

COMPILATION - FEEDBACK TO TF PROPOSALS FROM THE BOARD

MC 10/2024 Doc 5.1

14 October 2024

Name of proposed Task Force:	Main strengths:	Main weaknesses:	Recommend
<p>1. Stand complexity in planted forests. Testing for resilience in commercial plantations</p>	<p>Strong IUFRO Division cross-cutting topic</p> <p>Strong interdisciplinary and interorganizational collaboration on a critical issue team</p> <p>The proposal addresses a relevant topic, in particular its linkages with the climate crisis and sustainable production and consumption. addresses a societal relevant question</p> <p>Good argument about why the project is relevant</p> <p>Important topic present in global discussions</p> <p>Clear outputs (and dissemination)</p> <p>Planted forests are important for fiber production and understanding other benefits is important.</p> <p>This task force is in line with the conclusions of the fifth International Congress on Planted Forests (2023) and the setup of a new definition of plantation by FAO for the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2020. The Congress made evident that planted forests are still as important for wood production as for their protection and ecosystem service provision functions, combining both purposes in most cases.</p> <p>This is a continuation of an existing task force.</p> <p>Good representation as it includes many divisions with potential to strengthen inter-divisional collaboration</p> <p>Diversified and senior team members</p> <p>Members including FAO representatives and many stakeholders involved in many international policy processes. Potential to strengthen the cooperation outside of IUFRO.</p> <p>strong links with NGOs, private companies</p>	<p>Not clear what the difference between the task force and the specific IUFRO Units dealing with Silviculture is.</p> <p>The term 'Stand complexity in planted forests' has not been fully defined.</p> <p>Not all Division coordinators have been approached. TF coordinator and deputies are all representing the Global North</p> <p>More members of social sciences could be considered</p> <p>Loose use of the term Global Change; the concept paper is country specific and species specific ... should avoid generalizing</p> <p>Is Manuel G still President nominee (as it is listed) or is he a former nominee? Need clarity</p> <p>Not very clear what activities and products will result of the task force.</p> <p>Gender diversity of the membership could not be seen with no gender indicated</p> <p>Lacks detail and feasibility on comparison methodology and trade-off analysis</p> <p>At present, it seems to include only one developing country (Brazil) as a case study</p> <p>Plantations could be controversial because they are observed as a threat to land use change; however, in some countries, there are not even inventories of planted forests.</p>	<p>YES</p>

	<p>with secured funding</p> <p>Diversity of nationalities embodied in members</p> <p>Large contribution to IUFRO Thematic Areas</p> <p>Large spectrum of scientific expertise</p> <p>Plantations, as explained in the introduction, require more attention, particularly in developing countries with large natural forest cover.</p>	<p>The introduction mentioned that public perception is negative toward intensively managed plantations; however, there is no involvement of Division 6</p> <p>26 interactions could be ambitious</p>	
<p>2. Promoting African Forestry Research and Capacity Building</p>	<p>KEFRI is the host for the IUFRO2029 WC</p> <p>Focus on a region where IUFRO wants to increase engagement</p> <p>Relevant issue and will hopefully strengthen the representation of African research institutes in IUFRO and thus global forest research.</p> <p>Activities, deliverables and their timelines clearly indicated.</p> <p>They want to address the need for stronger scientific leadership, improved research quality, and the translation of research into policy and practice, which are crucial for sustainable forest management and climate resilience in Africa</p> <p>Contribution to implementation of the IUFRO strategy and Broader policy processes.</p> <p>Capacity building and research are important areas to strengthening in Africa context</p> <p>Poor proposal, but very important</p> <p>Addresses the critical need for increased research capacity</p> <p>It is important to strengthen research and its consequent publications in Africa. Seems that proponents understand that one of the difficulties is the lack of capacities</p>	<p>There is no clear indication about the IUFRO Units involved or the participating scientists. No specific Divisions mentioned</p> <p>Geographic, cultural and gender diversity not indicated</p> <p>Narrow focus as it focuses on one continent (Africa)</p> <p>Activities and governance not fully clear</p> <p>No mention of how funding will be secured</p> <p>Vague about capacity building outcomes and expectation</p> <p>Task force team small and not representing multiple divisions</p> <p>While the general idea is clear, the proposal is still too general in its scope and activities. Suggested to make it more focused on one or two aspects with clearer outcomes.</p> <p>The concept note lacks clarity. It seems very broad not focused on a particular challenge in forest education in Africa</p> <p>Suggest to clarifying the linkages with/contributions to IUFRO Strategy</p> <p>Lack of cross divisional expertise</p> <p>Risk of duplicating existing efforts or initiatives within IUFRO, which may lead to fragmentation of resources and confusion among stakeholders.</p> <p>The proposal needs clearer aims, targets and success measures.</p> <p>There seems to be little involvement with IUFRO divisions and special projects.</p> <p>Developing capacities to conduct and publish research requires more than one year; therefore, the deliverables could be reorganized to make publications for the 3er or 4th</p>	<p>More No than Yes</p>

		<p>year. In the same line, training is the key point; therefore, more emphasis on training is required. It would be interesting to see what kind of training they are pursuing. Types of research? Philosophy of research? How to conduct a literature review? Techniques to understand research project? Social research? Etc.</p> <p>Including a budget is important. However, some of the training can be done online, which can reduce costs. If the proponents perceive that high cost, it is a weakness not to have the funding secure</p>	
<p>3. Agroforestry</p>	<p>Diversified team members (16 researchers from 10 countries) from both the Global North and South with young scientists involved in membership</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-discipline research</p> <p>Agroforestry is an important land use in parts of the world. The topic is relevant and knowledge sharing is valuable</p> <p>Agroforestry is one of the most important Nature based solutions for adaptation, mitigation and biodiversity in many contexts</p> <p>non-fashion topic, but for many developing countries</p> <p>The topic is relevant in the context of the climate and biodiversity challenges, and addresses sustainable livelihoods.</p> <p>The proposal is relevant in terms of the Agenda 2030 and its SDGs, the Convention on Biological Diversity’s Kunming-Montreal Global Diversity Framework and the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience.</p> <p>Agroforestry is an important topic in the tropics; it provides several ecological and socioeconomic benefits that perhaps have been disregarded.</p> <p>The book proposal is great. Hope this can be achieved, and the book will be distributed online.</p>	<p>No mention about the contribution to IUFRO Strategy and how the Task Force will complement activities of existing IUFRO Divisional unit</p> <p>Not clear what the difference is with the Unit on Agroforestry in Div. 1</p> <p>Activities and governance not clear.</p> <p>Division coordinators not contacted</p> <p>Limited cross-divisional collaboration. Mainly Divisions 1 and 9</p> <p>It ignores decades of ICRAF’s work</p> <p>Output is a book, but the coordinator’s publication experience is limited</p> <p>No mention of Gender and Women in the text</p> <p>Lacks women in TF core team</p> <p>Objective is rather vague Agroforestry is a very broad concept for a task force. the focus must be on a very specific area</p> <p>Budget not secured</p> <p>Not clear what are the multidisciplinary components of agroforestry that will be addressed</p> <p>It is important to mention the linkages with/contributions to IUFRO Strategy.</p> <p>There is no clarity on how IUFRO Divisions will contribute</p>	<p>Half No half yes</p>

<p>4. Gender Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in Forest-related Sectors</p>	<p>Timely and important subject. Gender Equity, Diversity and Inclusion are all important areas for IUFRO to develop</p> <p>Well written with clear objectives, activities and governance</p> <p>Building on the work of previous task forces on gender equality. important cross-division topic</p> <p>Wants to help IUFRO Management on Diversity strategy Will help to inform IUFRO strategy with respect to diversity and inclusion They aim to advance the gender equity, diversity and inclusion agenda in forest-related sectors and support transformative change</p> <p>helpful in the establishment of IUFRO EDI Committee</p> <p>The taskforce envisages to interact with many international institutions, Non IUFRO member is also considered</p> <p>Strong team, Large, confirmed member (43) from many countries, from all continents</p> <p>The composition of the proposed TF reflects a diversity of regions (just note that Costa Rica is in Central America) and gender-balance.</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-divisional collaboration and collaboration with IUFRO partners</p> <p>The proponents have experience in the topic since they have a previous task force.</p> <p>The three streams proposed seem logical and achievable</p>	<p>No scientific publications by team members on ‘diversity’</p> <p>Team’s no/limited experience with diverse groups could impact outputs</p> <p>Unclear what ‘marginalized’ groups refer to (and marginalized from whose perspective)</p> <p>Too many collaborators without clarity on their roles</p> <p>Funding not mentioned</p> <p>This cuts across all IUFRO divisions, so surprising to only see D4, D5, D6 and D9 mentioned initially</p> <p>Narrow focus - Why only gender? Would building forward not also be trying to branch out to ethnicity and other forms of diversity? Also, active researchers in Div7 not included</p> <p>African experts are less represented</p> <p>More members from Asia could be considered</p> <p>Not specific on what “forest related sectors” mean</p> <p>How this is different to unit 6.08.01?</p> <p>How this builds on previous gender related task forces such as Gender equality task force?</p> <p>What is “transformative change” ?</p> <p>How inclusive has been the process to involve the listed potential members?</p> <p>Suggest adding the linkages with/contribution to IUFRO Strategy.</p> <p>recommend including more information on the expected outcomes/products in the full proposal.</p> <p>Too many people to coordinate, and there is no regional balance. According to the table, there seems to be a strong group from Europe, but Latin America, Asia, and Africa are at a disadvantage</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>5. Continuous Cover Forestry for better forest resilience and</p>	<p>CCF topic is widely researched in SLU and Sweden</p> <p>Highly relevant to areas where CCF is the dominant silvicultural system.</p> <p>CCF hold promising in forest ecosystem resilience to climate change</p>	<p>Poorly written.</p> <p>Activities and governance not clear.</p> <p>Division coordinators not contacted.</p> <p>Could also be slightly too ambitious in the goals</p>	<p>NO</p>

<p>greater societal welfare</p>	<p>Interesting approach to forest management in an era that attention is on “carbon optimality and capture” and minimizing impacts of clearcuts and forest harvesting</p> <p>The taskforce is to strengthen the knowledge base for CCF with the objective to bring together the difference research subjects/ researchers represented by/in the different divisions</p> <p>Potential to contribute to the broader policy process;</p> <p>Goal and objectives clearly mentioned.</p> <p>To someone from the tropics, this is a new concept and perhaps foresters from other latitudes need to understand more about it and be aware of its benefits.</p> <p>The proposal includes developing educational material.</p>	<p>Weak outputs</p> <p>Lacks depth in the concept paper (unclear study area)</p> <p>No mention of funding</p> <p>Too technical and Europe-centric.</p> <p>Only D1 and D4. Should have broader input from other divisions Currently no other researchers are named than the task force leader and deputy.</p> <p>Members of the TF seems few (2, both coordinators)</p> <p>Geographic, cultural and gender diversity not mentioned;</p> <p>Lack of timelines for tasks</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>it seems not to be focused on the tropical forest. It does not have to be, but it will be important to understand on what type of ecosystems this is focused.</p> <p>How is this different to similar forest management practices such as selective logging in the tropics</p> <p>It does not mention potential negative impacts and leakage of this approach (if any)</p> <p>The focus on promoting CCF without explicitly addressing potential downsides or challenges may lead to biased outcomes</p>	
<p>6. Post-War Forest Landscape Restoration: Make it back better</p>	<p>Clear objectives</p> <p>Forest landscape restoration is important and relevant (hence the past FLR task force). Relevant seeing all global conflicts. Important to gather knowledge on what is needed after conflicts Important in addressing severe deforestation and forest degradation in areas affected by war</p> <p>The taskforce team are senior people, diversified IUFRO divisions, and four countries</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>TF Needed regarding the geopolitical environment of Europe</p> <p>Intergenerational collaboration to achieve the TF goals is highlighted</p> <p>Interesting and innovative</p>	<p>It has not been highlighted why post-war restoration is different from other types of restoration after disturbance.</p> <p>Activities and governance not clear.</p> <p>The activities (3) didn’t match with the objectives (9)</p> <p>Division coordinators not contacted</p> <p>Too ambitious project for TF: ‘post war’ restoration concept is vague in given current scenario Claims for Global network, but the TF team is all from Global North</p> <p>Lacks what they propose as outputs</p> <p>No information about budget or no need, as the activities will be implemented virtually.</p>	<p>Half No half yes</p>

	<p>An ambitious proposal, particularly regarding long-term objectives. It would be important to clarify whether those are expected to be part of the TF outcomes, or they are envisioned future work of a potential network arising from the TF after it concludes its term.</p>	<p>Lack of timelines for tasks, as the suggested time frame might not allow to accomplish all the long-term objectives. It seems to be a regional imbalance in the group of proponents.</p> <p>If this should be a global project there is a need to include participants from the other regions.</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>It would be good to understand if the focus is restoration of the structure of the forest or function</p> <p>It will be interesting to add examples from places where peace has arrived after long periods of civil war such as Colombia, Guatemala and El Salvador.</p> <p>suggest adding the linkages with/contributions to IUFRO Strategy</p>	
<p>7. Building an integrated view of forest-based bioeconomy</p>	<p>Important topic and IUFRO could benefit if tapped nicely</p> <p>Purpose-build forest-based bioeconomy for different countries.</p> <p>Objectives clear and proposed governance suitable Well written, task force objective placed into context. Forests / trees are an important part of the bioeconomy and this fits well with IUFRO strategy activities and deliverables clearly embodied</p> <p>Multi-divisions involved. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>Its objectives align with IUFRO strategy, contribution to the IUFRO Strategy. Potential to contribute to the broader policy process.</p> <p>Facilitate active dialogue at all institutional levels to elucidate how to make and strengthen relationships.</p> <p>The leadership and core-team are already established Involves members from most of the IUFRO Divisions The taskforce team are senior people of different countries. Some participated in the previous task force.</p> <p>Interesting but still forest biobased bioeconomy is a vision that it has been difficult to materialize as it not only depends of forest but many other enabling conditions many of which are not in place</p>	<p>Interesting but not clear about what authors define as bioeconomy as the definition is very broad</p> <p>If it is global focused, then the TF panel is problematic (all Global North) the concept paper seems to be Finland focused ... should avoid generalizing.</p> <p>Geographic and gender diversity not mentioned in membership (potentially regional imbalance in the core team)</p> <p>While the concept note refers to the “Global South”, all the proponents are based on developed countries, mostly in the EU. We suggest inviting participants from other regions to improve the geographical balance it uses the vague term Global Change</p> <p>objective and activities of the TF are not very convincing</p> <p>No information about budget or no need, as the activities will be implemented virtually.</p> <p>Lack of timelines for tasks</p> <p>I suggest narrowing the scope in the full proposal, as the bioeconomy is too broad Division 7 can provide input since the bioeconomy relies on healthy forests. There are many forest</p>	<p>YES</p>

		<p>health issues that can cause a reduction in anticipated forest productivity, thus affecting the bioeconomy. Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p>	
<p>8. Bamboo and Other Biomaterials for Combating Plastic Pollution</p>	<p>Relevant topic Reducing plastic consumption and waste while promoting renewables is very good. Relevant question for society Important in addressing plastic pollution Align with the emerging initiative. Contribution to the Broader Policy The task force members are senior people of different countries (32 people, of which 8 are female) More than fifty nationalities are included with a strong intercontinental collaboration A strong team behind the taskforce. involves members from most of the IUFRO Divisions Potential to strengthen inter-divisional collaboration and collaboration with INBAR, and other partners Process. Objectives, activities clearly mentioned. Potential to contribute to IUFRO Strategy</p>	<p>Subject area rather constrained so not very cross-cutting across divisions. Limited scope with an overemphasis on bamboo. Wood, in general, offers significant potential as an alternative to plastic, and exploring a wider range of wood-based solutions could strengthen the TF's impact and relevance Governance not clear The aspect of plastic pollution does not reflect in any proposed activities The title needs some change; combating plastic pollution is a huge issue. Perhaps something like an alternative to reduce plastic use or not to mention plastic. The proposed activities are general and lacks any specific outputs Bamboo can be a weed species; this should be included. Bamboo can be invasive in many regions Unclear how an integrated view will be achieved by primarily engaging IUFRO researchers as a truly integrated perspective necessitates a broader societal view, incorporating diverse stakeholders even beyond the forestry community. How this is different to 5.11.05 Does not list specific collaboration among IUFRO divisions although a list of potential members is included No information about budget or no need, as the activities will be implemented virtually. Lack of timelines for tasks Absence of clarity of operational aspects Risk of duplicating existing efforts or initiatives within IUFRO, which may lead to fragmentation of resources and confusion among stakeholders. Why promoting a genus only?</p>	<p>More No than Yes</p>

		<p>It would be useful to have a reference to the IUFRO Strategy</p> <p>The document needs clarify whether it is only bamboo or other biomaterials.</p> <p>There are too many people involved; perhaps coordination will be a challenge</p>	
<p>9. Monitoring biotic and abiotic forest disturbance</p>	<p>Understanding biotic and abiotic disturbances</p> <p>Potential to strengthen collaboration with non-IUFRO partners and involvement of global south.</p> <p>Extensive spatial scales, from continental to global, fostering comprehensive insights into forest health.</p> <p>TF will provide critical decision-making support for enhancing forest resilience through advanced disturbance modeling.</p> <p>Interesting especially as many ecosystems are shifting due to changes in climate patterns.</p> <p>Important subject and logical follow-up from the Tree mortality Task force.</p> <p>Strong team, Hendrik Hartmann has led a very successful TF on tree mortality. Experienced and diversified team members from different countries</p> <p>The new task force will consider geographical, cultural and gender diversity, and will provide opportunities for early-career scientists for both membership composition and networking activities Well-written with clear objectives</p> <p>A global scale is very important and relates to the provision of ecosystem services, etc.</p> <p>The subject is very relevant, and the objective are ambitious but obtainable.</p> <p>Inter-divisional collaboration; Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration</p> <p>Deliverables clearly mentioned. Potential to contribute to IUFRO Strategy.</p> <p>A very practical and relevant proposal. I suggest looking into potential synergies with the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF)</p>	<p>European focused</p> <p>Unclear why they want to address India and China (none of the TF committee members are from those region)</p> <p>Gender diversity should be further indicated in the full proposal</p> <p>Deliverables are not mentioned rather focus is on dissemination techniques</p> <p>Technical focus for IUFRO Div 7</p> <p>Only D4, D6, D7, and D8 mentioned, but it is relevant to other divisions Probably the biotic damage will be limited to one or a few species.</p> <p>It seems to be focused on tree mortality mainly, how this is different from previous tree mortality task force and how it builds from this experience? Seems to be a continuation of the previous TF</p> <p>No information about budget or no need, as the activities will be implemented virtually</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>Risk of duplicating existing efforts or initiatives within IUFRO, which may lead to fragmentation of resources and confusion among stakeholders.</p> <p>Do not see evidence that is cross-division issue</p> <p>I suggest including the linkages with/contributions to IUFRO Strategy in the full proposal</p> <p>Not clear how they are planning to inform policy</p> <p>There is not a concrete list of researchers and their origin</p>	<p>More Yes than No</p>

<p>10. Scaling-Up Science-based Forest Sector Innovation</p>	<p>Scaling up and innovation are hot topics with major knowledge gaps. The proposal gives the impression that it will work towards identifying potential for innovations in all areas of IUFRO divisions. Also, that it will function as a bridge between the divisions. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration</p> <p>Geographic, gender diversity, scientists from both social and natural sciences, and young scientists considered in membership proposal; Objectives, activities and deliverables clearly indicated.</p> <p>Governance of task force well defined</p> <p>Good publication record on forest innovation</p> <p>Collaboration with FAO and INRAE; provides an opportunity for IUFRO to work closely</p> <p>Potential to contribute to broader policy processes and IUFRO strategy</p> <p>Innovation drives sustainable forest management, enhancing forest contributions to achieving the SDGs and Global Forest Goals</p> <p>This TF can improve forest monitoring, conservation practices, and sustainable resource use, increasing forest resilience and productivity.</p> <p>Unique TF structure (i.e., regional co-leads, steering committee, open membership)</p>	<p>The proposal claims to be interdisciplinary across Natural and Social Sciences, but fails to reflect it; is the focus too wide? Unclear what is meant by innovation. In that sense the actual products of the task force are rather unclear I believe that all divisions can scaleup their respective findings Very Broad in a sense that innovation exists in every aspect of forestry. The TF tackles a broad and complex concept (innovation) which can be interpreted and applied in numerous ways across various perspectives, needs, sectors, and stakeholder groups. This ambitious scope may make it challenging to achieve focused and meaningful outcomes. Lack of clarity of tangible outcomes and deliverables.</p> <p>Lacks details about funding</p> <p>With the FAO leading this proposal, a Task Force may not be the right instrument to implement the proposed joint activities. It may rather be suggested signing an MoU to implement collaborative action, using the proposal as a basis for this</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>11. Forest Living Labs for Sustainable Climate Adaptation (FORLIVS)</p>	<p>Network of Living labs for forests much needed. Living labs are an interesting approach in Europe to convene different actors Cross-cutting across divisions. All divisions interested</p> <p>A valuable contribution to infrastructure for forest research</p> <p>No international network of forest living labs exists to date, while there are living labs in different latitudes.</p> <p>The proposal addresses a relevant topic and has the potential to produce a good contribution.</p> <p>All Division coordinators contacted, interdisciplinary cooperation, particularly among scientists in the biological sciences and the humanities and social sciences</p> <p>Large spectrum of scientific expertise Gender and geographical diversity</p> <p>I see points of contact with proposal 22, so I suggest merging both proposals into one.</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration,</p>	<p>The “living lab” concept seems to be a very European model. I suggest looking into a more region-neutral label or address how the proponents intend to have a more flexible Specific deliverables should be complemented approach to make their work relevant for other regions</p> <p>Concrete activities not yet fully defined It seems very general</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>Funding issue not mentioned</p> <p>There is a huge list of people either supporting or interested in the TF. The full proposal should address how the proponents intend to work with such a large group.</p> <p>There is no clarify on how the divisions will be involved</p> <p>Needs to clarify its contribution to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy</p>	<p>YES</p>

	Living labs represent long-term research opportunities for forest science.	How is this different from the model forest network? The product of the TF will be an infrastructure to use for research locally and globally but research products will be secondary as far as we can see in the time frame of the TF	
12. Health, safety, and social dimensions of forest restoration operations	<p>Subject interesting and timely Worker health and safety is an important consideration in FLR work (all forest operations discipline collaboration) There is a need to monitor and evaluate how restoration has been implemented</p> <p>Objectives, activities and deliverables as well as budget clearly indicated. Clear pre-designed outputs that is good for IUFRO TF</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-divisional work</p> <p>Potential to contribute to broader policy processes and IUFRO strategy</p> <p>Gender diversity considered in the TF lead</p> <p>Well-known task force coordinators and the research team has strong experience in the field</p> <p>It seems that finding is secure</p>	<p>Not cross-cutting across many Divisions (unit and division coordinators not yet contacted).</p> <p>Concrete activities not fully ambitious. Governance not clear</p> <p>Regional imbalance. All TF members are Global North. Geographic diversity should be further strengthened</p> <p>No social scientist or forest health expert in the team Forest health and wellbeing of Div6 would be a good match. Not a single proposed activities address 'social dimension' I suggest removing the term social from this TF concept paper. This could be expanded to other activities such as harvesting and replanting in routine forest operations</p> <p>The question on how the proposed Task Force will strengthen cross-Divisional interaction on specified topics related to IUFRO Strategy's Thematic Areas and/or Institutional Goals, and how the Task Force will complement and/or expand activities of existing IUFRO Divisional units, should be answered</p>	More Yes than No
13. AI for Forest Science	<p>Subject timely and necessary New emerging topic</p> <p>AI is topical and important, so a task force seems relevant AI is a tool that will make its entrance into forest science. The task force has as aim to combine global AI developments with Forest Science and develop AI based tools and models.</p> <p>The team is well represented among the relevant divisions With support from Divisions 1, 4 and 9 Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration</p> <p>The concept note seems well prepared</p> <p>Objectives, activities and deliverables clearly indicated.</p> <p>Potential to contribute to the IUFRO Strategy;</p> <p>Geographic and gender diversity embodied in the membership</p>	<p>Not cross-cutting across many Divisions but could be as AI affects all units Technical panel on this topic from Congress 2024 should be tapped</p> <p>-Funding is unclear</p> <p>The task force coordinators are not listed</p> <p>Team lacks publications on AI topic They mention pests but don't include Division 7.</p> <p>This touches all IUFRO division specially 3 that focus in the "how" and implementation</p> <p>The objectives and goals are very elaborate. The success of the TF might be higher if focusing on fewer and more defined goals, especially as AI has an enormous breadth.</p>	YES

	<p>Cross-disciplinary collaboration, develop AI-driven tools and models, and drive innovation in forest research and management hold promising</p> <p>Ambitious scope, will need to narrow down when preparing the full proposal</p> <p>Some of the activities are feasible to implement</p>	<p>Also, a review of the current use of AI in Forest Science could be a good product to start with to focus the task force</p> <p>Unclear outputs Lack of the specific deliverables and timelines</p> <p>Budget is not indicated</p> <p>I suggest being less technologically optimistic and have a more neutral approach to AI. Special care should be given to providing AI with some kind of agency in terms of policy, particularly “policy influence”, as might entail the risk of encouraging manipulative conduct in the era of “post-truth” and “fake news”.</p> <p>I suggest to narrow the scope to specific aspects of AI that the Task force will focus.</p> <p>Are ethical consideration on AI included?</p> <p>Limited scope of AI applications, primarily focusing on remote sensing and forest modeling, whereas there are a lot more applications, such as precision forestry and automation of forest operations.</p> <p>Unsure how the proposed AI algorithm/tools can be effectively applied in diverse contexts and for various purposes globally. The reliance on region- and purpose-specific training data raises concerns about the generalizability and scalability of the proposed development</p> <p>Establishing a platform, which is the first activity, is very expensive, and the proposal does not mention secure funding.</p> <p>It seems that the pilot project is not yet concrete, and this could be a problem since the development of the AI will last two to three years.</p> <p>There is not clarity on how to influence policy since they do not know which case study will serve as a pilot.</p>	
14. Interaction and Synergy	This is an important topic and highly relevant for forest resource management and forest product utilization, strong subject. An integrated	Ambitious with many collaborators Lacks funding commitment	YES

<p>of Carbon “3S” (Sink, Storage and Substitution) in Forest Value Chains</p>	<p>view on carbon dynamics in forests is necessary to fully understand the contribution of forest to carbon mitigation. This task force is aiming to provide this overview beyond growing of trees.</p> <p>Very well written text. Clear justification of work and description of activities Action plan well prepared The activities and outputs are well thought of</p> <p>Wide diversity in the team and has made a good attempt to be inclusive. With experts involved across 6 divisions. The task force involves 31 identified members (who have given their formal consent) from different countries</p> <p>Multi-divisions involved. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>Contribution to strengthen the cooperation with partners outside of IUFRO, including FAO, INBAR, CIFOR-ICRAF etc;</p> <p>Geographic, gender diversity, scientists from both social and natural sciences, and young scientists involvement embodied;</p> <p>It has clear policy implications for 2030 targets Relevant topic in the light of the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement and the UAE Framework for Global Climate Resilience, addressing the challenge of climate change, with linkages to the Agenda 2030 and its SDGs.</p> <p>Clear linkages to IUFRO Strategy</p>	<p>The time period 2025-27 is tight to accomplish all activities</p> <p>Hope the deputy coordinator from Africa will be actively involved</p> <p>Division 7 can also contribute to this through the activities of WP 7.02.01, which studies decay</p> <p>The connection to decision-makers in the value-chain is weak even though they will have to convince the stakeholders to manage forests to obtain synergies</p> <p>Risk of duplicating existing efforts or initiatives within IUFRO, which may lead to fragmentation of resources and confusion among stakeholders.</p> <p>Suggest consider also the correlation of carbon and other co-benefits from the forest such as biodiversity and how value chains affect this related to the 3S’s</p> <p>The list of participants is large. It will need to address the way to work effectively in the full proposal</p>	
<p>15. Forest-Water-Livelihood-Governance Nexus</p>	<p>The provision of water is a very important ecosystem service. The relation Forest water governance is key in the political discussions on the role of forests. It may also relate to the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction</p> <p>Very well written text. Clear justification of work and description of activities Clear outputs and activities</p> <p>Asia/China focus with involvement of other regions</p> <p>Highly diverse TF members, over 40 Task Force members confirmed The Task Force membership is well-balanced to reflect scientific and management expertise, geographical, cultural, gender and age diversity</p> <p>Multi--divisions involved. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>Good to have linkages with the FAO and IAHS Important topic with the changes in precipitation patterns globally</p>	<p>This should have a global focus; not sure that this is stated</p> <p>Ignores all the work been done on forest-water nexus</p> <p>The goals would be stronger when formulated as products</p> <p>Budget is not indicated</p> <p>Too many stakeholders without clarity on how they will contribute</p> <p>Majority are men</p> <p>Consider deputies from Africa and Latin America as they can enrich the governance piece</p> <p>I suggest clarifying the contributions to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy in the full proposal</p> <p>The objectives and the activities are not interrelated. All the activities are about workshop and networking;</p>	<p>YES</p>

	<p>Currently, there is no IUFRO research division addressing this topic, which transcends several IUFRO divisions.</p> <p>Geographic, gender diversity, scientists from both social and natural sciences, and young scientists involvement embodied;</p> <p>Potential to contribute to broader policy processes and IUFRO strategy</p> <p>Continuing efforts on this particular important issue, related to SDG</p> <p>It is the first task force that I see addresses governance directly</p>	<p>however, objectives 3 and 4 are not reflected in the activities.</p>	
<p>16. A worldwide research on Climate change and Education</p> <p>The second international conference on forest education</p>	<p>Education related to climate change is critical for climate change adaptation Education is the corner stone for progress and therefore the task force subject is important. The TF aims to fill the gap between science and educational-outreach which is important for science-based policy making</p> <p>Climate change and education are both relevant but immense areas</p> <p>Forest education needs to be explored continuously.</p>	<p>Inappropriate as is a description of a conference to be held</p> <p>Proposals are incomplete</p> <p>A good fit for D6 Forest education</p> <p>No secured funding, and lacks funding experience</p> <p>Both the proposal fails to present members</p> <p>Expects IUFRO to pay 250,000Euros?</p> <p>Leadership and governance structure not well developed</p> <p>Currently only the application is mentioned in the proposal. It is unclear how the applicant is going to expand the members of the taskforce.</p> <p>The conference is not really a TF subject?</p> <p>IUFRO divisions to work with not identified; activities for five years not clear</p> <p>Across divisionally approach is needed to be clearly mentioned not just a general statement</p> <p>No large spectrum of scientific expertise</p> <p>No description of specific proposed Task Force activities, deliverables and timelines.</p> <p>50,000 Euro as TF budget seems very limited regarding the thematic</p> <p>Specific activities, deliverables, specific consideration of multi-divisional collaboration and membership lacked;</p> <p>narrow topic, it's only about organizing the conference.</p> <p>Lack of a clear and focused objective. While it touches upon various aspects like education, best practices, deeper</p>	<p>NO</p>

		<p>understanding of climate science, these elements aren't effectively linked and organized around a central purpose No clear cross-divisional work. No clear gender and geographical balance It would need to clarify the linkages to IUFRO Strategy The task force is somehow weak; it only proposes the Second International Conference, which is very important and, of course, it is an activity that requires time and money. However, this activity can be part of Unit 6.09, perhaps. There is not involvement of other divisions.</p>	
<p>17. Legacy Forest data and related resources</p>	<p>Important topic to 'save' forest data Digitization and curation of legacy data will save data from being lost and provide access to other users. The TF proposes to work towards saving non-digitized data for prosperity and make them accessible to a large public. Focuses on rescuing and digitizing valuable legacy forest data, which can enhance understanding of historical biodiversity and land management practices. Funding (some part) is secured Taskforce members are large and well distributed in different regions Geographical and gender balance Several members of the TF have experience with curation of older and grey data sources Activities are well prepared Multi-divisions approached. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional collaboration Strong proposal to develop a robust database for decision-making across the Global South, Engages a diverse range of stakeholders from various IUFRO divisions and regions, promoting interdisciplinary cooperation and knowledge sharing. Supports the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration by providing critical historical data to inform ecological restoration efforts and enhance biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>Technical/ Natural science focused primarily on Europe, but aims to include other regions Will be difficult to fulfil as it depends on the will of people to input data into a database (not defined). Not clear how the different formats and languages will be handled. May be better as a funded project rather than a voluntary task force Too many collaborators so it is unclear what role each of these 30+ members would play in TF Copyright and ethical dimension of data collection unclear; how IUFRO will benefit from such repository is unclear Many institutions are working through this process with open data initiatives. There are intellectual property and ownership issues with data that could pose problems for the initiative Very broad as data is a very general term and could be anything I suggest clarifying the contributions to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy Interesting topic but how effective a task force can be to rescue forest data and related issues; it seems to me it needs certain infrastructure that a task force budget may not provide specially in a voluntary effort</p>	<p>NO</p>

		<p>Unclear activities required for global collaboration. Limited research focus</p> <p>Making legacy data accessible in multiple languages and formats could present logistical challenges, complicating the dissemination of information. Need to elaborate more on how to leverage this aspect</p> <p>Securing consistent funding for curation and digitization efforts may be difficult, potentially hindering the initiative's sustainability. Need to elaborate more on how to leverage this aspect</p> <p>I wonder if they will find issues of property rights and how to solve that problem</p>	
<p>18. The impact of biodiversity on carbon related ecosystem services provided by soils of managed forests</p>	<p>Understanding soil carbon dynamics and biodiversity is important for climate change adaptation / mitigation The TF proposed to focus on the influence of biodiversity (microbiome) on carbon sequestration.</p> <p>Large contribution to IUFRO Thematic Areas; Across divisional proposal TF will leverage on two big (EU scale) projects, a good plan for securing funding Forestry sector in EU has good funding to support them</p> <p>Large spectrum of scientific expertise. The TF topic is multidisciplinary in its nature and directly bridges two IUFRO divisions</p>	<p>Targets Europe and Asia; would be good to include other regions as well</p> <p>Reads more like a project proposal than a task force. Subject rather constrained.</p> <p>The TF team is not mentioned</p> <p>Desk/ literature review kind of findings without primary data.</p> <p>The topic includes several IUFRO divisions but the TF seems to lack consolidation in those divisions with many of the TF participants being non-IUFRO members.</p> <p>The question on how the proposed Task Force will strengthen cross-Divisional interaction on specified topics related to IUFRO Strategy's Thematic Areas and/or Institutional Goals, and how the Task Force will complement and/or expand activities of existing IUFRO Divisional units, should be answered</p> <p>The topic is not quite clear for me.</p> <p>The proposal does not have clear objectives, contributions from divisions, how to include regional and gender balance.</p> <p>Activities are not clearly described.</p> <p>Need to elaborate more on the policy aspect, particularly on how the TF will impact the current discussion about</p>	<p>More Yes than No</p>

		<p>alternative forest management, carbon sequestration as well as biodiversity preservation.</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>Need to include more expert from global south particularly from Africa</p> <p>Are they planning to include also tropical areas that may be very different?</p> <p>Unclear objectives. Focusing on global north</p> <p>not sure what publication in a more popular form means but policy engagement will take much more than a nice pub</p> <p>I suggest clarifying the contributions to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy</p> <p>Involvement of representatives from other regions should be further considered.</p> <p>Gender diversity should be further considered</p>	
<p>19. Capacity Development for Youth Empowerment and Stewardship</p>	<p>The TF aims to develop quality education for future professionals in forestry globally Important subject on youth education. A good opportunity to bring the youths to lead</p> <p>Emphasizes inclusive education and the integration of Indigenous knowledge, broadening the scope and impact of forest education.</p> <p>Focus on training of professional foresters. Led by IFSA. Leverages partnerships between IUFRO and IFSA, enhancing resource sharing and networking opportunities. The IUFRO-IFSA partnership is a very rich one, and holds strategic value</p> <p>Directly targets youth engagement, fostering a new generation of forest professionals equipped to tackle climate and biodiversity challenges.</p> <p>Clear activities</p> <p>Potential to strengthen inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>Potential to contribute IUFRO Strategy;</p> <p>Young scientists/students involvement</p>	<p>Governance not well defined.</p> <p>Divisions not contacted. IUFRO divisions to work with not identified</p> <p>Too vague and broad and seems repeat the previous TF</p> <p>Nothing innovative</p> <p>Funding unclear</p> <p>TF team not mentioned. From the description it remains unclear who particularly are involved with the TF.</p> <p>the TF aims to develop a forest education curriculum but is not clear who would be running the curriculum</p> <p>Taskforce members are not indicated</p> <p>Geographic and gender diversity should also be considered in next steps.</p> <p>Specific deliverables should be further considered.</p> <p>Outcomes are subjective.</p>	<p>YES</p>

		<p>In case the existing educational institutions resist adopting new curricula or methodologies, hindering progress, it is not clear on how this potential difficulty will be leverage</p> <p>Elaborate more on across divisionally approach is use in this TF</p> <p>Curriculum development may not be a realistic product as each country has its own particularities</p> <p>Lack of divisional engagement No clear cross-divisional work, or divisional involvement. It looks very much like a topic for an MoU. It might be worth analyzing whether this should be a TF or it would be better to carry out these activities within the framework of an MoU.</p> <p>It would be necessary to clarify the contributions to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy.</p>	
<p>20. Forestry-pulp-paper integration in developing countries</p>	<p>The Task Force aims to address bottlenecks in forestry-pulp-paper integration in developing countries by sharing experiences, promoting advanced technologies, and enhancing international dialogue among diverse stakeholders, thereby supporting sustainable industry development amid the challenges of greening and decarbonization policies</p> <p>Mentions collaboration across divisions to study pulp and paper.</p> <p>Emerging issue, with cross-division requirement</p> <p>Potential to contribute to the broader policy process and IUFRO Strategy;</p>	<p>Interesting but limited to a particular product</p> <p>Poorly written with minimal description on activities and governance</p> <p>A controversial topic in developing countries</p> <p>Lacks funding, and outputs are not target specific</p> <p>Narrow scope; good focus for a working party T</p> <p>The question on how the proposed Task Force will strengthen cross-Divisional interaction on specified topics related to IUFRO Strategy's Thematic Areas and/or Institutional Goals, and how the Task Force will complement and/or expand activities of existing IUFRO Divisional units, should be answered</p> <p>For me the concept note is not well prepared.</p> <p>Taskforce members are not indicated</p> <p>No description of specific proposed Task Force activities, deliverables and timelines.</p> <p>Absence of clarity of operational aspects</p> <p>Need to include more expert from global south particularly from Africa</p> <p>It does not list the countries of focus</p>	<p>NO</p>

		<p>More specific division involvement needed; no information on how other Divisions will participate.</p> <p>More geographic and gender consideration in membership needed</p> <p>Needs to clarify what the deliverables would be and their timeline.</p> <p>Needs to clarify the linkages with IUFRO Strategy.</p> <p>In spite of pointing to cross-divisional work, it is unclear that the proposed general activities would require a TF.</p> <p>There is a pulp-paper unit already in the IUFRO structure</p> <p>There is no information on the proponents</p>	
<p>21. The New Bauhaus – Global Wood-based Reconstructing for a Future of People and the Planet in Well-Being</p>	<p>Important societal topic The TF aims to promote the use of wood in the building industry to speed-up the realization of the circular economy</p> <p>Focuses on cutting-edge scientific knowledge and technologies to enhance the use of wood in construction, promoting long-term carbon storage and ecosystem benefits</p> <p>Important and relevant effort that build on experiences in Europe with circular economy A very relevant topic in a challenging time to achieve Net-zero targets and climate resilience</p> <p>If they secure funding then it is an ok project</p> <p>Identifies linkages across IUFRO Research groups and working parties.</p> <p>“Will not only serve as a catalyst for strengthened IUFRO networking and inter-Divisional collaboration but also addresses directly a number of UN-SDGs” Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline collaboration;</p> <p>Potential to contribute IUFRO Strategy and broader policy process; Addresses climate change and sustainability on a global scale, aligning with various UN Sustainable Development Goals and the New European Bauhaus initiative</p> <p>Young and Early career scientists involvement considered</p> <p>Good team and probably with bright future</p> <p>Task Force incorporates a wide range of stakeholders, including scientists, practitioners, policymakers, and NGOs, ensuring comprehensive perspectives and expertise.</p>	<p>European focused</p> <p>The goals are not well defined and appear not easily reached within the time-period given Activities and governance not clear The proposal is just general</p> <p>Too broad and ambiguous objectives and activities make it difficult to understand the purpose of the TF and what it aims to achieve. There is no concrete plan outlining how the participating IUFRO units will collaborate and contribute to the task force’s objectives</p> <p>Too many collaborations between IUFRO divisions without concrete action plan</p> <p>It is unclear who the additional members of the TF are and how they will contribute to reaching the goals of the TF.</p> <p>Budget is not indicated</p> <p>Taskforce members are not clearly indicated</p> <p>It seems that the group of experts has not been contacted yet.</p> <p>Although it mentions several units, the names of the participants are missing.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the topic, it would be nice to have an activity for a policy brief. The proposal needs to inform us how the findings will be translated to policymakers</p>	<p>Yes = No</p>

	<p>Cross-divisional work</p> <p>This is a very interesting task force, considering that wood production is a source of carbon emissions. It would be nice to know more about wood as carbon storage and how that boosts wood production in developing countries.</p>	<p>The effectiveness of proposed policies and innovations may be hindered by existing regulatory frameworks and resistance to change.</p> <p>Assessing the long-term effectiveness of the Task Force’s initiatives in achieving sustainability goals may be challenging due to varying contexts and metrics across regions.</p> <p>important to include Division 3</p> <p>Needs to clarify gender and geographical balance</p> <p>More information on the expected outcomes would be useful, as well as on the timeline and activities.</p> <p>I suggest including information on the contribution to/linkages with IUFRO Strategy</p>	
<p>22. Integrated Forest Management as an adaptive concept to improve multifunctionality and biodiversity in forests across the globe</p>	<p>The TF aims to integrate biodiversity into forest management concepts arguing that this is underemphasized in current management concepts. They envision to develop and promote the concept of integrated forest management. The topic seems relevant Important in addressing problems on biodiversity conservation;</p> <p>Interesting as Forest Management is key in face on climate change and degradation Emerging issue, hopefully transform forest management into next era</p> <p>involves members from IUFRO Divisions 1, 6, 8, and</p> <p>Activities in the frame of the Transformit project The connection to the Horizon 2020 project makes the goals obtainable. might support an initial phase of task force efforts.</p> <p>Multi-division involved. Potential to strengthen inter-divisional and inter-discipline cooperation;</p> <p>Potential to contribute IUFRO Strategy and broader policy process;</p> <p>Potential to expand cooperation beyond IUFRO;</p> <p>Objectives clearly indicated</p> <p>Involves a diverse range of experts, including those from East Asia, promoting cross-cultural knowledge exchange and collaboration.</p>	<p>The objectives need to be revised to be made consistent with previous sections, very much focused on European issues.</p> <p>Needs to further clarify the activities, timeline and outcomes in the full proposal</p> <p>The proposal is trying to include social science, which does not reflect in its overall objective unless they have ‘real’ social scientist (not forest ecologist) in TF team</p> <p>It is not clear what the difference is with many IUFRO units and divisions.</p> <p>Subject too broad for a Task force.</p> <p>Division coordinators not contacted</p> <p>Outputs vague and too broad</p> <p>Too many collaborators without explicitly mentioning their roles in the project</p> <p>More specific activities and deliverables with clear timelines needed in next steps;</p> <p>The TF misses out on the dimensions of forest health and social science in their approach. Forest health should be an essential component of integrated forest management with a strong link to biodiversity. The participation of</p>	<p>More Yes than NO</p>

	<p>Emphasizes a holistic view of forest management, aligning ecological, economic, and social objectives to enhance biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>scientists with expertise in acceptance of new concepts and methods and their implementation are of utmost importance for the success of the concept 'integrated forest management'</p> <p>Deliverables are not indicated</p> <p>More representatives from Asia and Africa should be involved</p> <p>Reliance on funding and support from the TRANSFORMIT project may limit the Task Force's autonomy and sustainability in the long term.</p> <p>The integrative approach may be difficult to implement consistently across varying regional contexts and stakeholder interests.</p> <p>Focused on Europe but IFM is very much needed in the tropics and global South</p> <p>Limited cross-divisional collaboration. Mainly Divisions 1 and 4. Other divisions could potentially participate.</p> <p>I am not an expert in the field, but I am a forester. Does not this task force repeat what we do every day?</p>	
--	--	--	--