

# Toward New International Arrangements for Sustainable Forest Management—United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)—

Kiyoshi KOMATSU

Forest Conservation Project, Institute for Global Environmental Strategies

**Abstract:** While several important multilateral environmental agreements have been reached on a number of global environmental issues during the past decade, the creation of any international agreement on sustainable forest management remains problematic. Nevertheless, many discussions have been held, and it appears that some progress is being made. This report covers the highest profile initiative at the international level on this topic. The United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) was established in 2001 based on Resolution /2000/35 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The main purpose of the UNFF is to facilitate the implementation of the proposed actions arising from its predecessors, the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IPF/IFF), by enhancing the coordination of relevant international instruments relating to sustainable forest management and monitoring of progress of their implementation at all levels. The first substantive meeting of the UNFF, held in June 2001, discussed key issues, including the adoption of a multi-year programme of work for the next five years, plans of action, financial matters, and initiation of a Collaborative Partnership on Forests. This report reviews the process leading up to the creation of the UNFF, the outcomes of its first substantive meeting, key issues that it has inherited, and its challenges in the coming years.

**Key words:** IFF, UNFF, Sustainable forest management, CPF, IPF

## 1 Introduction

The first substantive meeting of United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) was held on 11-22 June 2001 in New York. The UNFF was established by a resolution of the ECOSOC in order to promote implementation of international instruments related to sustainable forest management. It was anticipated that this meeting would result in the adoption of the UNFF's "multi-year programme of work" (MYPOW), which was to describe the detailed activities of the UNFF. In addition, discussions on the plan of action for implementation of the actions proposed by the IPF and IFF and activities of the Collaborative Partnership on Forest (CPF) were the main items on the meeting's agenda. The meeting was recognized as being important for deciding its future direction.

## 2 Background of the UNFF

Since 1992 efforts have continued with the aim of adoption of new legal instruments at the global level—a so-called "convention on forests." To this end, the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) and its successor, the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF), provided a forum for international discussions from 1995 to 1997, and from 1997 to 2000, respectively. These were ad hoc policy dialogue processes to discuss issues related to sustainable forest management and propose necessary actions to achieve it. Within these processes, several countries tried to build consensus for adopting a Convention on Forests. In the IFF process, the governments

of Costa Rica and Canada led the "Costa Rica-Canada Initiative" to build consensus for adopting a Convention on Forests in 1999. These countries insisted on starting negotiations for adopting a new legal instrument on forests at the global level. With countries such as the United States and Brazil opposing this approach, the delegations could not achieve consensus by the fourth and final IFF meeting in February 2000.

Despite differences in views, the delegations did reach a common understanding on the necessity of a new international arrangement to follow the IPF and IFF. Already many international instruments exist relating to sustainable forest management, such as the IPF's "Proposals on Actions" and the IFF's "Proposal Actions" that result from the two policy dialogue processes, as well as the Forest Principles adopted at the Rio Summit (UNCED) in 1992. In addition, many activities connected with international treaties are related to sustainable forest management, such as projects conducted by the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the working program of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and so on. Thus, many held the opinion that ensuring the implementation of these instruments and coordination among them was more urgent than adopting a new convention on forests. In short, the delegations recognized the necessity of implementation and coordination of these existing instruments. In order to facilitate this work, the governments also recognized the necessity of a permanent body, rather than ad hoc processes like the IPF and IFF that were limited to holding discussions on important issues and making proposals. Almost all countries thought that international society should take action under permanent bodies based on existing international instruments. Thus, they could not

---

Address: 1560-39 Kamiyamaguchi, Hayama, Kanagawa, 240-0198, Japan  
 Tel: +81-468-55-3837, Fax: +81-468-55-3809  
 E-mail: komatsu@iges.or.jp

achieve consensus to start new negotiations, but agreed in the fourth meeting of the IFF that a new permanent body should be established within the United Nations to continue the policy dialogue and promote the implementation of existing instruments related to sustainable forest management. The new body was named the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), and its establishment was recommended by the IFF to ECOSOC.

ECOSOC endorsed the recommendation and adopted a resolution to establish the UNFF in June 2000. According to ECOSOC's resolution E/2000/35, the UNFF has six principal functions:

1. Facilitate implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for actions
2. Ensure continuity of policy dialogue and monitoring implementation of the IPF/IFF proposal for actions
3. Coordinate among relevant international instruments and organizations
4. Enhance cooperation among all stakeholders
5. Monitor and assess progress at national, regional, and global levels
6. Strengthen political commitment

Regarding the function of coordination, the establishment of a collaborative partnership was recommended in the resolution. The collaborative partnership consists of several international organizations and the secretariats of international treaties related to sustainable forest management, such as secretariats of the Convention on Biodiversity, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the United Nations Environment Programme, etc. It is expected that such a partnership will facilitate and promote coordinated and cooperative actions by these member organizations.

The resolution required that an organizational meeting of the UNFF be held as soon as possible, and that later, the first substantive meeting of the UNFF should be held, with the following agenda:

- a. adoption of the Multi-Year Program of Work;
- b. development of a plan of action for the implementation of proposals for action of IPF/IFF which will address financial provisions;
- c. initiation of the United Nations Forum on Forests work with the collaborative partnership on forests;
- d. set a provisional agenda, date, and venue for its second substantive session in 2002.

Based on the ECOSOC resolution, the first substantive meeting of UNFF was held 11-22 June 2001 (UNFF1).

### 3 Outline of the meeting

#### 3-1 Background of the meeting

According to the ECOSOC resolution, an aim of the first substantive meeting was originally to adopt the decision on MYPOW that includes the agenda of each session until the fifth meeting of the UNFF, a schedule of

high-level segments, and detailed descriptions of work expected to be dealt with by the UNFF in the resolution. The drafting of decisions on proposals of actions (PoA) and CPF were also expected in the first session, but the resolution did not suggest that they would be adopted then. However, many delegations expressed their interest in adopting not only the decisions of MYPOW, but also of the PoA and CPF in the session. They thought that starting action immediately was urgent for realizing sustainable forest management. Since almost all delegations hoped to adopt these three decisions as soon as possible, they were finally adopted in this meeting.

#### 3-2 Controversial issues

There were several controversial issues in the negotiation process during the meeting. Some of them were the same as with discussions in the previous two processes, such as on establishing a new international fund for sustainable forest management and some issues related to starting negotiation on a Convention on Forests.

Several countries insisted on starting discussions on the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests in the early stages of the UNFF. However, several countries (the United States, for example) insisted on discussing the matter at as late a stage as possible, illustrating the differences of attitude for adopting a Convention on Forests.

The Japanese delegation also pointed out the importance of trade. However, the context of their assertion was different. They emphasized consideration of the environmental aspects of trade, but developing countries stressed the importance of ensuring access to developed countries' markets for their products.

In the negotiation process, the developing countries emphasized the importance of technology transfer (capacity building) and financial resources. They recognized the importance of actions at the international level rather than at national levels. In contrast, the developed countries emphasized the importance of actions at the national level. For example, the European Union made proposals emphasizing actions at the national level in the negotiation process on decisions of the PoA. Behind this conflict was the developed countries' intention to avoid increasing the burden of providing financial assistance. However, technology transfer and financial resources are crucial for the implementation of international instruments. Therefore, there is a necessity for other measures for implementing international instruments related to sustainable forest management.

Monitoring, assessment, and reporting were discussed as alternate measures for implementing the international instruments other than technology transfer and financial resources. In particular, the New Zealand delegation proposed to utilize the criteria and indicators being developed in each region for the monitoring process. However, there were several oppositions to this proposal. (The next section provides a more detailed discus-

sion.)

Regarding the “involvement of major groups,” the U.S. proposed to open the door for all non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to participate in the UNFF sessions. In the IPF/IFF processes, NGOs were required to obtain NGO status with ECOSOC, however this rule presented an obstacle for many NGOs to participate in both processes. The procedure for obtaining ECOSOC NGO status takes a long time, and many NGOs face difficulties in acquire this status, particularly small NGOs. The U.S. delegation pointed out this fact and insisted on permitting the participation of all NGOs to ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders. However, the developing countries expressed doubt for the necessity of participation of “all” stakeholders. They insisted that the UNFF should discuss forest issues at the global level, and pointed out that it should avoid discussion on “micro” forest issues and that participation of “all” stakeholders would lead to such discussions. In the end, the rules applied to the MYPOW do not recognize the participation of all possible stakeholders; thus in order to participate in the UNFF, NGOs must obtain ECOSOC NGO status.

### 3-3 Outline of decisions<sup>1</sup>

#### 3-3-1 The decision on the Multi-Year Program of Work

The MYPOW decision consists of eight parts: Preamble; Structure; Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting; High-level Segments; Inter-sessional Work by ad hoc Expert Groups and Country-led Initiatives; Involvement of Major Groups; Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination; and Review.

In the first major part, Structure, several issues, such as combating deforestation, forest health and productivity, are pointed out as issues to be discussed in each session, and there is a timetable of discussion in order to continue policy dialogue in the UNFF (Table 1). The next part, Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting, was recognized as one of the principal functions of the UNFF in the ECOSOC resolution. In the decision, countries are invited to report on progress of implementation of the IPF/IFF Proposals for Actions on a voluntary basis. The MYPOW also schedules the high-level segment that ministers related to forest issues in each country will attend in the second and fifth meetings in order to strengthen policy commitment in the third part, High-level Segments. In the ECOSOC resolution, the UNFF can establish an ad hoc expert's working group in order to elaborate important issues related to sustainable forest management. In the part on Inter-sessional Work by ad hoc

Expert Groups and Country-led Initiatives, the duration and issues of ad hoc working groups are decided. The issues to be dealt with by the ad hoc working groups are monitoring, assessment and reporting; finance and technology transfer; and the parameters of the mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests. Since participation of all stakeholders is also required in the ECOSOC resolution, paragraphs related to participation of all stakeholders are in the section on Involvement of Major Groups. Coordination of international organizations and treaties related to sustainable forest management is also described as one of the key functions of the UNFF in the ECOSOC resolution. Hence, the importance of coordination is emphasized, and the CPF is required to support the UNFF in this regard in the Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination section. After five years of activities, the UNFF will be reviewed in an ECOSOC resolution. Detailed criteria are described in order to review activities of the UNFF in the final part, Review.

#### 3-3-2 The decision on the proposals of actions

There is no definition of proposals of actions (PoA) in the decision, but it seems that the PoA was expected to describe necessary actions for realizing sustainable forest management according to the decision. The decision can be divided into two parts. The first part describes the general direction of the PoA. It seems that the part plays the same role as the Preamble. The second part is described as an annex, where detailed information is described.

In the first part, the decision decided “to adopt the Plan of Action of the UNFF as appears in the annex” and invites “Ministers to endorse the Plan of Action at the high-level ministerial segment at the second session.” Then the decision requires ministers “to consider transmitting it as one of the inputs of the UNFF process to the preparatory committee of the World Summit on Sustainable Development.”

In the second part, the annex consists of seven parts. First, there is a preamble of the annex, then there are substantive sections as follows: Activities at the National Level, Activities of the CPF and its Members, Elements, Financial Resources and Other Means of Implementation, Targets, and Activities Related to Reporting.

In the preamble, the decision emphasizes the importance of activities for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposal actions at the national level by stating that “the responsibility of the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action is directed at the national level,” even though the role of international society is also described as an important one. The decision also requires the establishment of national focal points, effective cooperation among relevant international organizations and national organizations, such as bilateral donors and public and private partnerships, and active stakeholder participation in order to implement the IPF/IFF proposals for action. However, other detailed actions required at both

<sup>1</sup> This section is based on the “Report of the United Nations Forum on Forests on its first session” (E/2001/42 [Part II] - E/CN.18/2001/3 [Part II]). This document is still an advance version text and will be issued in final form as *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Supplement No. 22* (E/2001/42/Rev. 1).

Table 1 Structure of UNFF sessions.

Means of implementation: Finance; Transfer of environmentally sound technologies; Capacity building				
Common Items for Each Session: multi-stakeholder dialogue; enhanced cooperation and policy and program coordination, <i>inter alia</i> , with the CPF; country experiences and lessons learned; emerging issues relevant to country implementation; intersessional work; monitoring, assessment, and reporting; implementation of the Plan of Action; promoting public participation; national forest programmes; trade; enabling environment				
<p style="text-align: center;">UNFF 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption of the MYPOW</li> <li>• Development and adoption of a Plan of Action</li> <li>• Initiation of the work of the UNFF with CPF</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">UNFF 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combating deforestation &amp; forest degradation</li> <li>• Forest conservation &amp; protection of unique types of forests &amp; fragile ecosystems</li> <li>• Rehabilitation &amp; conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover</li> <li>• Rehabilitation &amp; restoration of degraded lands</li> <li>• Promotion of natural and planted forests</li> <li>• Concepts, terminology, and definitions</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">UNFF 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic aspects of forests</li> <li>• Forest health &amp; productivity</li> <li>• Maintaining forest cover to meet present &amp; future needs</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">UNFF 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traditional forest-related knowledge (TFRK)</li> <li>• Forest-related scientific knowledge</li> <li>• Social &amp; cultural aspects of forests</li> <li>• Monitoring, assessment &amp; reporting, and concepts, terminology &amp; definitions</li> <li>• Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">UNFF 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of progress and consideration on future actions</li> <li>• On the basis of the assessment referred to in paragraph 2(e) of ECOSOC resolution E/2000/35, consider, with a view to recommending to ECOSOC, and through it to the General Assembly, the parameters of a mandate for developing a legal framework on all types of forests</li> <li>• Review the effectiveness of the international arrangements for forests</li> </ul>
	Ministerial Segment			Ministerial Segment

Source: Report of the United Nations Forum on Forests on its first session\*E/2001/42 (Part II)–E/CN.18/2001/3 (Part II).

levels are not clear even in the paragraphs and sections that follow.

The section on Activities at the National Level it describes necessary actions or measures to be taken. First, countries “will set their own national priority, targets, and timetables for the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action,” and will “systematically assess and analyze the IPF/IFF proposals for action in the national context.” Then, “to cluster the proposals for actions” is pointed out as a means of facilitating assessment. In the paragraph, there are three measures other than the setting of priorities and assessment: development or strengthening of a national forest program, voluntary reporting of implementation in each country, and involvement of relevant stakeholders in the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

In the section on Activities of the CPF and its Members, the decision requires the CPF to support the UNFF and countries, in particular developing countries, by identifying and mobilizing “various financial opportunities” within existing frameworks among CPF members. Regarding other detailed actions and measures, the CPF is only required by the decision “to consider what contributions they can make.”

There are sixteen elements in the section on Elements as important tools for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action:

1. Formulation and implementation of national forest programs
2. Promoting public participation
3. Combating deforestation and forest degradation
4. Traditional forest related knowledge (TFRK)
5. Forest-related scientific knowledge

6. Forest health and productivity
7. Criteria and indicators of sustainable forest management
8. Economic, social, and cultural aspects of forests
9. Forest conservation and protection of unique types of forests and fragile ecosystems
10. Monitoring, assessment, and reporting; concepts and terminology definitions
11. Rehabilitation and conservation strategies for countries with low forest cover
12. Rehabilitation and restoration of degraded lands, and the promotion of natural and planted forests
13. Maintaining forest cover to meet present and future needs
14. Financial resources
15. International trade and sustainable forest management
16. International cooperation in capacity building, access to and transfer of environmentally sound technologies to support sustainable forest management

Financial assistance, technology transfer, and capacity building are important to implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for actions in developing countries and there are several descriptions in the section on Financial Resources and Other Means of Implementation. The decision urges all relevant actors “to give greater priority to sustainable forest management,” in particular developed countries, to fulfill the commitment at the Rio Summit to allocate 0.7 percent of GNP for official development assistance. Also, the decision recognizes the importance of the trade issue and declares to deal with it in the following sessions, but the decision doesn't men-

tion any detailed actions or measures.

In the section on Targets, the decision requires countries to set up targets and timetables related to the implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

The section on Activities Related to Reporting describes necessary actions for monitoring, assessment, and reporting. The decision requires countries and relevant organizations to report voluntarily "their implementation of IPF/IFF proposals for actions...drawing upon existing formats, as appropriate." In the report, "achievement, gaps, and obstacles" will be included. Submission of a report is also encouraged for relevant stakeholders. It is apparent that the PoA will be reviewed based on information from reports submitted to the UNFF.

### **3-3-3 The decision of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests**

The decision of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF) consists of a preamble part and text. Member organizations of the CPF, as listed in a footnote of the preamble, are the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Center for International Forestry Research, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, International Tropical Timber Organization, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, and the World Bank.

In the text, coordination is emphasized as a key function of the CPF. Supporting implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for actions at national levels is also stressed. On supporting implementation, use of CPF members' expertise and effective coordination among the member organizations are required. In particular, assistance for monitoring, assessment, and reporting activities at national levels are pointed out as important tasks for the CPF.

## **4 A brief analysis of the meeting**

### **4-1 Monitoring as a measure of implementation in the UNFF**

As mentioned above, "Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting" were recognized as important tools for implementation of the international instruments. Among several important topics, one of them was a proposal from the New Zealand delegation insisting on utilizing the "Criteria and Indicators" being developed in each region as mentioned above. This proposal was useful for maintaining an objective monitoring system. However, several countries opposed this proposal. Finally, it was included as "Stressing the importance of use of regional and national criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management as a basis for reporting on sustainable forest management." Hence, using the criteria and indicators depend on each country.

Beside this, there was a problem on demarcation be-

tween the MYPOW and the PoA regarding monitoring, assessment, and reporting. In the PoA, there was a section titled "Monitoring, Assessment, and Reporting" in the draft of the decision on the PoA. It caused some argument, and finally, the name of the section in the decision regarding the PoA was changed to "Activities related to reporting." However, it is difficult to distinguish a difference in their roles or their relationships on the matter of monitoring and reporting. At the same time, a similar description was found in the decision on the PoA, such as a voluntary reporting system, calling for international assistance for developing countries, etc. Some countries emphasized the importance of coordination between the decisions on MYPOW and the PoA, but it is difficult to identify such coordination from the decision.

Regarding submitting a report to the UNFF, some developing countries expressed concern about the duplication of work within each national government. They explained that they receive many requests to submit reports related to environmental issues, creating heavy workloads for these governments. Hence, a reference to drawing upon the "existing format" of reports is included in the decision on the PoA. However, these paragraphs only mention drawing upon existing ones, and coordination among reports for the UNFF and the others is still a question.

### **4-2 Concern about repetition of the IPF/IFF**

As mentioned above, the ECOSOC resolution did not require the adoption of a decision on the PoA in the first meeting of the UNFF, but required one in UNFF 2. However, from the beginning of the session several delegations made statements calling for adopting the decision of the PoA in UNFF 1. Finally, their demands led the other countries to adopt the decision of the PoA in UNFF 1, giving the impression that almost all countries take a positive stand on achieving sustainable forest management. However, there are many problems with the decision.

Even though the decision was adopted earlier than anticipated, there were few detailed actions described. Those seeking to find concrete actions for achieving sustainable forest management will face difficulties due to the overly general descriptions in the decision. For example, there are several paragraphs in the section on Activities at the National Level, but there are not many detailed actions required.

In order to ensure the effective implementation of the IPF/IFF Proposals of Actions, the PoA should describe more substantive actions, such as zoning, the establishment of protected areas, etc., even though setting uniform measures or actions at the global level is impossible due to diversity of the situations at each regional, national, and local level. Suggestions for concrete measures or actions are necessary and meaningful for implementation. Indication of concrete measures for ac-

achieving sustainable forest management is required for the PoA. In one paragraph, the development and enhancement of national forest programs is described as an action for implementation. Another paragraph also points out the necessity of participation of all stakeholders. There are no descriptions related to substantive actions other than these. Besides, these actions were already described in the IPF/IFF proposals for action and cannot be considered as measures for their implementation. The same thing can be said for the sections on Activities of the CPF and its Members, Financial Resources, and Other Means of Implementation. Almost all these descriptions duplicate the actions described in the IPF/IFF proposals for action.

In the “Elements” section, sixteen elements are listed as tools for implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action, as mentioned above. However, there is no description on detailed actions required by each tool. Besides, some elements cannot be said to be tools, such as forest health and productivity or the economic, social, and cultural aspects of forests. These elements cannot be called tools for implementing IPF/IFF proposals for action, but rather issues dealt with by these instruments. In the IPF/IFF process, the work of categorizing these issues and tools was not done, and a confusing category remained. The list is one of the results of the IFF process, but the confusion around categories in the IFF discussions still affects the UNFF. Therefore, these decisions cannot dispel concern that the problems of the IPF and IFF processes will be repeated.

## 5 Agenda for the following sessions

### 5-1 Coordination between the MYPOW and PoA for an effective monitoring system

Regarding the contents of the decisions, there is duplication between the decisions of the MYPOW and PoA, as mentioned above. The duplication can be seen in the issue of monitoring, assessment, and reporting. These descriptions are overlapping and there is no consideration for identifying the roles of the MYPOW and PoA—they should supplement each other. The concrete measures to supplement each other will be an issue in the following sessions.

Both the MYPOW and the PoA could not describe concrete actions regarding financial resources and technology transfer. These measures are crucial for effective implementation of international instruments. Accordingly, the UNFF should seek other measures. In this regard, the use of criteria and indicators for monitoring, assessment, and reporting will be very important. Hence monitoring, assessment, and reporting can be key measures required at the international level in the UNFF in order to facilitate implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. Hence, coordination among them will be an important issue.

### 5-2 Coordination among the members of the Collaborative Partnership on Forests

To facilitate implementation of existing international instruments and the work of the UNFF, the CPF can be important in the following discussion.

As mentioned above, strengthening of the secretariat would be difficult, however the CPF will be able to supplement the lack of capacity of the secretariat based on their expertise. For example, the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), one of the CPF members, can support secretariat activities, in particular the technical aspects, with their knowledge and the results of their research activities.

As mentioned above, no financial mechanism was created in the UNFF. The members of the CPF have also conducted activities related to sustainable forest management. Hence, these activities can contribute to achieving sustainable forest management and implementation of the IPF/IFF proposals for action. For example, the ITTO has implemented many projects on tropical forests. The Convention on Biological Diversity also has working programs on forests, and now a technical expert group is working to identify options for conservation and the sustainable use of the biological diversity of forests. These activities are connected with the UNFF and can promote implementation of the IPF/IFF proposal actions. Besides, they have financial resources, and favorable allocation of these resources for projects or activities will contribute to UNFF activities.

Although there is much expectation for the CPF, the decision just describes the CPF's principal functions. Hence, a detailed work plan will be on the agenda for the following sessions.

### 5-3 Necessity of a strong secretariat

There are not many personnel in the secretariat, compared with the demands of preparing documents for the sessions. In order to prepare for each session adequately, the secretariat should prepare documents in the period between sessions. However, the number of secretariat staff is just nine and they need to manage other logistical work. Even though this is still a transitional period, efforts are needed to work efficiently, and an increase in the number of staff is particularly important. However, several delegations stressed that the UNFF secretariat should be “compact” (i.e., small in size and with high quality personnel), and appeared to have an interest in delaying the work of the UNFF in order to prevent the start of a discussion on the necessity of a new legal instrument on forest management. They do in fact have grounds in the ECOSOC resolution for their assertion. Since a “compact” secretariat was also required by the ECOSOC resolution, it will be difficult to increase the number of secretariat staff. However, effective work is necessary in order to promote and facilitate debate within the UNFF and this issue should be considered in future sessions.

**Reference**

Report of the United Nations Forum on Forests on its first session (E/2001/42 [Part II] - E/CN.18/2001/3 [Part II]). This

document is still an advance text version and will be issued in final form as Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Supplement No. 22 (E/2001/42/Rev. 1).