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• **MORE THAN 8 MEETINGS ON EFT REPORTING SINCE 2006**

• **OBJECTIVES**
  
  – **DISCUSS OUTCOME OF THE PILOT STUDY ON EUROPEAN FOREST TYPES (EFTS)**
  
  – **COMPARE EFT AND THE CURRENT 3 FOREST TYPE SYSTEM, PROS AND CONS SEEN FROM DATA PROVIDERS’ AND END-USERS’ POINT OF VIEW**
  
  – **PREPARE FOR A DISCUSSION ON HOW TO REPORT BY FOREST TYPES IN NEXT SOEF.**
2 Questions on the Outcome of the Pilot Study

• Is the information provided on Sustainable forest management improved when reported by EFTs?
• Are EFTs a good compromise to stratify complex data information and forest variability in Europe?
EUROPEAN FOREST TYPES IN BRIEF
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OUTCOMES
• **Outcome 1**

- **High share of the response rate on compulsory indicators**

- **Only small proportions of total forest areas ‘Unclassified’**

- **Improvements possible to ‘fix’ unclassified forest areas with species assemblages not currently reflected in the EFTs**
• **Outcome 2: a better understanding of SFM in Europe?**

• **Forest Area Indicator**

  • **Snapshot of the large variability of forest communities, obscured by the 3 classes**
  • **Facilitate the interpretation of trends in forest area change, thus enabling question-driven monitoring (e.g. loss of valuable habitat, expansion of introduced species...)**

• **Other Indicators (growing stock, age structure, tree species composition, deadwood, naturalness)**

  • **Could be framed within meaningful ecological units**
PARTICIPATORY DISCUSSION

COMPARING THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE EFTS AND THE EXISTING 3 FOREST TYPES CLASSIFICATION TO A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF SFM IN EUROPE
EFT CLASSIFICATION

• POSITIVE ASPECTS:
  – CLEAR SUPPORT TO OUTCOME OF THE PILOT STUDY SOME NEGATIVE ASPECTS

• NEGATIVE ASPECTS
  – THE EFT CLASSIFICATION LESS RELEVANT FOR OTHER INDICATORS (NON BIODIVERSITY INDICATORS)
  – STILL DIFFICULT TO IMPLEMENT BEING RATHER COMPLEX
  – POSSIBILITIES FOR VERY DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS
  – COUNTRIES HAVE DIFFERENT INFORMATION THUS FURTHER COMPLICATING THE INTERPRETATION
  – DEMANDING MORE EFFORTS AND RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT COMPARED TO THE 3 FOREST TYPES SYSTEM
PROPOSED ACTION

• AN ENQUIRY
  – TO CLARIFY THE DRAWBACKS OF THE CLASSIFICATION
  
  – TO EASE ITS APPLICATION AND FURTHER DEVELOP GUIDELINES 
  FOR BETTER INTERPRETATION OF NFI INFORMATION AND ADD 
  TOOLS FOR IMPROVED INTERPRETATION.

• BOTTOM-UP IMPROVEMENTS AT NFI LEVEL (DIFFERENT FOR 
  DIFFERENT COUNTRIES)

• USE OF NATIONAL STANDARDS IN REPORTING SHOULD BE 
  EXCLUDED AND FURTHER HARMONIZATION PROCESS PROPOSED

• A FURTHER SIMPLIFICATION OF THE EFT (LESS THAN THE 14 
  CATEGORIES TO BE CONSIDERED)
THE 3 FOREST TYPES

• POSITIVE ASPECTS
  – EASY, CHEAP NOT RESOURCE DEMANDING
  – ALREADY IMPLEMENTED IN THE REPORTING SYSTEM BY COUNTRIES
  – MEETING THE INFORMATION NEEDS OF THE FOREST INDUSTRY ON
    INFORMATION ON THE 2 MAIN FOREST TYPES CONIFERS AND DECIDUOUS
    TREES

• SOME NEGATIVE ASPECTS
  – INADEQUATE AND TOO BROAD FOR LARGE SCALE ASSESSMENTS.
  – MIXED TYPE IMPRECISE INDICATOR OF HETEROGENEITY
  – VERY LITTLE INDICATION ON SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT

• ACTION
  – CONTINUE WITH THE 3 FOREST TYPES UNTIL A BETTER SYSTEM HAS BEEN
    DEVELOPED AND EVENTUALLY TO CONTINUE WITH THIS SYSTEM IN
    PARALLEL WITH THE NEW SYSTEM
CONCLUSIONS (1)

• Still challenges
  – to be able to extract the relevant information
  – to communicate it efficiently in the policy making
  – To evaluate benefits and use of this additional information
    • until now been very sparsely used by the COM and the EEA to some extent in several FP research projects

• The participation to the stakeholder’s meeting in Geneva in November 2012 was not sufficient to represent the different actors, data providers and end/users of the information on sustainable forest management in pan-Europe.
CONCLUSIONS (2)

- **TO INCLUDE OR NOT THE EUROPEAN FOREST TYPE CLASSIFICATION IN THE REPORTING OF SoEF?**

  - ISSUES RELATED TO THE CLASSIFICATION, SUCH AS WHETHER TO INCLUDE MORE FOREST TYPES (NOT CATEGORIES), WHETHER THE CLASSIFICATION IN CATEGORIES COULD BE SIMPLIFIED, ON THE ACCURACY OF THE ASSESSMENT

  - ISSUES RELATED TO THE REPORTING, SUCH AS HOW TO IMPROVE AND FACILITATE THE REPORTING?

  - ISSUES RELATED ON THE END-USE AND ADDED INFORMATION VALUE OF THE REPORTED INDICATORS BY FOREST TYPE

  - ISSUES RELATED TO THE EXTRA COSTS IN EFFORTS AND RESOURCES BY THE DATA PROVIDERS TO ACHIEVE THIS ADDED INFORMATION