

## Main takeaways regarding the EFMR

- **Goals need to be formulated more precise and clearly**

For a good monitoring system, clear and operational goals have to be defined. Existing information and gaps should be identified with monitoring professionals and stakeholders. Experts propose a methodology that is constantly improved by them. The standard procedures for creating a forest monitoring system are not taken into account adequately in the EFMR.

- **Spatial scales and timescales are not taken into account adequately**

There are clear differences in forest monitoring approaches on the forest owner scale, the national scale and European scale. The Commission's proposal aims to cover all three scales at once, which is not adequate for a European forest monitoring. The frequency of different information needs is linked more to the assumed technical possibilities than to the actual needs. Additionally, it does not account for the accuracy of the estimated changes (e.g. forest area).

- **The methodology and indicators need to be linked with the goals**

The methodology used in a monitoring system should be set up to serve the goals of the monitoring system. Yet, for certain indicators, the linkage with the goals is not clear. For each indicator the link to the goals should be included in annexes I-III.

- **Duplication needs to be avoided**

Most Member States already have a well-functioning National Forest Inventory (NFI) system in place that provides them with a lot of data needed for international reporting systems such as UN-ECE and Forest Europe. Given that the methodology in the EFMR differs from the Member States' NFI methodology, it is very likely to create significantly more work for Member States and the results will differ from each other, leading to confusion information. Existing synergies and expertise, such as ENFIN's harmonisation efforts, should be made use of to a larger extent.

