

ANNEX 5 FINNISH POSITIONS IN INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Summary of Finnish Activity at the Intergovernmental Level

UNFF:

Year/Event or Document	Further explanation of Finland position
Since 1993	
Participation in MCPFE process for Pan-European C&I for SFM	
2000–2008	
Responsible for 5.3% of UNFF Trust Fund contributions	
2002	
Pekka Patosaari appointed Head of UNFF Secretariat	
National Report to UNFF-3	<p>Key points:</p> <p>National Forest Programme 2010 approved by Government, 1999.</p> <p>Certification introduced, 2000</p> <p>Regional characteristics in sustainable harvesting objectives, 2001</p> <p>National Forest Committee as multi-stakeholder forum to discuss implementation and future of the NFP and resolve potential conflicts.</p> <p>M&E of forest resources in national forest inventories since 1921;</p> <p>Estimates and collection of information of some non-wood products National C&I, 2000</p> <p>Economic incentives to guide sustainable forestry</p>

2003	
Participant in <i>Ad Hoc</i> Expert Group on Approaches and Mechanisms for Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting	
EUR 200,000 grant to UNFF to boost SFM practices and inter-regional cooperation	
2004	
21st International Meeting for Specialists in Air Pollution Effects on Forest Ecosystems “Forests Under Changing Climate, Enhanced UV and Air Pollution”, Oulu, Finland	
Hosted Conference on Forest Landscape Restoration in Central and Northern Europe	<p>Finnish papers presented on: Metsähallitus Natural Resource Plan: Case Western Finland 2004–2013</p> <p>The Finnish National Urban Park (NUP) Concept as Part of Sustainable Urban Planning</p> <p>Evaluating Potential Protection Areas by Means of Multi-Attribute Priority Analysis for the Central Karelia Herb-rich Forest Network Pilot Project in Eastern Finland</p>
National Report to UNFF-5	<p>Key points: Active private sector participation in NFP implementation as key in enhancing stakeholder buy-in and financial commitment, but time consuming and laborious.</p> <p>NFP has targets</p> <p>Cooperation and partnerships with other countries: Baltics, Russia, Mexico, China, Indonesia, Brazil, Turkey</p> <p>Development cooperation: Forestry as a means for rural livelihoods and an instrument for poverty reduction</p>

	<p>Numerous multi-stakeholder bodies on forest issues at national level, participatory planning for state forests</p> <p>Relatively comprehensive network of protected areas</p> <p>METSU Programme (test, 2003–2007): to preserve valuable forest habitats while allowing forests to be commercially utilised to benefit rural economies and livelihoods</p> <p>Regulations on forest management in environmentally critical areas requiring special preservation:</p> <p>Tree felling permitted only in accordance with a felling and regeneration plan approved by the local forestry centre</p> <p>Conservation and nature protection programmes or multiple use Finnish Statistical Yearbook of Forestry, 2002→: emphasis on developing account system for non-wood products and services</p> <p>Private ownership of most forests in Finland but with Government support for ecosystem conservation and enhancement, landscape management</p> <p>Deforestation should be presented in terms of lost jobs and costs; and forests as a resource to help human development. Forestry sector must present itself as an opportunity and resource to advance human and economic development.</p> <p>95% of Finnish forests certified, based on PEFC C&I for SFM; Finland national FSC standard developed, awaiting accreditation by international FSC. Promotion of forest certification as a voluntary market-based tool and government facilitation of mutual recognition processes.</p> <p>Emphasis on cross-sectoral linkages, coordination and cooperation; all relevant administrative sectors and stakeholders involved in formulation of forestry policies, strategies and programmes and biodiversity action plan</p>
--	--

	<p>Right to pick non-protected wild berries, mushrooms and flowers in forests and wilderness regardless of land ownership</p> <p>No regulation of access and rights to genetic resources</p> <p>Hunting rights usually tied to land ownership, except in northern Finland, for local inhabitants on state land. Inhabitants, village committees and local organisations participate in process of preparing management plans for forest close to or in built-up areas</p> <p>Act on Metsähallitus (1993): natural resource management in the Sami area must not harm their traditional livelihood and culture</p> <p>Finnish Constitution guarantees the Sami people a right for cultural autonomy in their homeland area but not that the land should be transferred to the Sami people. Disputed by the Sami: attempts to resolve the question, including research study to clarify ownership matters, to be finalised in 2005.</p> <p>Private forest owners' role in issues concerning TFRK, in addition to that from indigenous people, must be emphasised; IPR or other protection for TFRK not applicable.</p> <p>Promotes international networking and dissemination of scientific knowledge.</p> <p>Research community participation in the NFP formulation, including in Future Forest Forum</p> <p>Finnish National Forest Inventory (NFI): one of world's oldest, based on systematic cluster sampling</p> <p>Monitoring of wildlife, berries and mushrooms</p> <p>Pan-European C&I for SFM updated and revised at the Ministerial Conference in Vienna in 2003.</p>
	<p>C&I contribution to building national consensus on content of SFM and formulating and implementing</p>

	<p>NFP, and linking the two; use of some biodiversity indicators</p> <p>NFPs formulation processes must make clear that not all forest sector financing should come from the government; all stakeholders should be prepared to invest, otherwise may well lack funding for implementation.</p> <p>Means of implementation: The processes for policy and NFP formulation and implementation have also been found to provide a vehicle for improved donor coordination and improved mechanisms for common forest sector financing, like Sector Wide Approach.</p>
2005	
Hosted UNEP Course on International Environmental Law-making and Diplomacy	Special theme: forests
2007	
McDermott, O'Carroll and Wood: International Forest Policy – the instruments, agreements and processes that shape it, June 2007	Published when Jan McAlpine takes over as head of UNFF
2008	
Workshop: “Forests in the changing environment”, Finland, September 2008, under MCPFE Work Programme	<p>Conclusions advocating:</p> <p>Promoting and communicating the role of forests in sustainable development</p> <p>Mainstreaming of sustainable forest management</p> <p>Strengthening coordination and collaboration</p> <p>Improving forest governance</p> <p>Promoting forest products and bioenergy</p> <p>Addressing climate change impacts, risks and adaptation</p> <p>Improving monitoring and terminology</p>

	Developing economic valuation of the multiple products and services of forests
High level UNFF event on the MDGs, 25 September	Under MDG 8 – develop global partnership for development – Finland announced an increase of sustainable forestry financing
Finland’s ‘Voluntary Sharing of Information on Progress’ on NLBI	<p>“NLBI has been recognized through the NFP” and “Finland’s Development Policy Program 2007”(no details given)</p> <p>Statements on enhancement of stakeholder participation at national level</p> <p>Finland Forest Certification Scheme (FFCS) criteria (1999) being revised for second time, expected to be ready by May 2009.</p> <p>METSO Programme, under NFP 2015, combines protection and commercial use of forests, based on voluntary actions by landowners, aiming to halt decline in forest habitats and species and establish stable favourable trends in forest biodiversity by 2016, financed by government</p> <p>Support for scientific research, including several research programmes at national level</p> <p>Tax reduction on timber sales, to secure timber supply</p> <p>Reducing deforestation a key element of Finland’s Development Policy Programme 2007</p> <p>NFP aim to create a balanced whole for the different uses of forests</p>
2010	
National Report to UNFF-9	<p>Key points: National Forest Programme 2015</p> <p>Bioeconomy</p> <p>Support for CLI in China, 2009 (see below)</p> <p>Support for Major Group Initiative in Ghana, 2010</p> <p>Support for protected areas</p>

	<p>National public procurement policy on legality and sustainability of timber and wood products, taking into account the life cycle of wood and wood products</p> <p>Contribution to FRA 2010 and State of Europe's Forests Report</p>
<p>“Enhancing the legality of the international timber trade: creating enabling environments and on opportunities for the private sector and other stakeholders”</p>	<p>CLI in support of the UNFF organized by the Governments of Viet Nam, Finland, the Netherlands, and the United States, Viet Nam, 15-19 November 2010</p>

UNFCCC:

Year/Event or Document	Further explanation of Finland position
2003	
<p>Hosted UNFCCC SBI and SBSTA Workshops on synergies and cooperation with other conventions</p>	<p>Focus on the Rio Conventions: UNFCCC, CBD, and CCD</p>
2005	
<p>“The Finnish CDM/JI Pilot Programme: Activities, Experiences and Lessons Learned”</p>	<p>Lessons learned: Secured long-term funding is essential for the coordinated and efficient application of project-based mechanisms.</p> <p>Many project developers require support in project design and implementation (technical assistance, advance payments or grants)</p> <p>The private sector needs to be better informed about project-based mechanisms and the opportunities they offer</p> <p>JI and CDM projects of the Pilot Programme seem to generate emission reductions at a competitive price, even when accounting for transaction costs (although cost estimates are should be interpreted cautiously). Transaction costs vary greatly from project to project, and they can be reduced through capacity building activities.</p>

2006	
“Post-2012 and Reporting” submission to UNFCCC for COP-12	<p>Current system of LULUCF reporting contains possibilities for unbalanced accounting</p> <p>Need for balance between level of disaggregation and the resources available for inventory</p> <p>Requirements for LULUCF-sector reporting and accounting need to be different for developing and developed countries.</p> <p>Applying AI LULUCF system to NAI countries not realistic for most NAI countries due to lack of resources and data</p> <p>Launching the concept of AFOLU-sector may confuse already difficult negotiations when discussing the inclusion of LULUCF-sector in the future commitments.</p> <p>Sinks and sources of LULUCF sector are unevenly distributed globally. In many developing countries with high deforestation rate, the most efficient measure in climate change mitigation would be the maintenance of existing C reservoirs e.g by reducing the rate of deforestation.</p>
2007	
FINADAPT study	Appraises socio-economic impacts of climate change for Finland
Statement of Minister of the Environment of Finland, Mr. Kimmo Tiilikainen, December 12, 2007 in Bali (COP-12)	<p>Key points: Role of private investments is crucial</p> <p>Must establish investment environment where clean technology is the most profitable choice anywhere that investment takes place; to create necessary level playing field we need a global carbon market to set a price for carbon emissions</p> <p>Range of complex direct and indirect factors in deforestation: illegal logging, fires, and forest conversion to agriculture...require distinct policy measures. To address deforestation: ⇒ SFM supports climate efforts, especially through carbon uptake in forests and harvested wood prod-</p>

	<p>ucts and renewable biomass energy. Finland's history proves that such an approach can achieve environmental, economic and social benefits for the society as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Solve institutional and governance issues Resolve property rights conflicts over forest land and resources and strengthen land tenure institutions ⇒ Clarify authority and responsibility for protecting forests and forest related decision-making ⇒ Promote access of rural communities to land and forest resources, equitable benefit sharing, and indigenous peoples' rights. ⇒ Policies, institutions and mechanisms that strengthen the resilience of local communities, for pro-poor approaches to adaptation and mitigation. <p>Contributions financing for mitigation and adaptation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ US \$5 million pledge to World Bank FCPF. ⇒ EUR 800.000 pledge to LDC Fund ⇒ EUR 400.000 to Special Climate Change Fund under UNFCCC Financial Mechanism ⇒ Additional to our annual contributions to the funds.
2009	
<p>Global Canopy Programme, <i>The Little REDD+ Book</i>: EU REDD proposal (Finland works through EU on all climate change policy negotiations)</p>	<p>Policies should focus on positive incentives to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation while promoting conservation, SFM and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.</p> <p>Incentives based on ambitious but realistic agreed national reference emissions levels, taking into account national circumstances and negotiated and revised periodically.</p> <p>Sub-national approaches may be appropriate under some national circumstances but national reference emission levels are essential to avoiding leakage within national boundaries.</p> <p>A REDD+ mechanism requires significant scaling up of public and private financial flows to developing countries</p>

	<p>REDD+ VERs could be used in the medium-term for compliance subject to strict quantitative limitations</p> <p>Medium to long-term: could phase VERs into the international carbon market: a well designed market-linked approach can contribute to long-term action.</p>
2010	
<p>Established Designated Focal Point required for Joint Implementation projects; has submitted national guidelines and procedures for approving JI projects to the Joint I Supervisory Committee</p>	

EU:

Year/Event or Document	Further explanation of Finland position
Natura 2000 Programme	Planning and implementation of national systems of protected areas, including guidelines, criteria and targets for selection
Forest Focus Framework Regulation, 2003:	On forest monitoring and environmental interactions in the European Community: to combine legislation on these concerns
EU Action Plan for Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT), 2003	Support for improved governance in wood-producing countries, and a licensing scheme to ensure that only legal timber enters the EU Finland: All major Finnish companies have fibre tracking systems based on ISO (14001 and 9002) and EMAS management systems, certified by independent third party bodies

Biodiversity:

Year/Event or Document	Further explanation of Finland position
2003	
<p><i>Ad hoc</i> Technical Expert Group on Biological Diversity and Climate Change, "Inter-linkages between Biological Diversity and Climate Change: Advice on the integration of biodiver-</p>	<p>Finnish financial and administrative support</p>

<p>sity considerations into the implementation of the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol”</p>	
<p>2006</p>	
<p>University of Joensuu – UNEP Course on International Environmental Law-making and Diplomacy, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa</p>	<p>Special theme: biodiversity</p>
<p>2008</p>	
<p>Council of the EU: Preparation for CBD COP 9 – Council conclusions</p>	<p>Key points:</p> <p>URGES COP 9 to address firmly the need for enhanced and effective collaboration at all levels between the Rio Conventions and other related instruments and processes, including work on REDD, as well as on other relevant mitigation and adaptation measures, and to determine ways to ensure that the CBD contributes to the process launched by the UNFCCC Bali Action Plan to maximise co-benefits and achieve greater synergies between climate change and biodiversity policies;</p> <p>4. EMPHASISING rapid implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, UNDERLINES its full commitment to implementing the Natura 2000 network on Protected Areas; STRESSES the need to meet the PoW’s specific targets; STRESSES the urgent need to develop more effective measures and adequate technical and financial support to establish and better manage protected areas in the regions in which they are most needed;</p> <p>WELCOMES LifeWeb Initiative aimed at matching voluntary commitments for designating and managing protected areas with voluntary commitments from donors for dedicated (co-)financing;</p> <p>ENCOURAGES Member States and the Commission to participate in this initiative;</p> <p>WELCOMES the work on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agricul-</p>

	<p>ture and the MYPOW of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture encompassing plant, animal, aquatic, forest and microbial genetic resources and aiming, <i>inter alia</i>, at the achievement of MDGs 1 and 7 and at climate change mitigation and adaptation</p>
<p>2005</p>	
<p>National Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Finland 2006–2016</p>	<p>Key points: The EU resolved to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010.</p> <p>Ecosystem capacities can be somewhat restored, for instance through reforestation, but forest plantations cannot compensate for loss of natural levels of forest biodiversity</p> <p>In spite of many positive developments, the measures within the National Action Plan will not be sufficient to halt or significantly slow Finland's ongoing decline in biodiversity by 2010. Many of the negative trends, for instance in Finland's forests, have emerged over long periods, while earlier practices may still result in delayed impacts on biodiversity, even though forestry methods have changed significantly in recent decades. Meanwhile, changes in forestry and the spread of residential areas in recent decades have resulted in new trends that impoverish the natural environment. (Not fully consistent with the Environment Minister's statement – above - that 'Finland's history proves that such an approach [SFM] can achieve environmental, economic and social benefits for society as a whole'.</p> <p>The need to safeguard biodiversity is understood in Finland, but the measures of the Action Plan have been insufficient to halt or reverse Finland's negative trend in biodiversity.</p> <p>Current trends: Legislative changes, such as the protection of biotopes under the Nature Conservation Act and sustainable forestry support scheme.</p> <p>New forestry guidelines applied in commercially managed forests</p>

	<p>Metsähallitus's natural resource planning procedures and habitat restoration work in protected areas,</p> <p>Agrienvironmental subsidy schemes.</p> <p>New drainage schemes no longer supported in forestry plans</p> <p>Landowners' opinions given more weight in efforts to safeguard biodiversity;</p> <p>Increased research means much more data is now available, providing a basis for planned changes in activities, more applied research, and increasing recognition of biodiversity's value</p> <p>METSO Forest Biodiversity Programme for Southern Finland: successful voluntary and market-based conservation; could be adapted and applied to improve conservation networks of other kinds and in other regions</p> <p>Increases in areas of forest under protection, improvements in quality of protected forests through habitat restoration schemes, and development of natural forest management practices for commercially managed forests.</p> <p>Hindrances: levels of expertise and adaptive natural resource management practices not yet been sufficiently developed</p> <p>need to increase quantities of decaying wood in commercially managed forests, not just protected areas, to improve prospects for species dependent on decaying wood.</p> <p>for economic or social reasons, relatively little prominence given to biodiversity in construction, forestry and agriculture.</p> <p>lack of research data, training and information to facilitate practical consideration of biodiversity issues by landowners and others.</p>
--	---

forest species are still increasingly threatened in Finland:

⇒ protective measures are slow to take full effect.
⇒ without further measures the numbers of forest species becoming threatened or extinct in Finland will continue rising in near future. Further measures particularly needed to safeguard forest biodiversity in Southern Finland

Not enough is known about the biodiversity of farmland and forest soils.

Goals:

expand network of protected areas, improve linkages between them, increasingly manage and restore habitats in PAs, develop natural management methods for commercially managed forests.

The ecosystem approach: Methods derived from this approach are already used in regional forestry planning. Such approaches must also be more widely applied in regional planning related to management and use of natural resources, but the often complex related concepts, principles and guidelines need clarifying.

The ecosystem approach can be applied in EIAs for plans and programmes, where real alternatives and wider regions can more easily be assessed. Evaluations should pay more attention to the practical benefits that can be obtained from biodiversity, and how projects will affect the availability of such benefits to different groups.

Adopt the ecosystem approach, safeguard ecosystem services, and conduct EIAs to ensure that the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is considered in all administrative sectors and help clarify the responsibilities of different actors.

Build knowledge base and public awareness through improved collaboration between researchers, officials and educational institutes

Strengthen cooperation between ministries and other organisations

	<p>Improve Finland's international influence</p> <p>Incorporate objective of halting biodiversity loss into other MEAs and make them support each other more effectively</p> <p>Free trade is part of economic mainstream thinking, but it is important to attempt socio-political measures to prevent any harmful impacts that could endanger ecosystem services, such as through international legal agreements; implementing them requires sharing responsibility between developed and developing countries and safeguarding the prerequisites for legislative, administrative and political stability in both</p>
<p>National Action Plan for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Finland 2006–2016</p>	<p>Key points:</p> <p>Forests most widespread habitat type in Finland</p> <p>greatly shaped by humans over the centuries</p> <p>use of forests over last 100 years based on extensive inventories of timber resources and forestry research, with intensification after Second World War largely to improve timber production</p> <p>total annual timber growth usually exceeds timber logged by about 40 million M³; rapid rise in amount of timber imported into Finland for use by the forest industries in recent years.</p> <p>no major investments made any longer in improving exploitation of forest resources (<i>e.g.</i>, mire drainage, forest road-building); conditions for forestry and the forest industries in Finland now less advantageous.</p> <p>Impacts from climate change expected: increased growth rates, higher tree lines, changes in species composition, northward shifts in ranges, and increased risks of natural damage; this ongoing trend may accelerate if the climate changes as forecast.</p> <p>Even though Finland's forest resources are used sustainably in terms of timber production, forest biodiversity has been impoverished, especially in the south: Likelihood of extinction still rising for many</p>

species, many of them in the few remaining isolated old-growth forests of Southern Finland

Tools of the METSO programme: natural values trading, competitive tendering, nature management areas and co-operation networks, with voluntary participation of landowners and using criteria defined by conservation biologists for defining forest habitats requiring most urgent action, to halt declining trends through combination of a regionally comprehensive network of PAs and application of natural forestry methods in commercially managed forests.

Forest habitats have been restored in protected areas in Finland for >10 years; habitat restoration should be carried out on a local and regional scale to ensure that it increases the ecological value of protected areas and supports development of an ecologically functioning network of protected areas; monitoring methods should be devised for restored habitats and a monitoring network established and maintained in state-owned PAs. Measures to restore the natural state should also be initiated in protected areas on private land where necessary. Forest habitat restoration methods should be improved to make them also applicable in commercially managed forests.

Cross-cutting measures:

Legislative and administrative instruments should be developed and range of policy instruments should be expanded, increasing the role of voluntary actions by various stakeholders.

Appreciation of the economic aspects of biodiversity should be increased. Motivating and expedient economic instruments should be applied to promote the conservation and management of biodiversity.

Environmental education on biodiversity should be promoted from nursery and preschool to higher education, with biodiversity monitoring data made easily available free of charge for education.

Public awareness of the ecological basis of biodiversity and of the benefits of conservation for the national economy, business and individuals should be increased. Information should be compiled on good practices and methods and disseminated, even on difficult themes, in an intelligible and motivating way, stressing the responsibility of people for national species and biotopes.

The concept of the ecosystem approach has been difficult for people in Finland to grasp fully. It has been suggested that the term “sustainable use” (CBD COP-7, Decision VII/12, 2004) should instead be used more widely with its related concepts. Principles of sustainable use that consider natural ecosystems have been applied in several projects in Finland, thanks to established planning practices, comprehensive legislation, a working group culture that incorporates interest groups, and participatory planning. In natural resource plans drawn up for state-owned commercially managed forests but also applied in multi-objective forest planning for privately owned forest. Principles of sustainable use that account for natural systems should be applied in EIAs, especially at the planning and programming level. The perspective of sustainable use of nature should be given prominence in planning. EIAs should pay attention to the practical benefits of biodiversity and to how a project will affect various groups’ access to these benefits.

Natural systems should be duly considered in land use planning and road planning. Planning should be based on thorough studies of the natural environment that allow for ecosystems to function outside of the planning zone. Damage from fragmentation of continuous natural areas should be prevented or reduced.

Appreciation of the economic linkages of biodiversity should be increased with a view to innovation and new forms of livelihood.

Effects of climate change on biodiversity should be investigated to expedite actions necessary to reduce or adapt to harmful impacts

Assessment and monitoring of the environmental safety of use of GMOs in Finland should be reliable and of a high standard. Development of genetic applications that enhance the state of the environment should be promoted. Possible negative environmental impacts related to GMOs should be prevented.

Aim to control alien species in Finland through cooperation between officials both nationally and internationally: to identify potential alien species and their pathways and detect invasion attempts early. Functioning systems are needed for monitoring, information exchange and risk assessment, and improved cooperation between public authorities, in order to benefit from each sector's expertise on management of alien species

Indigenous rights:

Finland has not ratified ILO Convention no. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (Article 14: the right of indigenous peoples to own and possess the lands that they have traditionally occupied must be recognised).

The Sámi contest the ownership by the Finnish State of lands within the Sámi homelands. Reports have been prepared on the land ownership question, but there are still considerable differences of opinion regarding their conclusions. Most Sámi homelands consist of protected or wilderness areas. The basic principles of nature conservation in these areas are consistent with the objectives of safeguarding the continuity of Sámi cultures and traditional livelihoods. Cooperation between the nature conservation authorities and the Sámi Parliament is regular, open and close, and no major conflicts have arisen in practice.

The unclear situation as to land ownership nevertheless causes continual problems in planning the management and use of areas and in their administration, as the nature conservation administration operates within the prevailing legal framework, while

the views of the Sámi Parliament are consistently based on its opinion that ownership of the Sámi homelands by the Finnish State is illegal.

The land rights issue also forms the background to many disputes on the use of natural resources in the Sámi homelands, the repercussions of which may even jeopardise sustainable development within this region.

An administrative model enjoying the broad approval of various parties is currently under development that will safeguard the rights of the Sámi as an indigenous people as required by the spirit of the Finnish Constitution and ILO Convention no. 169. The conditions for Sámi culture will continue to be safeguarded as a universal principle in various sectors.

While the various ways in which the Sámi culture uses the environment include a great deal of traditional and empirical knowledge of using a northerly environment, this information has not been systematically stored, nor can it be used in conserving and managing biodiversity. The threat posed by climate change to the northern environment is also a serious threat to the future of freely grazing reindeer husbandry, which is the foundation of the Sámi culture.

Objective: The traditional Sámi way of life and culture should continue to be promoted within the Sámi homelands, and the northern biodiversity on which these cultures are based should be conserved.

International measures:

Finland should exert influence through international conventions, processes and other fora to ensure the achievement of the global goal of significantly reducing the current rate of loss of biodiversity.

Cooperation should be improved, by harmonising the objectives of MEAs and processes and through foreign policy measures, particularly in support for developing countries. Co-operation between EU member states on biodiversity conservation should be reinforced, especially in the Eastern European region of importance for Finland.

	<p>The sustainable use of biodiversity should be incorporated as an important factor in reducing poverty in developing countries when preparing environmental sector policy guidelines for Finland's development policy. Finland's environmental sector's development cooperation work should be enhanced systematically and cost-effectively to support developing countries' capacities in the context of their objectives and actions related to the conservation, management and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>Monitoring: A body to oversee implementation and monitoring of Finland's Biodiversity Strategy should be set up, to include representatives of all key actors from the public and private sectors, interest groups, and NGOs. This body will also be responsible for evaluating changes in the state of biodiversity, assessing the need to revise and redirect the strategy and action plan, and improving dialogues and participation between different sectors of the administration and other actors.</p> <p>An effective system should be set up by 2010 for monitoring and evaluating trends in the state of biodiversity, the pressures that affect biodiversity and the impacts of biodiversity policies</p>
--	---

2006

University of Joensuu – UNEP Course on International Environmental Law-making and Diplomacy, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa	Special theme: biodiversity
---	-----------------------------

Year/Event or Document	Further explanation of Finland position
2008	
“Opportunities and challenges of responses to climate change for indigenous and local communities, their traditional knowledge and biological diversity”	Conference organized by CBD Secretariat and hosted by Finland; Helsinki, 25-28 March 2008

<p>Council of the EU: Preparation for CBD COP 9 – Council conclusions</p>	<p>Key points:</p> <p>URGES COP 9 to address firmly the need for enhanced and effective collaboration at all levels between the Rio Conventions and other related instruments and processes, including work on REDD, as well as on other relevant mitigation and adaptation measures, and to determine ways to ensure that the CBD contributes to the process launched by the UNFCCC Bali Action Plan to maximise co-benefits and achieve greater synergies between climate change and biodiversity policies;</p> <p>EMPHASISING rapid implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, UNDERLINES its full commitment to implementing the Natura 2000 network on Protected Areas; STRESSES the need to meet the PoW's specific targets; STRESSES the urgent need to develop more effective measures and adequate technical and financial support to establish and better manage protected areas in the regions in which they are most needed;</p> <p>WELCOMES LifeWeb Initiative aimed at matching voluntary commitments for designating and managing protected areas with voluntary commitments from donors for dedicated (co-)financing;</p> <p>ENCOURAGES Member States and the Commission to participate in this initiative;</p> <p>WELCOMES the work on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the MYPOW of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture encompassing plant, animal, aquatic, forest and microbial genetic resources and aiming, <i>inter alia</i>, at the achievement of MDGs 1 and 7 and at climate change mitigation and adaptation</p>
<p>Second meeting of the <i>Ad hoc</i> Technical Expert Group (AHTEG-2) on Biodiversity and Climate Change</p>	<p>Conference organized by the CBD Secretariat and hosted by Finland, Helsinki, 18–22 April 2009</p>

2009	
Fourth National Report on the Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Finland	<p>Statements related to forest biodiversity: Since ca. 1950 relatively strong measures have been employed in order to increase timber production, by far the most economically profitable use of forest land. Total volumes of commercial and private-use forestry, by total roundwood removals, increased by 1/3 from 1990 to 2008 (FO1). Some forest management practices threaten forest biodiversity in Finland.</p> <p>Mainstreaming biodiversity into different policy sectors, and into the development cooperation budgets of both donor and recipient countries, is a huge challenge.</p>

Finnish Action in other Relevant Global Fora:

WSSD (Rio+10), Johannesburg, South Africa 2002	Presentation by European Union of major action plan initiated by Finland, aimed at changing unsustainable patterns of production and consumption.
--	---

Global Environment Facility 5th replenishment	Finland increased its share more than any other donor, by 80 percent from the previous replenishment. Finland's total contribution to 5th replenishment = 57.3 million euro.
---	--

FAO

2006	
Expert Consultation on Global Forest Resources Assessment (FRA): Towards FRA 2010	Hosted by Finland, Kotka, Finland, 12–16 June, 2006

Coherence with development cooperation:

On NFP/forest policy formulation:

- ❖ Support for formulation of national forest policy since 1997 in Tanzania and Namibia.
- ❖ Support for formulation of national forest strategies, NFPs in Zambia, Tanzania and Vietnam.
- ❖ Participation of all relevant stakeholders emphasised in all of these.

- ❖ Funding for UNDP-WB/PROFOR and the FAO NFPE. (UNFF-5 national report)

Forests for People: the role of NFPs and the NLBI; A CLI by China in Support of the UNFF in collaboration with Governments of Austria, Finland, and Germany; Guilin, China, November 2009.

General recommendations:

- ❖ Design policy and legal frameworks that support forests for people
- ❖ Recognize and raise awareness of the importance of forests and the forest sector to national sustainable development
- ❖ Create an enabling environment, including good governance, investment and incentives for forests for people, including development of small and medium enterprises
- ❖ Understand and capture the full range of forest values
- ❖ Emphasize NFPs as ongoing processes which respond to emerging issues, including mitigation of and adaptation to climate change
- ❖ Achieve more effective cross-sectoral integration
- ❖ Ensure benefits reach indigenous and local communities
- ❖ Establish clear land and resource tenure and responsibilities
- ❖ Engage stakeholders more effectively in decision-making and implementation
- ❖ Enhance the capacity of countries and people to manage their resources sustainably, including through education, training, research and extension
- ❖ Utilize the Forest Instrument (NLBI) to guide NFPs to strengthen priorities, including the need to mobilize financing
- ❖ Acknowledge that NFP processes, to be successful and to contribute to poverty reduction, require public institutions to assume a facilitative role, secure tenure arrangements, meaningful stakeholder participation, and support to enterprise development.

On wood and wood energy:

Hosted Wood Energy Solutions 2008, organized by Wood Energy Net (Wenet), European Regional Development Fund and Regional Council of North Karelia

On forest industry:

(ITTO) Capacity Building in Training in Planning and Management of Forest Industries in ITTO Producer Member Countries – Phase II (ITTO catalogue of projects related to IPF/IFF PoAs)

On fire management:

Development and implementation of integrated forest fire management in Namibia, Burkina Faso and Mozambique, with awareness raising in rural communities, particularly for women (UNFF-5 national report)

On protected areas:

Activities: In Eastern Usambara mountains of Tanzania Finland has supported a long exercise of forest conservation, which included the establishment of forest conservation areas and piloting joint forest management as a tool for participatory protected area management. Forest conservation has been supported also in the Peruvian Amazon areas and in Namibia.

Progress: In Tanzania a major achievement was the declaration of a Man-and-Biosphere reserve by UNESCO in the East Usambaras. In Namibia the foundations of a network of forest conservation areas were laid and in Peru the cooperation advanced considerably the political support to establishment of protected forest areas in the Amazon.

Constraints: Forest conservation tends to attract less attention in public forest administration which is constrained with lack of human and financial resources. The returns from the investment are often intangible and long term, which may reduce the interest on conservation activities.

Lessons learned: In case of multiple priorities in developing the forest sector of a country, practical forest conservation should not be forced to be a first priority. Its turn will come naturally later, when the most urgent issues of sector development have been dealt with. However, forest conservation should be firmly in the policy and strategic agenda so that legal provisions for practical work are in place when needed. (UNFF-5 national report)

On JFM:

Finland support of PROFOR on financing SFM, including innovating financing mechanisms for forest conservation: joint forest management (JFM) in Zambia and Tanzania as modern tool for involving rural communities in the conservation of protected forest areas of different categories. (UNFF-5 national report)

On valuing non-wood goods and services:

Tuusula international workshop on Forests and Poverty Reduction Strategies, 2002:

Results: highlighting forestry's high potential to contribute to the implementation of national poverty reduction strategies, but this potential is practically wasted because most of the economic contributions of forests in developing countries are not valued at all and hence macroeconomists do not grasp their importance to national

economy. Some countries working on mainstreaming forestry issues into PRS processes, but progress slow.

Constraints: lack of basic forest assessment data and lack of advocacy skills to promote use of forests as a tool to implement PRSs.

Lessons learned: involve other sectors such as finance in the discussion. (UNFF-5 national report)

On forests in larger context/larger national frameworks:

Deforestation should be presented in terms of lost jobs, budgets needed to repair damages from floods or increasing number of people falling below poverty line.

Constraints: The idiosyncrasy of forests being importance for their own sake is a major obstacle. Forests should be seen as a resource which can help to achieve human development.

Lessons learned: Forestry sector should be willing to change its approach and present itself as an opportunity and resource to advance human and economic development. (UNFF-5 national report)

On forest governance:

Funding for the Forest Governance and Decentralisation in Africa CLI workshop, Durban, South Africa, April 2009.

Recommendations:

- ❖ Promote decentralization of forest management with participation and empowerment of all relevant stakeholders
- ❖ Support broad-based participation and efforts to clarify, secure, enforce and protect ownership rights, taking into account the traditions of the local and indigenous communities
- ❖ Eliminate barriers and improve the access of local communities to markets and revenue from SFM
- ❖ Promote the sustainable management of forests and enhanced benefits derived from them and judicious use of market tools such as transfer payments and voluntary partnership agreements
- ❖ Enhance transparency of government policies and actions on forest law enforcement, and pursue holistic anti-corruption efforts at all levels
- ❖ Ensure that forest sector actors actively contribute to setting the post-2012 agenda of the UNFCCC, particularly in mitigation and adaptation
- ❖ Promote national dialogue on norms and standards to facilitate benefits to local people and making best use of UNFCCC mechanisms;
- ❖ Establish trust and high standards of forest sector governance.

On gender equality:

High level goal of Finnish development policy and all ODA-funded forestry cooperation. This sector identified as needing further development. (UNFF-5 national report)

On community forestry:

Integration of local communities into SFM through community forestry practices has been financed by Finland in Vietnam, Tanzania, Namibia, Central America, Peru and Lao PDR. (UNFF-5 national report)

On monitoring and assessment: expertise in forest resource assessment. Development and implementation of national forest inventories supported in Mozambique and Namibia

Constraints: lack of technical capacity, funding and time. (UNFF-5 national report)

On C&I:

Support for national processes for formulation of C&I in Namibia and Lao PDR.

Supported the International Conference on the Contribution of Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management: *The way forward* (CICI 2003, Guatemala).

Recommendations on: strengthening the elaboration and implementation of C&I, promoting political commitment for their use as tools for SFM, strengthening institutional capacity and stakeholder partnerships for implementing C&I, facilitating exchange of information among all stakeholders, and contributing to the work of UNFF and international initiatives on indicators related to sustainable development.

On desertification:

From Addendum: Compilation of summaries of reports submitted by developed country Parties (ICCD/CRIC(3)/3/Add.2), March 2005

Projects:

Programme formulation for acacia management for poverty reduction, rural development and sustainable land management through gum arabic production in Africa

The Viikki Tropical Resources Institute (VITRI) of the University of Helsinki was contracted by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (the UNCCD national focal point) to work together with the participating countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sudan and Tanzania) and international organizations to formulate a set of projects for a comprehensive programme of cooperation and investment.

The Regional Set-up for the Project: The project strategy follows Article 2 of the UNCCD, which states that the combating of desertification and the mitigation of the effects of drought will include “long-term integrated strategies that focus simultaneously, in affected areas, on improved productivity of land, and the rehabilitation, con-

servation and sustainable management of land and water resources, leading to improved living conditions, in particular at the community level”.

The projects will promote the inclusion of traditional knowledge and experience, while at the same time introducing and using a variety of new technical, technological and decision-making tools which enhance the ability to cope with the current vulnerability and constraints of gum production in the African drylands. As the UNCCD secretariat is not a project- implementing body, the projects will be carried out under the project administration framework of ICRISAT in Nairobi, Kenya and Niamey, Niger, which will coordinate the overall regional project and provide support services for the national projects. The regional project will be bilingual with English and French as the official languages. The idea is to attempt to reduce the language barriers between the ten above-mentioned countries and to open up/allow free exchange between the national projects of know-how and experience on gum arabic production and marketing.

The main focus of the projects is on supporting the local communities and the national Governments in combating desertification by maintaining and improving a sustainable natural resource base while at the same time strengthening local food security. The projects are supposed to build on an integrated agroforestry systems approach around the two main gum-Arabic producing acacia trees, namely *Acacia senegal* and *Acacia seyal*, which already have an established high market share in the gum market. The projects require marketing to international financiers, such as the GEF or the Islamic Development Bank (IDB) based in Saudi Arabia, for funding.

VITRI is creating a practical concept in cooperation with the partner countries, following the newly-established GEF criteria for combating land degradation. The GEF has grouped these criteria under two operational programmes: the Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management (OP 15) and the Operational Programme on Integrated Ecosystem Management (OP 12). The Regional Project comprises coordination and reporting arrangements, regional training and information centre activities, and research and market analysis activities.

The national projects: The ten national projects will be tailor-made for each country, which means that the content of the projects varies somewhat. Some countries have in many ways a fairly advanced situation and in these the project concept builds on what already exists in the country. In other countries, project work will be initiated through pilots comprising management capacity building, field research integrated with existing research institutions, and extension work. Technical cooperation arrangements will be initiated between countries to enhance knowledge transfer through field expertise and training.

The budget for each national project will be a maximum of about 2 million euros per country, which means that the total budget for all projects will probably be around 22.5 million euros. The Finnish contribution towards the programme formulation is of the order of 106,000 euros.

Programme of catalytic support to implement the UNCCD in West Asia and North Africa (UNDP/Drylands Development Centre)

In 2000–2002, the first phase of the “Programme of Catalytic Support to Implement the UNCCD in West Asia and North Africa” was supported by the Government of Finland (with US\$ 0.6 million) and implemented by the UNDP Drylands Development Centre (based in Beirut, Lebanon) in six countries: Algeria, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic and Yemen. The programme also supported a few regional processes. Since May 2003, the Programme has continued and expanded as the second phase, supported by the Government of Finland with another 1 million euros. In total, the Programme now also supports the Islamic Republic of Iran, Tunisia and Palestine besides the six countries of the first phase. Two expected main outcomes are: (i) support to national drylands development processes provided through capacity building, advocacy, resource mobilization and innovative programming, and (ii) support to Arab regional and subregional drylands development processes provided through policy advice, technical assistance and knowledge networking. The second phase of the Programme is to be completed by June 2005.

International Programme for Arid Land Crops (IPALAC)/ ICRISAT

Since 1997, Finland has supported the work of the IPALAC and ICRISAT Centre in Niamey, Niger in the development of new methodologies for dryland agricultural practices. The volume of this support has been of the order of 250,000 euros per year.

Improvement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Global Mechanism

In 2001, Finland made an agreement with IFAD/GM by which Finland made available 1 million FIM (about 168,188 euros) for support to affected countries Parties to the UNCCD at national and subregional levels to identify and enter into the pipeline potential projects for financing by the GEF. Such projects will be identified on the basis of national and subregional action programmes and will support the development and implementation of NAPs within the member countries of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). In 2002, Finland contributed an amount of 350,000 euros through the GM for purposes to be agreed upon in due course. In 2003, a further support of 60,000 euros was made available to support pilot projects in Ethiopia and Kenya.

Tentatively, Finland considers continuing its support through the GM in the coming years, with a view to enhancing UNCCD implementation at the international level in a manner complementary to Finland’s bilateral relations with affected countries, and with the purpose of identifying and programming projects eligible for GEF and other funding. In this regard, the CRIC could consider re-assessing the coordination and cooperation elements within the mandates of various bodies and structures within the Convention, in particular the secretariat, the GM and the Committee on Science and Technology (CST) and its Group of Experts, with a view to strengthening their

respective roles and areas of comparative strength in supporting national and regional processes and mobilizing resources for implementation.

From UNCCD 5TH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION, NATIONAL REPORT OF FINLAND, July 2006

In general, Finland has not received new proposals or requests for support by affected country Parties with regard to UNCCD implementation.

GENERAL POLICY SUPPORT In 2006, Finland continues to support the UNCCD process by making voluntary contributions to the order of 250 000 € (with carry-overs from 2005) to support the following:

- ❖ work of the Intergovernmental Intersessional Working Group for the preparation of a new 10-year strategic plan and framework for the UNCCD regional cooperation
- ❖ IYDD: Youth Congress, Bamako, Mali in September, 2006
- ❖ Global Mechanism: facilitation of mainstreaming, partnership building and contribution towards the work of the IIWG

Projects:

Name: Programme of Catalytic Support to Implement the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in West Asia and North Africa **Main sector:** environment; **sub sectors:** poverty reduction, good governance and participatory development

Duration: 2005–2008 (III-phase) **MFA's budget:** 1,5 mil. € **Target countries:** Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, Iran, Palestinian Authority Area; Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia

The project is executed in collaboration with UNDP/DDC. General development objective for the programme is to improve the capacity of target countries in implementation of the UN's Convention to Combat Desertification. The aim is to produce sustainable solutions in the fight against desertification in the countries. With the help of the programme, the implementation of national action programmes (NAPs) has started and the capacity of governments and NGOs was strengthened. In addition, the programme promotes the development of fund-raising strategies. A Coordination Unit is in UNDP Regional Office, Beirut. The project is executed with the UNDP's country offices.

Name: Environmental Monitoring and Management Capacity Building, 2nd Phase, Kyrgyz Republic **Duration:** 2004–2006 **Main sector:** Environment, **sub sectors:** participatory development/good governance **MFA's Budget:** 889 882 €

The objective for the programme is to improve the capacity of the environmental institutions in Kyrgyzstan. During the phase one (1998-2000) a Finnish adviser participated in creating a monitoring system in the Kyrgyz Republic, which was designed to assess the state of the environment. In addition, the adviser contributed to the devel-

opment of the administrative system. The second phase concentrates on supporting a vertical chain of information in environmental monitoring in the local, regional and national level. This is done by supplying necessary equipment and educating local workforce.

**From Finland Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: Bilateral Projects,
6/26/2009**

Project: Programme of Catalytic Support to Implement the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in West Asia and North Africa

<i>Project</i>	Regional: Programme of Catalytic Support to Implement the UN Convention to Combat Desertification in West Asia and North Africa
<i>Countries</i>	Algeria, Jordan, Yemen, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia
<i>Field of activities</i>	Environmental policy administrative management
<i>Duration</i>	2009–2011 (phase IV)
<i>Realizer</i>	UNDP: DDC
Total funding	Proportion of Finland: € 2,0 million (phase IV)