

#	Current proposal by Task Force	Initial proposal by OLI meeting	Comments from TF meeting
1	Forest area as proportion of total land area	Forest area net change rate (%/per year)	<b>Modified</b> from "Forest area net change rate (%/year) as the net change rate can be computed using forest area as proportion of land area (land area reference year 2015). The proposed indicator name corresponds to the SDG 15.1 wording. No factual change.
2	Forest area within protected areas	Proportion of forest area located within legally established protected areas (%)	<b>Modified.</b> The term "legally established" dropped to avoid confusion and the indicator changed from proportion to total area. The protected areas should follow the definition of IUCN/CBD. If possible, the reporting should be broken down by IUCN categories. The proportion of forest area located within protected areas can be calculated. Efforts be made to maintain consistency with SDG indicator terminology.
3	Above-ground biomass stock in forest	Above-ground biomass stock in forest (tonnes/ha)	<b>Modified.</b> Suggest reporting in tonnes instead of tonnes/ha as the latter can be derived. Overharvesting/degradation/damage will result in reduced biomass/ha. In some cases increased biomass/ha may be negative (increased fuel load for fires)
4	Forest area designated and managed for protection of soil and water	(a) Mountain Green Cover Index Or (b) Forest area designated and managed for protection of soil and water	<b>Changed to green.</b> Option (b) preferred as already reported to FRA. However, it can be difficult to identify forests "designated and managed" for protection as they often are part of areas managed for multiple purposes. Option (a) Mountain Green Cover Index is currently a Tier 2 SDG indicator. Development work in progress. Not ready to be included in the core set but progress needs to be assessed and inclusion to be considered in the future
5	Employment in forestry and logging	Number of forest related jobs per 1000 ha of forest	<b>Modified and changed to green.</b> Change proposed from "Number of forest related jobs per 1000 ha of forest" to employment in forestry and logging. Employment per 1000 ha of forests can then be derived).
6	Existence of policies supporting SFM	Existence of policies supporting SFM, including formal protection of existing forest, or definition of a permanent forest estate in countries where this is necessary, with the institutions and resources necessary to implement these policies	<b>Modified.</b> "...including formal protection of existing forest, or definition of a permanent forest estate in countries where this is necessary, with the institutions and resources necessary to implement these policies" was deleted from the indicator name as those are only examples of such policies. They can be added to the explanatory note. Concept already used in FRA 2015.
7	Existence of scientifically sound national forest assessment process	Existence of a recent, scientifically sound, national forest inventory	<b>Modified.</b> Deleted the word 'recent' and added the word 'process' in the original indicator to reflect the need for continuous information flow. Suggest adding "includes NFI and related information and monitoring systems" in the explanatory note. Concept already used in FRA 2015
8	Existence of a national mechanism to secure multi-stakeholder participation in the development and implementation of forest-related policies	Existence of a national multi-stakeholder policy platform, with active participation of civil society, indigenous peoples and the private sector	<b>Modified</b> the original wording to avoid ambiguity. Concept already used in FRA 2015
9	Forest area under a long-term forest management plan	Proportion of forest area under a long-term forest management plan	<b>Modified</b> from "proportion of forest area" to "Forest area" in order to align with SDG 15.2.1. Concept already used in FRA 2015
10	Forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme	Forest area under an independently verified forest management certification scheme (ha)	<b>Changed to green.</b> Explanatory note should refer to different types of certification schemes. The TF discussed the problem of double accounting but did not find a solution to that because countries seem not to have that information. Deleted "ha". Concept already used in FRA 2015 . Concern in IAEG that certification is not an official policy instrument. Not all sustainably managed forest are certified – indicator could lead to misunderstanding
11	Official development assistance for SFM	Percentage change in official development assistance for sustainable forest management	<b>Modified.</b> "Percentage change in..." was removed from the original wording of the indicator The use of absolute value allows calculation of share of SFM funding of total ODA. Included in GOFs.
12	Volume of wood removals	Volume of wood harvested per 1000 forest workers (m3/1000 workers)	<b>Modified.</b> Suggest replacing "wood harvested per 1000 forest workers" with "wood removals" and consider as <b>new indicator, using JFSQ data.</b> Some issues identified with the original proposal was the interpretation and significance, and how to handle informal workers.
13	Existence of a traceability system for wood products	a. Proportion of traded/consumed forest products derived from illegal logging or trade (%) or b. Existence of a robust system to track sustainable produced forest products	<b>Modified and changed to green.</b> The TF meeting suggested a rewording of option (b) to "Existence of a verified tracing system to track sustainably produced forest products". After the meeting a further consultation with FAO subject specialists suggested "Existence of a traceability system for wood products". FAO has modified the name accordingly. The meeting suggested to <b>drop option (a)</b> as reliable data on illegal logging and trade are difficult to obtain

14	Forest health and vitality: % of forest area disturbed	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fairly good data exist on fire and possibly large areas hit by storms. Suggest dropping of vitality as it is difficult to measure.</li> <li>"Area disturbed" needs a clear definition (e.g., reduced production &gt;20%, unwanted or unnatural fire, damage from invasive insects), especially to distinguish it from 'degradation'. So this indicator would monitor natural disturbances and other kind of degradation as well as harvesting would be reported using another indicator.</li> <li>It is difficult to combine data on different types of disturbance</li> </ul>
15	Percentage change in area of degraded forest	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link to GOFs lost during their revision.</li> <li>Measurement of forest and land restoration was seen as a better option and it was noted that the intention seems to be include forest degradation as part of 15.3.1 (Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area) which has three sub-indicators which are land cover and land cover change, land productivity, and carbon stocks above and below ground.</li> <li>It was also noted that forest degradation is ambiguous as no globally agreed definition for it exists, thereby also difficult to measure.</li> <li>Should be differentiated from the indicator on disturbance.</li> </ul>
16	<p>a. Percentage change in the number of forest dependent people</p> <p>or</p> <p>b. Livelihoods of forest dependent people</p>	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both indicators are vague as the terms 'forest-dependent people' and "livelihoods" lack globally accepted definitions.</li> <li>It is not clear whether a positive change in the value of the indicator reflects positive development.</li> <li>The TF proposes using "Number of people living in extreme poverty whose livelihoods are dependent on forest and trees" instead.</li> <li>The indicator requires further work and alignment with the Global Forest Goals.</li> </ul>
17	Financial resources from all sources (except ODA) for the implementation of sustainable forest management (\$/ha of forest)	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included in the GOFs</li> <li>Need to define "all sources"</li> <li>Although it is important to track all financing sources it would be easier to limit the indicator to public expenditure on SFM (as was done in the past FRAs).</li> <li>Potential danger of double accounting (private sector, academia, etc).</li> </ul>
18	Share of wood based energy in total primary energy consumption, of which in modern clean systems (%)	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Task Force questioned this indicator's role in the GCS of indicator and proposes using <b>removal statistics</b> (woodfuel vs total removals) instead.</li> <li>Its significance is not fully clear (traditional wood energy vs. clean wood-based renewable energy)</li> </ul>
19	Value of payments for ecosystem services (PES) related to forests (value of payments, as ratio to total forest area or area of forest covered by such PES)	<p><b>Further work needed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not ready for the GCS of indicators. Data on payments (from where?)</li> <li>Concepts not yet defined</li> <li>Measurement problems, especially for small PES schemes</li> </ul>
20	Recovery rates for paper and solid wood products (volume recovered for re-use as % of volume consumed)	Indicator considered outside scope of SFM, as not subject to SFM policy instruments
21	Carbon stocks and carbon stock changes in forest land: net forest GHG sink/source of forests, forest carbon stock, carbon storage in harvested wood products (Tons C)	<b>TF meeting suggest to drop this indicator.</b> Changes in ABG biomass stock already captured by another indicator. Using UNFCCC data could cause confusion as it often disagrees with the figures reported to FRA (forest definition, etc.). Too many elements in indicator.