 civil servants participating at the Vienna conference the number decreased slightly to just over 130 in Warsaw in 2007. Notable is that two types of civil servants have increased their participation dramatically since Helsinki. The number of directors participating at conferences almost doubled from 14 in 1993 to 26 in 2003. However, the most dramatic increase is the number of advisors, councillors and experts that accompany ministers to MCPFE conferences. From just ten in 1993 the number of advisors attending the Vienna conference had quadrupled to 41. The number of advisors has, however, declined somewhat to 37 in 2007 (Table 3.3). This follows a general down-trend in participation.

Peer organisations, bodies and stakeholders began to participate at MCPFE conferences under the Lisbon conference in 1998. Ten peer organisations have participated at MCPFE conferences between 1998 and 2007. The most frequent of these are the, UN/ECE, UNFF, FAO/EFC and UNEP. Representatives from the Council of Europe, IUCN and Montreal Process have participated at the Vienna (2003) and Warsaw (2007) conferences. The ITTO participated in 2003 and the World Bank in 2007. Eighteen **stakeholders** have been allowed at an early stage to participate at MCPFE conferences. Eight of these have a high level of participation at MCPFE conferences since they participated in Lisbon, Vienna and Warsaw. The most frequent participants are the WWF and CEPF. European state forest owners (EUSTAFOR) and the Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) have each participated for the first time in 2007. The number of peers and stakeholders in attendance at MCPFE conferences has increased since 1998 adding to the already high relevance of the MCPFE (Table 3.3).

The overall relevance of the MCPFE is good considering the number of signatories and observers have been stable over time with an increase in 2003 (Albania, Georgia and Cyprus) and 2007 (Montenegro) and the number and stature of the politicians in attendance at its conferences. Together these indicators reveal that the MCPFE has a high relevance factor. However, the diminished attendance at Warsaw 2007 gives rise for some concern.

3.3 The Added Value of the MCPFE

The added value analysis includes the statements of signatory countries (SiCs), intergovernmental organisations (IOs) and multi-stakeholder groups (MSGs) at Ministerial Conferences. Noteworthy is that, peer organisations, bodies and stakeholders were invited first to participate and give written statements at the MCPFE's Lisbon conference (1998). These conference statements express the views of organisations concerning topics linked with MCPFE commitments. If between four to eight IOs, MSGs or SiCs state that they are pleased or satisfied with an individual resolution, or a topic addressed by the MCPFE, then it is considered to have a high added value. If there is mixed, for example half negative and half positive, reaction from IOs in statements concerning topics addressed by the MCPFE, or its resolutions, added value is average. If all of the IOs are dissatisfied with a resolution its overall added value is interpreted as low. Not all statements in MCPFE conference proceedings touch on topics that are linked with MCPFE resolutions (S2, S3 and S4) and are, therefore, not included in Table 3.4.

In order to determine changes in the added value of the MCPFE this component of the analysis will be divided into two time periods (1990-1998 and 1999-2007). The following views come from the time period 1990-1998. With regards to research on tree physiology (S5) SiCs were first to express dissatisfaction with the **Strasbourg** resolutions. For instance, the Council of Europe was not satisfied with the monitoring of forests (S1) in 2007. Both the scientific community and private forest owners expressed the same year that more must be done to promote research into forest ecosystems (S6). In sum, three of the Strasbourg resolutions (S1, S5 and S6) have had an average added value in meeting the needs of IOs and/or MSGs. Despite resolution H3 some signatory countries (1993) and private forest owners (2003) are of the opinion that the MCPFE has not yet added value in bringing about cooperation with countries with economies in transition. In fact this view was expressed by signatory countries and the scientific community as early as 1993 and again in 1998. Private forest owners (1998), the forest industry (2003) as well as environmental NGOs and the scientific community still believe that much remains to be done concerning climate change (H4).

On the other hand, UNEP, Council of Europe, UNFF, EOMF and environmental NGOs mentioned in 2003 that the MCPFE's work on introducing new SFM guidelines in **Helsinki** (H1) was moving in the right direction. This satisfaction with H1 was repeated again in 2007 by the UNCBD and FAO/EFC. The MCPFE's work on biodiversity (H2) is also seen as adding value by the FAO/EFC and UNEP as well as private forest owners in 1998. Concerning the **Lisbon** resolutions two pan-European/regional IOs, the Council of Europe and UN/ECE, expressed in 1998 and again in 2003 that measures to strengthen the socio-economic aspects of SFM (L1) had improved. Moreover, actors like the FAO/EFC, UN/ECE and WWF, scientific community and private forest owners also expressed their satisfaction with pan-European criteria and indicators and PEOLGS for SFM (L2) in 1998 (Table 3.4).

The following views concern the latest MCPFE conferences in Vienna 2003 and Warsaw 2007. The IUCN (2003) and UNEP (2007) both expressed satisfaction with the first **Vienna** resolution on cross-sectoral cooperation. The EOMF (2007) stated that it was pleased with the MCPFE in relation to its work on the topic insisting, nevertheless, that much more can be done. The forest industry and private forest owners were the first to state their appreciation for the resolution on economic viability (V2). Both social and environmental NGOs echoed this view. However, it would seem that IOs in general do not express any enthusiasm for V2. Private forest owners who in 2003 were critical of the MCPFE's work on the socio-cultural aspects of SFM (V3) expressed in 2007 that it had added some value concerning, in particular, forest owners' property rights. Concerning forest biodiversity (V4), both the Council of Europe and UNEP in 2003 express their appreciation of MCPFE efforts. Private forest owners stated as early as 2003 that they were satisfied with the MCPFE's work on biodiversity and pleased with its collaboration with PEBDLS. Finally, the UNEP (2003) expressed its satisfaction with the MCPFE's work to mitigate climate change via SFM (V5). Nevertheless, environmental NGOs and the UN/ECE still believe that more must be done by the MCPFE before SFM has a tangible effect on global climate change (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Added Value of MCPFE Resolutions (1990-2007)

		Added value		
		Low	AVERAGE	High
Strasbourg (1990)	S1		IOs (1998 and 2003); SiCs (2007)	
	S5		Scientific community (2003/2007)	
	S6		SiCs (1993); MSGs (2003/2007)	
Helsinki (1993)	H1		Environmental NGOs (2003/2007) SiCs (1993/1998), UN/ECE (2003)	IOs (1998/2003/2007)
	H2		SiCs (1998/2003) Private forest owners (2003)	IOs (1998/2007)
	H3		MSGs (1998-2003), SiCs (1993), EOMF (2007)	
	H4	SiCs (1993/1998/2003/2007) MSGs (1998-2007)	State forest owners (2007) EOMF (2007)	
Lisbon (1998)	L1		MSGs (1998/2003/2007), IOs (2003/2007)	
	L2		SiCs (1998/2003) Forest industry (2003)	IOs (1998/2003/2007) MSGs (1998/2007)
Vienna (2003)	V1		IOs (2003/2007), SiCs (2003/2007) Private forest owners (2007)	IOs (2003/2007)
	V2	IOs (1998/2003/2007)	IOs (1998); SiCs (1998/2003)	MSGs (1998/2003/2007)
	V3	SiCs (1998/2003/2007)	MSGs (1998/2003/2007)	
	V4		Private forest owners (2003), SiCs (1998/2003)	IOs (2003/2007)
	V5	SiCs (1993/1998/2003/2007)	IOs (2003), MSGs (2007)	
Warsaw (2007)	W1		IOs (2007), MSGs (2007)	
	W2		EOMF (2007), State forest owners (2007)	

With regards to the **Warsaw** conference in 2007 the FAO/EFC, EOMF and social NGOs have mentioned that they are pleased with the MCPFE's work on increasing cross-sectoral policy cooperation, strengthening the competitiveness of wood and increasing energy production (W1).

In sum, global and pan-European/regional IOs are pleased, in particular, with H1, V1 and V4, while MSGs are more pleased with V2. Resolution H2 is considered by IOs to have a high added value. All MCPFE resolutions are considered to have had an average added value. Nevertheless, statements from signatory countries and MSGs imply that the MCPFE must put new effort into future actions linked with resolution H4. As mentioned, the second Lisbon resolution has an average to high added value. MCPFE resolutions V3 and V5 are welcomed by signatory countries, but still not considered by them to have added value. Intergovernmental organisations tend to add more value to MCPFE resolutions than do MSGs and signatory countries. Finally, concerning V2, it would seem that MSGs and IOs have different views.

3.4 The Effectiveness of the MCPFE

The effectiveness of the MCPFE is determined by analysing the impacts of its activities and resolutions on the policy documents of global, pan-European/regional and EU-level organisations. If, for instance, 15-21 (under half) of the signatory countries mention the MCPFE regarding, one or more of its activities or resolutions in documents their impact factor is high. The MCPFE will have an average impact factor if it is mentioned in 8-14

documents. If mentions are under eight the MCPFE, activities or resolutions in question will be interpreted as having had a low impact. The most important aspect of MCPFE effectiveness is the signatory country level. Since signatory countries make up the MCPFE, its resolutions are expected to have the most impact at this level of the IFPC. Since not all SiCs report that they have made progress in their efforts to implement MCPFE resolutions, reports by SiCs indicate the MCPFE's legitimacy (authority) and relevance as a facilitator.

About half of the 47 global and pan-European/regional (core forest and forest-related) policy documents mention forests and Europe. However, less than a quarter mention the MCPFE, its activities or resolutions. Half of the organisations and bodies mention the MCPFE and the other half mention its activities or resolutions (see Annex for more details). The MCPFE as a political body was mentioned most in **policy documents** originating from pan-European IOs such as the Council of Europe (EFS 1999), UN/ECE (Kiev resolution 2003) and UNEP (PEEN 2004). Of all MCPFE activities, expert level meetings (ELMs) were mentioned the most (UNEP, PEEN 2004) and then MCPFE work programmes (FAO, SOFO 2005) as well as workshops (ENA-FLEG 2005). The most mentioned resolution is by far the second Lisbon resolution on pan-European criteria and indicators for SFM (L2). This resolution is referred to in both the EU's Forest Strategy (1999) and Forest Action Plan (2006) and has already been shown to add value. The first and second Helsinki resolutions as well as Vienna resolutions two and three are mentioned by the UN/ECE's Kiev resolution (2003) and the UNEP's 2010 biodiversity plan. The effectiveness of the MCPFE in regards to influencing the agendas of the European Commission and stakeholders is low. The ENFE (2002 and 2003), CEI-Bois (2003), CEPI (2007), ELO (2008) and CEPF (2008) all mentioned the MCPFE or its ELMs. All in all, the effectiveness of the MCPFE is lower at this level of the IFPC (Table 3.5). MCPFE resolutions are not mentioned in the documents of EU-level stakeholders (see Annex for more details).

The first four Strasbourg resolutions (S1-S4) were still under implementation in **signatory countries** (which they often outsource to technical organisations) in 1998. Resolution S5 was at this time (1998) still in the preparation phase of implementation, while S6 was considered implemented by EFERN and IUFRO. Some aspects of resolutions H1 and H2 were considered implemented by the UN/ECE, FAO/EFC and SiCs, while others were still under implementation in 1998. Signatory countries reported also that although resolutions H3 and H4 were under implementation they had not yet been implemented.

Most resolutions were, with the exceptions of S5, L1 and L2, implemented by signatory countries by 2003. However, there still remained a few resolutions in the preparation and implementation phases. By 2003 all of the Strasbourg resolutions with the exception of S5 are implemented. The same is the case with the Helsinki resolutions. By 2007 most of the Strasbourg, Helsinki and Lisbon resolutions are implemented with the exceptions of V1, V2 and V4 which are only considered partially implemented (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5 Effectiveness of the MCPFE, its Resolutions and Activities (1995-2008)

Impacts	Effectiveness of MCPFE, Resolutions and Activities (1995-2008)		
	Low	Average	High
Policy documents at the global and pan-European/regional levels	ELMs, L2, WP, H1, H2, V2, V3, WS	MCPFE	
Agendas of European stakeholders	MCPFE, ELMs		
Implementation in signatory countries	S5 (1998) L1, L2 (2003) V1, V2 (2007)	S1-4, H3, H4 (1998) S5, L1, L2 (2003) V4 (2007)	S6, H1, H2 (1998) S1-4, S6, H3, H4 (2003) L1, L2, V3, V5 (2007)

In sum, based on mentions in policy documents it can be concluded that the impact of MCPFE commitments is low at the global and pan-European levels of the IFPC. It is mostly the MCPFE as a political body or its activities that are referred to and not its resolutions. The same is the case concerning the agendas of European stakeholders. Not surprisingly, the MCPFE is most effective in impacting on the national policies of signatory countries. However, since some of its resolutions and activities have been mentioned between 1995 and 2008 by a number of pan-European/regional IOs and EU-level stakeholders the MCPFE can be said to have had an impact at this level of the IFPC. Also concerning the effectiveness of the **economic**, **social** and **ecological** aspects of SFM, it can be concluded that resolutions linked with the economic aspects of SFM (L1 and V2) have a low implementation rate. Ecological-oriented resolutions (H2, H4, V4 and V5) have an average to high implementation rate and socially-oriented resolutions (L1 and V3) have a high rate of implementation.

3.5 The Efficiency of the MCPFE

The MCPE is often influenced by other organisations and bodies to work together towards common objectives such as the protection of forests. This part of the analysis will focus on two aspects of the MCPFE's efficiency. The first aspect concerns the speed with which the MCPFE is picking up topics from the IFPC and addressing them in one or more of its resolutions. If a relevant forest, or forest-related, topic is, for example, mentioned frequently by global IOs in the beginning of the 1990s and was addressed in one of the Helsinki resolutions this is considered fast (3-5 years) and, therefore, efficient. If the same topic was addressed in one of the Lisbon resolutions its speed is average (6-8 years). If the topic is not addressed until Vienna or Warsaw, the speed between pick up and being addressed is slow, and, therefore, not very efficient. The second aspect of MCPFE efficiency has to do with the speed in which MCPFE resolutions are implemented by signatory countries.

The need to **address** SFM and climate change which is mentioned in some policy documents from the 1970s were not addressed by the MCPFE in Strasbourg (1990). The topic of criteria and indicators (C&I) surfaced in documents from the UNCED (1992), Council of Europe (1996) and IFF (1997). It has taken just a few years for the MCPFE to address SFM (H1), climate change (H4) and C&I (L2). The topic of socio-economic aspects of SFM is mentioned by the UNCED in its Rio declaration from 1992 and the topic of NFP is mentioned by the Council of Europe (PEBDLS) in 1995. Here the efficiency of taking global topics on the MCPFE agenda takes an average of 6-8 years (Table 3.6). The MCPFE has been slow in addressing topics like legal frameworks and cross-sectoral cooperation.

Table 3.6 Efficiency of the MCPFE (1990-2007)

Impacts	Efficiency of MCPFE		
	Slow	Average	Fast
Pick up—Address new topics in resolutions	Governance, Cross sectoral coop (from 1990 to V2 2003/ W12007)	NFP (from 1995 to V1 2003), socio-economic SFM (from 1992 to L1 1998)	SFM in (from 1990 to H1 1993), climate change (from 1990 to H4 1993), C&I (from 1994/1995 to L2 1998), biodiversity (from 1998 to V4 2003), Promotion of wood (from 2003 to WI 2007)
Resolutions—Implementation by signatory countries	S1-S5 (cooperation, research), H3 (economies in transition), H4 (climate change), L1 (socioeconomic SFM), L2 (C&I)	S6 (research), V1 (NFP), V2 (economic viability SFM), V4 (biodiversity)	H1 (SFM), H2 (biodiversity), V3 (socio-cultural SFM), V5 (climate change)

The MCPFE also addresses topics that are dealt with at the EU-level. Between the Helsinki and Lisbon conferences the European Commission produced a policy document on biodiversity (EU Biodiversity Strategy). This topic resurfaces again in Vienna in 2003 (V4). The topic of property rights has not yet been addressed by the MCPFE. Between the Lisbon and Vienna conferences some more topics surfaced in the documents from some European stakeholders. The need for political support for forest owners was mentioned by FERN in 2000. This topic has still to be addressed by the MCPFE. Three topics were mentioned by stakeholders like CEPI (2003), FERN (2003) and CEI-Bois (2004) between the Vienna and Warsaw conferences. These are the needs for better legal frameworks to combat, among other things, illegal logging, better coordination between EU organisations, signatory countries and stakeholders and the promotion of wood as a renewable resource. The latter topic is addressed by the MCPFE in 2007.

The implementation of a resolution is a process that continually requires actions. As a consequence the efficiency of the MCPFE is difficult to determine in this context. However, the implementation of resolutions by signatory countries is a proxy indicator of MCPFE efficiency in terms of its ability to facilitate implementation. Signatory countries have been slow in **implementing** the Strasbourg resolutions with the exception of S6 (forest ecosystem research) which took between six and eight years to implement. Signatory countries are also slow in implementing H3 and H4, that is, the resolutions on cooperating with economies in transition and adapting forests to climate change. Despite the fact that H4 was picked up and addressed quickly by the MCPFE, signatory countries have been slow in implementing it. This is, however, not the case concerning V5, which was

implemented within three to five years. The MCPFE has also been slow in bringing about the implementation of the Lisbon resolutions on the socio-economic aspects of SFM and C&I. Once again the C&I topic was addressed quickly by the MCPFE, but has yet to be implemented fully by signatory countries. Signatory countries have been relatively quick in implementing resolutions on NFPs (V1), economic viability (V2) and biodiversity (V4).

In sum, the MCPFE has been efficient in addressing and impacting on signatory country forest policies (or equivalents). The MCPFE has been particularly effective in putting efforts into facilitating the implementation of resolutions that touch on topics like SFM (H1) and rather ineffective in efforts to facilitate the implementation of resolutions such as aiding economies in transition (H3) and climate change (H4). The MCPFE does not address topics like property rights, better coordination and better legal frameworks on forests. Similar to the results of the effectiveness analysis, resolutions with an economic-orientation (L1 and V2) are implemented slowly by signatory countries, while ecologically and socially oriented resolutions have, with the exceptions of L1 and V4, a fast implementation rate.

4. Concluding Remarks

The MCPFE has positioned itself well to address most topics that are mentioned by signatory countries and peer organisations at the global and pan-European/regional levels of the IFPC. It has, for instance, picked up and addressed most forest and forest-related topics of relevance since its establishment. The MCPFE can measure itself with its peers concerning the number of forest and forest-related topics its resolutions address. Nevertheless, despite the MCPFE's ability to deal with multiple topics, EU-level topics such as legal arrangements to combat illegal logging, better coordination between the EU, signatory countries and stakeholders and political support for forest owners remain unaddressed. This can be explained by the fact that other institutions such as FLEGT already deal with, for example, illegal logging.

A stable and increasing number of signatories and observers as well as high attendances at conferences emphasise the MCPFE's relevance. Yet, a decline in the participation of high-level politicians, in particular ministers and deputy ministers, at Warsaw in 2007 raises some concern about the MCPFE's future political relevance. Moreover, those MCPFE resolutions that display a high added value are also those most effective in influencing the agendas of peers. However, despite the added value of, for example, C&I (L2), signatory countries have been slow in implementing it, as well as economic-oriented resolutions. On the other hand, signatory countries implement ecologically and socially oriented resolutions more efficiently. Although the ultimate responsibility for implementing MCPFE resolutions lies with individual signatory countries the fact that they both report to the MCPFE on resolution implementation and that they have made good progress is evidence that the MCPFE has legitimacy as a political body and as a facilitator.

5. Bibliography

Documents from Global level Organisations/Bodies (1989-2007)

Actor	Document	Year
ILO	ILO Convention nr. 169	1989
UNCBD	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (No. 30619)	1992
UNCBD	Cartegna Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity	1992
UNCCD	Elaboration of an International Convention to Combat Desertification in Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (A/AC.241/27)	1994
UNCED	Non-Legally Binding Authoritative Statement of Principles for a Global Consensus on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of all Types of Forests	1992
UNCED	Agenda 21	1992
UNCED	Rio Declaration on Environment and Development	1992
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (GE.05-62220 (E) 200705)	1994
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Agreement	1994
IPF	Proposals for Action	1997
UNCBD	Expanded Programme of Work on Forest Biological Diversity	1994
UNFCCC	Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	1998
World Bank	Sustaining Forests: A Development Strategy	2002
LULUCF	The Marrakesh Ministerial Declaration (FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.1)	2002
WWF	Global Conservation Programme	2002
IUCN	Rehabilitation and Restoration of Degraded Forests	2003
ILO	Raising Awareness of Forests and Forestry: Building Bridges between People, Forests and Forestry	2003
FAO	State of the Forest (SOFO) (Includes summaries of 1990 and 2000 SOFOs)	2005
FAO	Europe and North Asia (ENA) Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG)	2005
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Agreement	2006
UNFF	Non-Legally Binding Instrument on all Types of Forests (NLBI) (A/C.2/62/L.5)	2007
FAO	Forest Strategy	2007
IUFRO	IUFRO Report 2007 (Includes summaries of earlier reports)	2007

MCPFE Documents (1990-2007)

Actor	Document	Year	Type
MCPFE	Strasbourg Declaration	1990	Declaration
	European Network of Permanent Sample Plots for Monitoring of Forest Ecosystems	1990	Resolution S1
	Conservation of Forest Genetic Resources	1990	Resolution S2
	Decentralized European Data Bank on Forest Fires	1990	Resolution S3
	Adapting the Management of Mountain Forests to New Environmental Conditions	1990	Resolution S4
	Expansion of the EUROSILVA Network of Research on Tree Physiology	1990	Resolution S5
	European Network for Research into Forest Ecosystems	1990	Resolution S6
	Helsinki Declaration	1993	Declaration
	General Guidelines for the Sustainable Management of Forests in Europe	1993	Resolution H1
	General Guidelines for the Conservation of the Biodiversity of European Forests	1993	Resolution H2
	Forestry Cooperation with Countries with Economies in Transition	1993	Resolution H3
	Strategies for a Process of Long-term Adaptation of Forests in Europe to Climate Change	1993	Resolution H4
	Lisbon Declaration	1998	Declaration
	People, Forests and Forestry - Enhancement of Socio-Economic Aspects of Sustainable Forest Management	1998	Resolution L1
	Pan-European Criteria, Indicators and Operational Level Guidelines for Sustainable Forest Management	1998	Resolution L2
	Vienna Living Forest Summit Declaration	2003	Declaration
	Strengthen Synergies For Sustainable Forest Management in Europe Through Cross-Sectoral Co-Operation and National Forest Programmes	2003	Resolution V1
	Enhancing Economic Viability of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe	2003	Resolution V2
	Preserving and Enhancing the Social and Cultural Dimensions of Sustainable Forest Management in Europe	2003	Resolution V3
	Conserving and Enhancing Forest Biological Diversity in Europe	2003	Resolution V4
	Climate Change and Sustainable Forest Management in Europe	2003	Resolution V5
	Warsaw Declaration	2007	Declaration
	Forests, Wood and Energy	2007	Resolution W1
	Forests and Water	2007	Resolution W2
	Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (16-17 June)	1993	Conference proceedings
	Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (2-4 June)	1998	Conference proceedings
	Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (28-30 April)	2003	Conference proceedings
	Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (5-7 November)	2007	Conference proceedings
	Second Interim Report on the Follow-Up Work With the Strasbourg Resolutions	1993	Interim report
	Interim Report on the Follow-Up of the Second Ministerial Conference	1995	Interim report

MCPFE Documents (1990-2007) (continued)

Actor	Document	Year	Type
	Interim Report on the Implementation of Resolution H3. Assistance and Cooperation with Countries of Central and Eastern Europe in Transition (CITs)	1995	Interim report
	Study on Political Impetus of the Helsinki Process: With the emphasis on the Helsinki Resolutions H1 and H2, and the work on criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management	1995	MCPFE study
	Short Summary Report on the Follow-Up Action Needed, Helsinki 1994. Progress Report 1996	1996	Summary report
	Report on the Follow-Up of the Strasbourg and Helsinki Ministerial Conferences on the Protection of Forests in Europe	1998	Follow up report
	Sustainable Forest Management in Europe Special Report on the Follow-Up on the Implementation of Resolutions H1 and H2 of the Helsinki Ministerial Conference	1998	Special report
	Implementation of MCPFE Commitments: National and Pan-European Commitments 1998-2003	2003	Implementation report
	State of Europe's Forests 2003: The MCPFE Report on Sustainable Forest Management in Europe	2003	MCPFE report
	Implementation of MCPFE Commitments: National and Pan-European Activities 2003-2007	2007	Implementation report
	State of Europe's Forests 2007: The MCPFE Report on Sustainable Forest Management in Europe	2007	MCPFE report

Documents from EU-Level Organisations (1993-2006)

Actor	Doc	Year
European Commission	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on a European Community Biodiversity Strategy (Com 1998) 42	1998
European Commission	Resolution on a forestry strategy for the European Union (1999/C 56/01)	1999
European Commission	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament - Biodiversity Action Plans in the areas of Conservation of Natural Resources, Agriculture, Fisheries, and Development and Economic Co-operation (COM/2001/0162)	2001
European Commission	Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy	2000
European Commission	Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT): Proposal for an EU Action Plan	2003
European Commission	Communication from the Commission: Biomass action plan {SEC(2005) 1573}	2005
European Commission	Communication from the Commission to the European Council and the European Parliament an Energy Policy for Europe {SEC(2007) 12}	2008
European Commission	Communication from the Commission to the COUNCIL and the European Parliament on an EU Forest Action Plan {SEC(2006) 748}	2006
European Commission	Renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy as adopted by the European Council on 15/16 June 2006 (10917/06)	2006

Documents from EU-Level Stakeholders (1995-2008)

ELO	European Forest Policy (EPG 6/95)	1995	Position paper
ENFE	1st European Entrepreneurs forest day	2000	Proceedings
FERN	Sinking the Kyoto Protocol: The Links between Forests, Plantations and Carbon Sinks	2000	Briefing
	Climate Change, Stabilization and Carbon Sequestration a Statement for the Second Session of COP 6 an Important Environmental Challenge for European Land Managers (EPG 131/01)	2001	Statement
ELO	Strategy for the Integration of Environmental Considerations into Development Policy to Promote Sustainable Development	2001	Briefing
FERN	Report 2002	2002	Annual report/work plan
ENFE	Report 2003	2003	Annual report/work plan
ENFE	Steps to Stop Illegal Logging: An Analysis of the European Commission's Action Plan on Illegal Logging	2003	Briefing
FERN	Renewable Raw Materials vs Raw Energy: Two Competing Goals	2003	Position paper
CEPI	Tackle Climate Change Use Wood	2003	Report
CEI bois	Europe and North Asia FLEG: A Key Task for Civil Society	2004	Briefing
FERN	European Responses to Climate Change: the Role of European Land Users in the Sequestration of Atmospheric Carbon (167P-04-EN)	2004	Position paper
ELO	Annual Report	2005	Report
ECNC	Live or let die? An Evaluation of the Fifth Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests	2005	Special report
FERN	Multi-functional forestry	2005	Congress resolution
UEF	Statement regarding EU forest action plan	2006	Statement
CEI-bois	Annual Report	2006	Report
ECNC	Position Paper on Sustainable Forest Management	2006	Position paper
CEPI	Position of European Pulp and Paper Industry on EU Forest Action Plan and its Implementation	2006	Position paper
CEPI	CEPI Sustainability Report: Consideration of the European Paper Industry	2007	CEPI study
CEPI	Renewable bioenergy from the forests	2007	Position paper
CEI bois	Annual Report	2007	Report
ECNC	Making European Forests Work for People and Nature	2007	Policy Brief 1
EFI	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade – The European Union Approach	2008	Policy Brief 2
EFI	In response to the Commission Initiative on Options for Combating Illegal Logging	2008	Position paper
ELO	Family Forest Owners in Combating Climate Change	2008	Position paper
CEPF			

Documents from EU-Level Stakeholders (1995-2008) (continued)

CEPF	A Legally Binding Agreement (LBA) for Forests in Europe	2008	Position paper
CEPF	Hunting Rights, Game Management and Sustainable Forest Management	2008	Position paper
CEPI	The Availability and Mobilisation of Woody Biomass	2008	Position paper