

**FLEGT 5th annual coordination meeting
19-20 November 2009
Final report**

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
INTRODUCTION	3
SESSION 1	4
SESSION 2	4
SESSION 3 – BREAKOUT GROUPS	4
GROUP 1 : VOLUNTARY PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT – SWOT ANALYSIS; BREAKOUT GROUP SUMMARY	4
GROUP 2 : AFRICAN FOREST GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES	5
GROUP 3: ASIAN FOREST GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES	8
GROUP 4 : LATIN AMERICA FOREST GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES	9
SESSION 4	10
SESSION 5: FLEGT ACTION PLAN ASSESSMENT 2010	10
SUPPLY SIDE: TIMBER PRODUCING COUNTRIES	10
DEMAND SIDE: CONSUMER MARKETS	11
COMMUNICATION	12
CONCLUSION & LINKAGES WITH THE GLOBAL CONTEXT	12
SESSION 6: COMMUNICATION	13
ACRONYMS	14
LIST OF ANNEXES	14
ANNEX I : PROGRAMME	15
ANNEX II : LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	18
ANNEX III : EVALUATION	22

Introduction

This report is a summary of the 5th annual coordination meeting of FLEGT related projects, which took place in Brussels on 19 & 20 November 2009.

The objective of the meeting was to share information on recent developments of the FLEGT Action Plan (session 1 on FLEGT & VPA update, session 4 on Ghana and DDR), to discuss its relevance 6 years after its adoption, reflecting on the main areas of progress, whether it helped in tackling forest governance challenges (session 5 focused on the FLEGT Action Plan, session 2 on lessons learned from recent FLEGT projects, session 3 on forest governance challenges in the different regions in the world). A session was held on communication with media experts and journalists in Europe and developing countries on demand from participants.

The meeting was well attended with participants from FLEGT project beneficiaries and partners, EC staff from Headquarters and Delegations, and Member States (see list of participants). Most participants were satisfied with the meeting (see evaluation synthesis), and provided many recommendations, one of them being to hold this kind of meeting regularly.

Discussions were based on field experience and conceptual analyses. The exchange of information was excellent, and led to recommendations for further action, both for individuals and institutions (EC, Member States, partner countries, NGOs, private sector organisations, research institutions).

Copies of the presentations as well as notes of various sessions are available.

We would like to thank all participants for their very positive contributions and ideas, and look forward to meeting them, as part of the global FLEGT network, in the coming weeks, or at the 6th FLEGT annual coordination meeting.

Session 1

After an introduction of the meeting and its objectives by Roberto Ridolfi, Philip Mikos reflected on the complexity of the issue of illegal logging and forest governance and highlighted that so far we have achieved good results with the first VPA (that with Ghana) being ratified that very same day, and promising progress with negotiations with other countries. He stressed the quality of the VPA process and agreement, and the success at adapting it to national priorities (allowing for a tailor-made approach). The proposal of a due diligence regulation is also progressing and we have high expectations for conclusion in 2010. In terms of challenges for 2010, top of the list are making FLEGT licensed timber a reality and securing agreement on the due diligence regulation, in addition, Philip Mikos put the question to the group that we need to adapt the VPA approach for “processing hubs”, and to countries which have very limited direct trade with EU, but whose raw material may well end up in furniture sold in EU, as well as to countries with limited international trade but interested in forest governance reforms. Ensuring coherence and synergies with REDD is also one of the key priorities for 2010. Collaboration with other markets, public procurement policies, banking systems were also identified as potential future focal areas. Philip Mikos invited the group to work collectively to propose analyses and chart ways forward (see session 5).

An update of the VPA process in Africa and Asia was then presented (see attached slides).

Session 2

Three FLEGT projects had their final evaluation in 2009. Lessons learned from these projects by the evaluators were presented and shared with all participants, providing useful thoughts for projects which are still ongoing. Slides are included in the project handbook.

Session 3 – Breakout groups

Group 1 : Voluntary Partnership Agreement – SWOT analysis: breakout group summary

The breakout group opened with an introduction to the VPA concept and a brief description of the global timber trade context in which it operates. As it was a ‘brainstorm’, no attempt was made to reach consensus on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for VPAs. Key issues identified by participants include:

Strengths

The main strength identified was the framework of ‘partnership’ in the agreement – recognizing responsibilities and rights of each party and bringing a wide set of stakeholder interests to the negotiating table. That these are legally binding is a key strength. Participants felt that the VPA afforded the EU an effective strategy for supporting sovereign governments in tropical forest countries to improve their domestic forest governance and law enforcement, while at the same time helping European consumers to avoid buying illegal wood. The bilateral nature of negotiations helped protect sovereign interests but allowed progress on sensitive issues. The focus on legality centres the negotiation on priorities already established

by the partner country and avoids a polemic on "externally imposed" standards. Partner country civil society representatives were keen to highlight the positive role of VPA negotiations in creating trust and political opportunities for them within their national forest sector dialogues. A further strength is that the VPA helps tropical forest countries maintain markets and ensure that they are not excluded from increasingly sensitive timber markets in the EU and US.

Weaknesses

A number of VPA weaknesses were highlighted, among them the risk of “strong agreements with weak governments and weak agreements with strong governments”, and the possibility that the VPA might endorse inequitable or unsustainable laws through licensing. The fact that these are bilateral by nature, but that trade is increasingly complex was identified as a shortcoming. Many felt it was too early to identify weaknesses as so few Agreements have been negotiated or implemented.

Opportunities

- The political interest in climate change brings more attention to forest issues. Thus affording new opportunities for work on forest governance.
- A well-resourced, effective REDD mechanism – increasing incentive for governments to tackle illegal logging in order to reduce deforestation/degradation.
- New legislation to reduce market access for illegal wood in USA, EU, Australia etc. creates more interest for FLEGT VPA
- In addition to international circumstances, participants identified a number of domestic opportunities for sectoral reform which have or could be supported by negotiation/implementation of a VPA.

Threats

- Failure to ensure coherent and effective demand-side policies for legal timber (Due Diligence Regulation, Green Public Procurement Policies etc)
- Decreasing market share of EU market compared to increased importance of domestic consumption and/or trade with other regions with faster growing economies.
- Failure to resource implementation adequately
- Loss of EU government focus and interest with increased political attention to REDD
- Lack of interest by EU buyers and/or policy setters for FLEGT licenses will undermine credibility

Group 2 : African forest governance challenges

TRENDS: Major issues and trends identified by the group impacting forest governance in Africa

1. Central Africa

- A major increase in the use of **management plans**. Out of 55 million ha, some 30 million ha are under preparation or already in implementation of a long-term (25 to 30 years) management plan. This means new norms and new regulations (better?), but also a new factor of illegality, as companies do not adapt to new norms & regulations in time.

- Annual operation plans are foreseen and are a reality, but there is a very weak capacity of the national administrations to use and manage this tool. **Capacity** is a major concern.
- An increased capacity, particularly with FORAF (*Observatoire des Forêts d'Afrique centrale*) to **monitor** forest trends, and in the future, possibly monitor also carbon trends (although no scientific analyses of carbon contents in African forests have been developed so far).
- A general recognition of the importance of the **informal sector** but very limited knowledge is available on size, impact, routes, etc. There is absence of a clear (regulatory) framework for the domestic markets. What are the levers to improve management of the domestic sector? The EC noted it will finance a CIFOR project to work on these issues.
- The Congo Basin Forest Partnership and the COMIFAC (*Commission des forêts d'Afrique centrale*) are quite unique in the world in terms of active and efficient **regional coordination** of forest policy and forest-related projects. There was consensus in the group that there is political will to harmonise forest policy in the region, however, views differed on whether this will result in concrete actions and activities in reality.

2. There seems to be an increase in participatory forest management / **Community forest management**, particularly in East and South Africa (concept extended to community natural resources management in Namibia and Botswana). This is in line with the general trend on decentralisation, which one can also see in West Africa.

- In **Liberia** the recently adopted bill gives a prominent role to community management of natural resources.
- In **Cameroon**, community forestry developed some ten years ago, and there is now a move towards “*foresterie communale*” (forest area being managed by the local authority with increased participation from communities).
- In other countries of **Central Africa**, community forestry is still a concept which is being tested, but is for the most part taking place OUTSIDE of the permanent forest domain (which means the land is not foreseen for production forestry). How to match the balance between expectations raised by community forestry and possible long term sustainable management of forests (when the land is not to be permanently covered with forests)?
- In **Madagascar**, there has been a process to devolve forest management to communities, but weak capacity of the administration, inadequate awareness raising in communities combine to result in major mismanagement
- It is however worth noting that participatory forest mapping (one of the tools of rural rapid appraisal), is a useful tool for involving forest communities in forest management, in partnership with concessionaires.

3. The FLEGT process has given more confidence to NGOs to support indigenous people's rights and forest communities' rights.

4. Forest titles can be divided in different categories:

- titles related to areas (concessions, community forestry)
- titles which have been decentralised to local authorities (forêts communales)
- titles for artisanal logging
- titles related to volumes

5. Interest in **REDD** is evident all over Africa, although its impact on the forestry sector is difficult to predict. For some, REDD offers a potential alternative to commercial logging, but the question asked is can countries earn more money from their forest by NOT logging?

6. Forests ecosystems are more at risk to land-use changes than other types of ecosystems. “**Land grab**” is increasing as the competition for agricultural land increases (forests are increasingly being converted to oil palm, commercial agriculture, ...). Mining also competes with forest use and is generally favoured by African governments as mining may provide higher sources of income and employment.

7. The **financial crisis** has had a major impact on the forest industry in Africa. A number of derogations to the laws have been granted by the governments in response to the crisis. There is a risk that these derogations remain permanent.

8. In VPA countries, one can see clear steps forward in terms of governance, for example:

- Improved dialogue between and within stakeholder groups as part of the VPA negotiation. VPA processes demonstrate the complexity of the different interests involved and give visibility to the different voices some of which are seldom heard;
- in Congo, more effective and dissuasive sanctions ,
- in Ghana civil society is now clearly identified as a partner of the government,
- in Cameroon, launch of a process to revise the forest code and secure greater responsibility and benefit for communities; ,
- in DRC, the completion of the concession title conversion process and the development of a template for cahier de charges (Social agreements between communities and logging companies) through a multi-stakeholder process.

But also some steps backward for example:

- independent observer cannot access some areas in Cameroon,
- recommendations of the independent observer are not followed in Cameroon.

9. It is not yet clear how **forest sector reforms** recently introduced in some countries are going to impact forest governance, for example:

- prohibition to export logs in Gabon;
- merging of Ministry of Forest and Ministry of Environment in a number of countries; and
- splitting one Ministry into two Ministries in other countries

CHALLENGES:

Beyond the challenges specific to each country, the group identified the following major challenges likely to be faced in 2010:

- the evolution of the financial **crisis**. It is impossible to ask companies to invest when there is so little market demand and high risk of foreclosure. Shareholders do not understand or have an interest in good governance. Focus is more on profit earnings than behavioural change.
- the role of **China** in Africa which could heavily influence African national strategies
- the evolution of **REDD**
- the adoption of EU’s **due diligence regulation** and the first cases of the Lacey Act will certainly induce change.

The group recommended the development of a list of forest governance indicators.

And to conclude, a quote from Richelieu (Prime Minister of Louis XIII, France, 1585-1642) :
“ *Faire une loi et ne pas la faire exécuter, c’est autoriser ce que l’on veut défendre...*”
"Adopting a law and not enforcing it means sanctioning exactly what you want to prevent"
Food for thought !

Group 3: Asian forest governance challenges

Two areas of regional forest governance progress were highlighted by participants: first in national political discussions, such as the post Suharto process in Indonesia and second in response to changing international patterns of demand. In the latter, the US Lacey Act was described as a ‘game changer’. The absence of a concluded VPA in Asia was noted and concern was raised that they could be seen as too ‘Africa focused’ and thus could discourage further expansion in the Asia region, unless there is good progress with those countries already engaged in negotiations (Malaysia and Indonesia).

The primary reason for progress was judged to be government leadership – where individual Ministers had committed themselves to improving governance in the sector, progress was generally quick to follow. Where civil society capacity is limited, it is important to anticipate providing support to build capacity, but in a way that encourages local ownership for processes and avoids the risk that the VPA be seen as something driven by and for the EU. Finally, the important challenge that there remain substantial financial incentive for illegal actors – most notably that created by the ongoing willingness of consumer nations to allow the import of illegal wood.

A number of positive and negative trends were identified by the group. Encouraging signs included the increasing regional media/political focus on highlighting and tackling corruption in various natural resource sectors, including forestry; the forthcoming due diligence regulation; Australian government interest in addressing the problem of illegal imports and recent ITTO discussions about land tenure questions in the region. However there was concern that global financial problems had increased pressure on all actors in the tropical timber trade to reduce costs, and that former ethical commitments may not be acted on in this economic climate. This fear applied equally to individual company purchasing policies and to implementation of government policy including green public procurement policies and impending due diligence regulation requirements.

The group discussed whether VPAs could be considered as a Trojan horse – offering market access but pushing a governance agenda, or whether they are an honest partnership, recognizing that consumers in the EU did not wish to buy illegal wood and offering governments support in order to access increasingly sensitive markets. It was noted that the strength of the VPA lies in its partnership approach.

Practical proposals from the group included:

- A regional CPET (central point of technical expertise) to provide specific, tailored advice to companies wishing to clean up their supply chains and sell to sensitive buyers.
- A focused diplomatic effort on the part of EU leaders, centering on negotiations at Copenhagen, linking legality in the timber trade with REDD payments.

- That ASEAN get actively engaged in setting legality standards for the region in order that the proliferation of standards does not cause buyer confusion or undermine progress in the sector. It was recommended that the EU follow this process closely and work to ensure that such a regional standard does not lower bar (vis a vis FLEGT standards)

Group 4 : Latin America forest governance challenges

Colombia's timber is mainly sold in its domestic market, although there are no comprehensive market studies. Chinese buyers are entering the market, which may produce a change in future trade flow patterns. . Some timber originates from conflict zones. There are reported links between illegal logging and organized crime and/or anti-government movements. Forest governance and problems of illegal logging are not seen as national priority and do not feature in the development cooperation agenda. However, there is clearly a massive problem: studies estimate that 20-40% timber is illegally harvested worth as much as US\$ 200 million annually. The police and environmental authorities are responsible for controlling the timber harvest and flows. However, the police are not well equipped with necessary skills and knowledge. Consumers do not know how to distinguish between legal and illegally produced timber products. Eco-certification in Colombia is very limited.

Experiences of an EC-financed FLEGT project were discussed. A key problem has been gaining access to authorization of forestry operations. The permits for operations take a long time to obtain. Capacities and knowledge related to the permit processes are limited. Another problem is the limited involvement of civil society (particularly rural communities) in the drafting of norms which govern the use of forests. This has lead to non-obedience and illegalities. Most of natural forest in Colombia is under the formal control of indigenous or afro-Colombian communities. The project has achieved an understanding that there are illegalities related to timber in Colombia. A multi-sectoral pact on legal timber has been signed and the issues of legality and sustainability are being discussed.

Brazil is resolute in its desire to keep forest sector policy as a sovereign issue. Therefore international processes or initiatives in this regard are of little interest to the Brazilian government. However, there are numerous national and state-level initiatives which aim at controlling the forest sector. The horizontal and vertical linkages between FLEGT and REDD and deforestation strategies are scarcely made.

In Acre there has been a dialogue between government, NGOs and private sector on illegal logging, supported by IUCN and WWF. This process has resulted in better involvement of stakeholder groups in the forest policy development processes and an interest of the state government to continue working with them. One concrete result has been the revision of forestry norms, with increased measures for control of illegalities. There is now a better understanding on the importance of working with private sector. Acre was selected because it was considered “fertile ground” for civil participation. Other states may be much less open to this.

In general **Latin America** has limited volumes of trade in timber and wood-based products with the EU. The US is a much more important trade partner. Often, internal domestic markets consume most of timber production. It is necessary to develop the FLEGT-concept further, giving the domestic trade due attention – FLEGT was suggested as a new concept. Current trade flows are, however, not static and changes in markets may lead to an increase in

exports. The influence of due diligence regulation and Lacey Act remains to be seen but should be anticipated. The FLEGT Action Plan is not well known in the Latin America countries. It is a difficult concept and easy to confuse with other related issues and initiatives. Another important feature of the Latin America forested regions is Amazonia whose vast expanse spans many countries. Brazil often uses its predominant position to influence the forest related processes in the region. The Amazon Treaty Organization provides a potential forum to discuss forest issues, but at the moment the "environment" is not high on the agenda of the foreign ministers who dominate this forum. Another potential forum to further forest dialogue is the Amazon Networking Initiative.

Future opportunities for FLEGT in the Latin American region were discussed. One proposed area for focus would be the quantification of the economic losses caused by illegal logging at national level. This would help raise political awareness of the issue. Ministries of finance will only be convinced with hard facts and figures. Another issue to explore in dialogue is the linkage between REDD and FLEGT – the latter may prepare a country for being a good candidate for REDD financing. Also national events like elections and trade negotiations with the EU can afford opportunity as well as the Latin American forestry Congress in 2010.

Session 4

This session was divided into two parts.

- Mathilda Åberg, from the Swedish Representation to the EU, informed the participants about the latest developments of the due diligence regulation, although the proposal was still under discussion at that time (political agreement was reached on December 19). Together with John Bazill, she took note of the participants concerns and tried to answer their specific questions. Main questions were related to the need for a prohibition clause (to make it illegal to trade illegal timber), the systems of approval of monitoring organisations, penalties foreseen and their application, risk assessment procedures, applicable legislation, communication strategy, implications of Lisbon Treaty for the due diligence regulation and possible date of application.
- Nana Bema KUMI, Ambassador, Head of the Mission of the Republic of Ghana to the European Union and Lluís Riera, Director DEV B, then informed the participants of the conclusion of the 1st voluntary partnership agreement at Council on 19 November, and the signature on the following day. They congratulated themselves for this joint endeavour and called for maintaining the partnership during implementation. The agreement entered into force on 1st December 2009.

Session 5: FLEGT Action Plan assessment 2010

1. The group stressed that the FLEGT Action Plan of 2003 provides a useful framework for activities on forest governance and associated international trade. The areas of the FLEGT Action Plan that have seen most progress are clearly the Voluntary partnership agreements (VPAs) and the due diligence regulation (although not yet approved).

Supply side: timber producing countries

2. Concerning the VPA, participants felt that the process to develop VPAs should be reinforced noting that more agreements need to come into force. Some people noted that countries with whom VPAs have been concluded might be the "low hanging fruit" and a strategy is needed to expand the VPA concept to other contexts so as to engage with more countries as the VPA is seen as a very positive tool.

3. Central and South America has not been a priority for focus and this is a concern to be addressed in future. Brazil has demonstrated significant progress in improving forest governance and in its fight against illegal logging, although this has been completely unrelated to any dialogue on a VPA or political dialogue with the EU. Drawing on this experience could provide valuable lessons to support FLEGT activity where a VPA is not foreseen. Intensifying communication on FLEGT Action Plan and VPAs is needed in Latin America to increase awareness of all stakeholders. This communication should target both private sector (to inform them about how market is changing, with the support of FLEGT EU funded projects) and the governments. The EC should aim for a high level political dialogue on forest governance and trade issues as a preliminary step. EU Delegations have a key role to play in that respect. Projects and partners may also play a role in communicating the FLEGT Action Plan to national stakeholders.

4. Another area where there has been little progress under the FLEGT Action Plan is work with countries with limited trade with Europe. Expanding activity under the FLEGT Action Plan to such countries is likely to require the identification and development of suitable "change levers" to foster forest governance reform.

5. In some countries, although there is limited EU trade, significant trade with the US might be sufficient to foster interest in a VPA. Another approach would be to focus on trade chains, even where the volume or value of trade is low, as these might provide important points of leverage for reform. Example of small scale trading groups of forest owners in Latin America was cited, as they have an influence over a large part of the forest area even though the quantity of timber traded is rather limited. A new instrument may be needed to be defined: a VPA like approach but on a smaller scale. It was also suggested to work on other production models than the large scale industrial logging sector, and find appropriate tools.

6. The adoption of the Lacey Amendment in the US has clearly been a major driver for change, and with the forthcoming EU due diligence regulation, more interest for FLEGT licensed timber is likely.

7. The domestic sector, charcoal, and fuelwood may be very important forest governance challenges in different countries, which can be addressed either in the VPAs or through a specific approach to be defined. Ghana, Congo and Cameroon have indicated their intention to cover the domestic market with their legality assurance system. However those sectors are often poorly regulated and more work is required in this area.

Demand side: consumer markets

8. On the demand side, the major achievements are the Lacey Act (US) and the forthcoming EU Due diligence regime. The Due diligence regime should change behaviour of companies. Private sector support projects may be instrumental in enabling companies to shift to meet new market requirements helping to bring about this change.

9. On public procurement policies (PPP), progress has been made with 6 Members States adopting a PPP which requires (legal or) sustainable timber, the exclusive focus on the latter is a concern, but difficult to address in the (to date) absence on the market of FLEGT licensed timber. In terms of policy coherence for development, this is a concern, and more work needs to be done in terms of promoting FLEGT licenses timber in PPP.

The refinement of construction standards and norms are also a key area where FLEGT timber promotion may be encouraged.

10. On financing and investment, experience has shown that it was difficult to influence and change business practices. However, with the Due diligence regulation and its focus on importers, more analysis and action on this issue is needed to assess scope for further action.

11. There has been strong move internationally to address illegal logging and cut illegal timber out of supply chains: many other consumer markets are increasingly sensitive (including US, New Zealand, Australia, etc.). Collaborative action with Japan has been disappointing. There has been limited attention to the Middle East which is trading more and more timber. Further work with the US, in the context of Lacey Act and DRR, with China, through the bilateral coordination mechanism, and with Australia in the context of their PPP will be needed in the immediate future.

Communication

12. An annual report on the FLEGT Action Plan making the link between the different elements of the Plan, and which would frame development in a global context has been proposed as a useful communication tool and one immediate action for 2010.

13. A number of participants felt that VPAs were often presented as synonymous with to FLEGT, rather than one piece of the package of measures set out in the Action Plan. More work on information exchange and communication is thus needed. Communication with different institutional partners, in particular regional organizations, should be reinforced. Use of Free Trade Agreements could also be explored if identified as an appropriate tool to tackle forest governance challenges.

14. More communication and exchange is also needed with some environmental advocacy NGOs to better explain FLEGT and the linkages with sustainability, which is generally their primary focus.

Conclusion & linkages with the global context

15. Globally speaking, the FLEGT action plan is considered still very relevant by the group. But in the future, there is a need for more economic analysis, for more monitoring, including definition of baselines and indicators.

16. The present discussion on climate change and REDD offers new opportunities. Forests are more fashionable than in the past, and it is considered to be timely to present the FLEGT experience and what can be achieved. Working together with the REDD+ Champions, in particular on governance, law enforcement and land tenure issues is key for the success of FLEGT (and REDD).

17. The issue of land use, including land grabbing, conversion for agribusiness and payments for ecosystem services, notably carbon storage is going to be more prominent in the international and national debates. Contributions of FLEGT Action Plans to these debates, and synergies with related initiatives should be strengthened.

18. Finally, the critical role of EC Delegations in the success of the FLEGT Action Plan has been underscored, as well as the importance of coherence and synergies between policy oriented projects.

Session 6: Communication

The final afternoon of the meeting was devoted to interactive communications training. The first session aimed to suggest ways in which participants could develop effective media strategies, identify news value in their projects and research results, and deal with journalists. The session included a group exercise in turning scientific research into attention-grabbing headlines and drew on a detailed communications handbook provided to all participants ([pdf available in ENG, FR and SP](#)). The session also looked briefly at the policy implications of one scientific research paper which was effectively communicated to the local and international media, demonstrating the positive impact of successful public relations (PR).

Following the media session the group was informed about different channels for communicating with key audiences in developing countries. The trainers highlighted the importance of radio and film/video as well as print materials in local languages and dialects. In addition to the focus on international and local media the training session looked in detail at some of the complex issues relating to work with print and broadcast journalists in developing countries, particularly when discussing politically sensitive issues. This session drew on the experiences of journalists and communications specialists from a range of FLEGT countries who had been invited to the meeting as participants and observers, and highlighted the importance of international actors in providing a neutral/un-attributed channel for critical voices from inside national debates.

Acronyms

DDR	Due diligence regulation
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
FLEGT	Forest law enforcement, governance and trade
NGO	Non governmental organization
PPP	Public procurement policy
PR	Public relations
REDD	reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation
US	United States of America
VPA	Voluntary partnership agreement

List of annexes

Annex I : Programme
Annex II : List of participants
Annex III : Evaluation synthesis

Annex I : Programme

FLEGT 5th Annual Coordination meeting Final Agenda

Venue: Centre Borchette, rue Froissart 36, Brussels.

Room AB 4D

Thursday 19 th November - Day one
--

09.00 – 09.30 Coffee and registration

Session 1 : Chair & Moderator – Julia Falconer, DG DEV

09.30 – 09.40 Introduction (Roberto Ridolfi, DG AIDCO)

09:40 – 09:50 Objective of the meeting (Mathieu Bousquet, DG DEV, Jade Saunders, EFI)

09.50 – 10.15 Overview of strategic FLEGT priorities (Philip Mikos, DG DEV)

10.15 – 10.45 Africa VPAs update and expectations for 2010 (Julia Falconer, Mathieu Bousquet, DG DEV).

10.45 – 11.15 Asia VPAs update and expectations for 2010 (Flip van Helden, John Bazill, DG ENV).

11.15 – 11.45 Refreshments

Session 2 : Chair : Frank Jacobs, DG AIDCO; Moderator : Jade Saunders, EFI

11.45 – 12.45 Independent evaluations: impacts and lessons learned from long-term projects

- Tom Blomley – IIED Independent Evaluator
- Neil Bird – Verifor, ODI
- Frits Hesselink - IUCN

12.45 – 14.15 Lunch

14.15 – 16.00 Breakouts (rooms AB4D, 304, 305 and 405)

Group one	FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements: SWOT analysis and implications (Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) <i>Moderation : Renaat van Rompaey</i>
Group two	Africa Region Forest Governance: achievements, trends and forthcoming opportunities. <i>Moderation: Ralph Ridder</i>
Group three	Asia Region Forest Governance: achievements, trends and forthcoming opportunities. <i>Moderation : Flip van Helden</i>
Group four	Latin America Forest Governance: achievements, trends and forthcoming opportunities. <i>Moderation : John Bazill</i>

16.00 – 16.30 Refreshments

Session 3 : Chair & Moderation : Mathieu Bousquet, DG DEV

16.30 – 17.30 Due Diligence Regulation update: Mathilda Aberg (Sweden) & John Bazill (EC – DG ENV)

17.30 – 18.00 Presentation by Ghana and EC of the FLEGT VPA ratification (speakers tbc)

18.00 – 19.30 Drinks reception at Borchette

19:30 Dinner

Friday 20 th November - Day two
--

09.00 – 09.30 Coffee and registration

Session 4 – Chair and moderation : Jade Saunders, EFI

09.30 – 13.00 Open Discussion: FLEGT Action Plan Assessment 2010 – impacts, gaps and focus for the future

***Aim:** The aim of the session is to gather lessons/experiences from project representatives to be fed into the EC's evaluation and possible review of the EC FLEGT Action Plan in 2010.*

***Output:** A set of meeting notes will be presented for consideration in the planned 2010 evaluation.*

Key questions:

Assessment of existing Action Plan

- Has the Action Plan helped the European Union to achieve its stated aim of “addressing the growing problem of illegal logging and related trade”?
- Which areas of the Action Plan have seen most progress achieved? Why? Can this progress be maintained? Do participants see opportunities or threats to future achievement in these areas in the short to medium term (2010-2015)?
- How have project activities/impacts contributed to achievements under the FLEGT Action Plan?
- Where has progress been limited? What are the main challenges to progress in these areas? Do participants see opportunities for achievement in these areas in the short to medium term (2010-2015)?
- How /could project activities contribute to achievements in these areas in the future?

Focus for future strategy

- Are the assumptions which underpinned the Action Plan still valid? If not, what has changed? What are the implications of any changes for the ongoing relevance of the Action Plan?

- Should the Action Plan focus more closely on areas where most progress has been made or maintain its broad strategy?
- To what extent is the success of the FLEGT Action Plan dependent on policy coherence in other sectors and between EU Member States? In which areas should most emphasis be placed?
- Is a revised Action Plan necessary? If so, what would the benefits be of the revision?
- What would the advantages and disadvantages be of a future/revised Action Plan with a more explicit link to forest governance in the context of REDD?
- What would the resource and policy implications be of any recommendations in this respect?
- Are there other policy areas where stronger links would be justified and effective?

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch

Session 5 Interactive training session led by Coimbra Sirica, Burness communications and Oumy Ndiaya, Head of Communications, The Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation.

14.30 – 18.00 Strategic communication of project results with media and developing countries.

International media strategies (1 hour)

- Identifying news value in research and project results
- Framing research and project results for different stories (climate, poverty, feature, personal experience, trade etc)
- Pitching to journalists and editors

Partner country communications strategies (2 hours)

- Identifying key audience groups and appropriate methods of communication
- Best practice for different communications channels
- Developing culturally-appropriate messages
- Communicating around politically sensitive issues (eg governance)

Annex II : List of participants

	CFP/ Other	Title	Institution / organisation	Participants	E-mails
<i>Project partners - EC funded</i>					
2004		EC Indonesia FLEGT support project	Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia	Ratman Tasmin	: rt@eu-flegt.org
2008	81135	DICOGERE (suite de DACEFI 2004/81135)	WWF Gabon	Nathalie Nyare	nnyare@wwfcarpo.org
2008	81135	DICOGERE (suite de DACEFI 2004/81135)	Nature +	Jean-Louis Doucet Michèle Federspiel Cédric Vermeulen	doucet.jl@fsagx.ac.be m.federspiel@natureplus.be vermeulen.c@fsagx.ac.be
2004	81639	Forest & Trade Networks for legal and sustainable forest management in Africa and Asia	WWF	George White	georgecwhite@btinternet.com
2004	81661	Forest Governance Learning Group - Enabling Practical, Just and Sustainable Forest Use	IIED	Dr Nguyen Quang Tan Elaine Morrisson (<i>excused</i>)	tan@recoftc.org elaine.morrisson@iied.org
2008	151966	Social justice in forestry	IIED	Elaine Morrisson	
2005	81758	Timber Trade Action Plan for Good Governance in Tropical Forestry (TTAP 1)	Tropical Forest Trust	Scott Poynton Susanna Lohri	s.poynton@tft-forests.org s.lohri@tft-forests.org
2006	114494	Timber Trade Action Plan for Latin America and China (TTAP2)	Tropical Forest Trust	Alastair Herd	a.herd@tft-forests.org
2004	82019	The VERIFOR project: institutional options for verifying legality in the forest sector.	ODI - Overseas Dev Inst	Francesca Iannini Neil Bird	f.iannini@odi.org.uk n.bird@odi.org.uk
2004	83484	Strengthening Voices for Better Choices: Enhancing Forest Governance in Six Key Tropical Forest Countries in Asia, Africa and South America	IUCN	Guido Broekhoven	Guido.BROEKHOVEN@iucn.org
		ENAFLEG	IUCN	Richard Aishton	richard.aishton@iucn.org
2004	86364	Regional Processes for Forest Law Enforcement and Governance - FLEG	World Bank	Nalin Kishor	nkishor@worldbank.org
2006	116381	Programme on Forests (ProFor - II)	World Bank	<i>excused</i>	
2005	101218	Improving governance of forest resources and reducing illegal logging and associated trade with full civil society participation in SE Asia.	EIA	Faith Doherty	anonfaith@hotmail.com
2008	151324	Strengthening civil society to promote integrated actions and policies to tackle tropical deforestation in Asia-Pacific	EIA	Faith Doherty	anonfaith@hotmail.com
2005	108387	Observatoire des Forêts d'Afrique	JRC - Ispra	Alain Billand Paolo Cerutti	alain.billand@cirad.fr P.cerutti@cgiar.org
2005	124886	Support to the EU FLEGT process in developing countries	EFI	Ralph Ridder Melissa Othman LenaYadlapalli Jade Saunders Tomi Tuomasjukka	lana.yadlapalli@efi.int jade.saunders@efi.int Tomi.tuomasjukka@efi.int ralph.ridder@efi.int

2009	168912	Asia FLEGT programme	EFI	Aimi lee Abdullah	aimi.lee@efi.int
2006	131823	Capacity building in the Congo Basin and implementation of Independent Monitoring of FLEG in the Republic of Congo	Forests Monitor Ltd	Stuart Wilson Valérie Vauthier	swilson@rem.org.uk vvauthier@rem.org.uk
2007	133003	Developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw lumbering through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Ghana and Guyana	Tropenbos International	K.S. Nketiah (Sam) Roderick Zagt	ksnketiah@yahoo.com roderick.zagt@tropenbos.org
2008	151390	Renforcement des structures du secteur privé en vue de la mise en oeuvre du plan d'action FLEGT dans le Bassin du Congo et en Afrique de l'Ouest	IFIA Interafrican Forest Industries association sarl	Gregory Reinbold	events@atibt.com
2008	151502	Veille et Interpellation autour de la Gouvernance de l'exploitation et de la commercialisation des ressources forestières	Observatoire national pour l'environnement et le secteur forestier	Etienne Rasarely	osf@moov.mg
2008	151637	Governance Initiative for Rights & Accountability in Forest Management (GIRAF)	Care Danmark Fond	Mohamed Asaah Rolf Herno	Asaah.Mohammed@co.care.org Rhernoe@Care.Dk
2008	151770	Ensuring a seat at the table: supporting NGO coalitions to participate in FLEGT VPA processes with the aim of improving forest governance and strengthening local and indigenous peoples rights	FERN	Iola Real Dan Saryeh Symphorien AZANTSA Protet Judicaël ESSONO ONDO	iola@fern.org saskia@fern.org dsaryee@ldi-lbr.org azantsabs@cedcameroun.org essono.ondopj@gmail.com
2008	151919	Innovative timber tracking using genetic and isotope fingerprints	GTZ - Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit	Bjoern Hecht	bjoern.hecht@gtz.de
2008	152358	Forest Governance and Integrity Programme: Phase 1.Anticorruption Advocacy, Forest Governance Systems Analysis and Monitoring	Transparency international EV	Michel Gary Manoj Nadkarni	mgary@transparency.org mnadkarni@transparency.org
EDF		FLEGT support project for ACP countries	FAO	Bob Simpson	Robert.Simpson@fao.org
		NFP Facility	FAO	Marc Vandenhaute	Marc.Vandenhaute@fao.org
	152459	Promovendo a inclusão socio-ambiental das populações em zonas de ocupação da Amazônia brasileira por meio da gestão territorial e adoção de práticas de manejo sustentável dos recursos florestais	INSTITUTO INTERNACIONAL DE EDUCACAO DO BRASIL	<i>excused</i>	
	151754	Gestión Territorial Indígena y Servicios Ecosistémicos Amazónicos	ASOCIACION INTERETNICA DE DESAROLLO DE LA SELVA PERUANA	<i>excused</i>	
	172565	Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation through Payments for Environmental Services, Conservation and Improved Forest Management in Santa Cruz Department, Bolivia	FUNDACION NATURA BOLIVIA	<i>excused</i>	
	114796	Proyecto Bosques/FLEGT	CARDER	Rubén Darío Moreno Orjuela Alberto Árias Dávila	rudamor@carder.gov.co
	114452	Fortalecimiento de la gobernabilidad local para la conservación de los bosques en la Amazonia de Colombia y la construcción de programas transfronterizos con Brasil y Venezuela"	GAIA Foundation	<i>excused</i>	

151979	Bosques y Territorios Étnicos en el Chocó-Darién Columbo-Ecuatoriano: Protección Territorial, Manejo y Comercialización Responsable de Productos Forestales	OXFAM GB LBG		<i>excused</i>	
<i>Special envoys</i>					
	Special envoy	FLEGT Indonesia	Andy Roby		andyroby2001@yahoo.com
	Special envoy	FLEGT Central Africa	Alain Penelon		penelon_alain@yahoo.fr
	Special envoy	FLEGT Ghana & Liberia	Clare Brogan		c.brogan@frr.co.uk
	Special envoy	FLEGT Liberia	Stephanie Altman		stephanie.l.altman@gmail.com
	Special envoy	FLEGT DRC	Emmanuel Heuse		emmanuel.heuse@btcctb.org
	Special envoy	FLEGT Liberia	Art Blundell		artblundell@yahoo.com
<i>Resource persons</i>					
	Resource person	Chatham House	Duncan Brack		dbrack@chathamhouse.org.uk
	Resource person	Chatham House	Alison Hoare		alhoare@chathamhouse.org.uk
	Resource person	Forest Trends	Phuc Xuan To		pto@forest-trends.org
	Resource person	ProForest	Ruth Nussbaum		Ruth@proforest.net
			Joyce Lam		Joyce@Proforest.net
			Andreas Knoell		Andreas@proforest.net
	Resource person	TTF	Rachel Butler		rbutler@tff.co.uk
	Resource person	Traffic Asia	Ulrich Malessa		ulrich.malessa@traffic.sur.iucn.org
	Resource person	Consultant - evaluator of IIED project	Tom Blomley		tom.blomley@gmail.com
	Resource person	ITTO	Gerhard Breulmann		-
<i>Member States</i>					
	Member State - France		Cyril Loisel		cyril.loisel@diplomatie.gouv.fr
	Member State - The Netherlands		Sicco Stortelder		s.w.stortelder@minlnv.nl
	Member State - France		Jean-Paul Torre		jean-paul.torre@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
	Member State - Finland	Embassy of Finland in Vietnam	Huong Le Thi Thu (Ms)		huong.lethithu@formin.fi
	Member State - Finland	Embassy of Finland in Zambia	Elizabeth Ndhlovu		Elizabeth.Ndhlovu@formin.fi
	Member State - Finland	Ministry for Foreign Affairs	Timo Kienanen		timo.kienanen@formin.fi
	Member State - Czech republic		Katerina Ventrubova		katerina.ventrubova@mze.cz
<i>European Commission</i>					
	European Commission	DG DEV	Mathieu Bousquet		
	European Commission	DG DEV	Julia Falconer		
	European Commission	DG DEV	John Bruneval		-
	European Commission	DG DEV	Philip Mikos		-
	European Commission	DG AIDCO	Roberto Ridolfi		-
	European Commission	DG AIDCO	Frank Jacobs		-

	European Commission	DG ENV	John Bazill	-
	European Commission	DG ENV	Flip van Helden	-
	European Commission	DG ENV	Giuliana Torta	-
<i>Journalists and communication</i>				
	Journalist	INCEP CONGO	Bonne Annee Matoumona (<i>excused</i>)	bonnematou@yahoo.fr bonneannee@incef.org
	Journalist	Jakarta Post	Adianto P. Simamora	adiantops@yahoo.com
	Journalist	Journalist - Cameroun	Assitan KANOUTE	kanoutcha@hotmail.com
	Journalist	LMI (Liberia Media Initiative)	John Kollie	liberia.mediainitiative@gmail.com
	Journalist	New Straits Times	Chai Mei Ling	cmeiling@nst.com.my
	Journalist	Burness communications	Coimbra Maher Sirica	csirica@burnesscommunications.com
	Journalist		Sara Stefanini	sestefanini@gmail.com
	Journalist		Alice Bomboy	
	Journalist	CTA - journaliste	Oumy Ndiaye	
<i>Other</i>				
	Facilitator	WIX	Renaat Van Rompaey	renaat@wix.nl
	Chinese Academy of Forestry	Chinese Academy of Forestry (CAF)	Chen Yong	chenyongv2000@yahoo.com.cn
	Chinese Academy of Forestry	Chinese Academy of Forestry (CAF)	Su Haiying	suhaiying0724@163.com

Annex III : Evaluation

Item	Very dissatisfied / <i>Insatisfait</i>		Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied / <i>Neutre</i>		Very satisfied / <i>Très satisfait</i>
Overall satisfaction with the seminar <i>Satisfaction globale p/r au séminaire</i>			12%	40%	48%
EC HQ & Delegation			1	3	2
Member States and Special Envoys			1	2	5
Project beneficiaries			1	5	5
Did it respond to my objectives ? <i>Le séminaire a-t-il répondu à mes attentes ?</i>		4%	11%	58%	27%
EC HQ & Delegation		1		4	1
Member States and Special Envoys			2	4	3
Project beneficiaries			1	7	3
Thursday morning : EC expectations and update		8%	8%	54%	31%
EC HQ & Delegation		1		4	1
Member States and Special Envoys		1	2	3	3
Project beneficiaries				7	4
Thursday morning : Evaluation of projects		16%	21%	42%	21%
EC HQ & Delegation		1	1	3	1
Member States and Special Envoys		1	1	4	1
Project beneficiaries		2	3	3	3
Thursday afternoon : Breakout groups	4%		4%	42%	50%
EC HQ & Delegation				3	3
Member States and Special Envoys			1	2	6
Project beneficiaries	1			6	4
Group 1 : SWOT analysis	1				2
Group 2 : Africa				6	4
Group 3: Asia				2	3
Group 4 : Latin America				2	2
Thursday afternoon : Due diligence		4%	26%	22%	22%
EC HQ & Delegation				3	1
Member States and Special Envoys			5	2	1
Project beneficiaries		1	1	6	3
Friday morning : FLEGT Action Plan			13%	52%	35%
EC HQ & Delegation			1	2	2
Member States and Special Envoys				5	4
Project beneficiaries			2	5	2
Friday afternoon : Communication		8%	28%	24%	40%
EC HQ & Delegation			3	2	1
Member States and Special Envoys		2		1	6
Project beneficiaries			4	3	3

What part of the seminar was most useful to you?
Quelle partie du séminaire vous a été le plus utile ?

Project beneficiaries :

- breakout groups (2)
- networking during coffee breaks (4)
- lessons learnt from special envoys
- update on VPAs
- update on due diligence
- FLEGT Action plan assessment (5)
- Communication session
- Discussion on legality/sustainability

EC (HQ & Delegations):

- everything useful
- communication and media
- SWOT analysis, to better understand the process

MS and special envoys:

- FLEGT Action Plan (5)
- Communication (3)
- Networking
- Breakout group (3)
- Exchange of experiences

Are there issues of importance to you that were not addressed?
Y a-t-il eu des questions que vous auriez aimé voir traitées et qui ne l'ont pas été ?

Project beneficiaries :

- how to operationalise a meaningful public participation in FLEGT VPA countries
- specific questions related to one's project

EC (HQ & Delegations):

- hear about different FLEGT projects around the world in order to get new ideas

MS and special envoys:

- organise small group session on one country
- monitoring of the problem
- land tenure in VPA countries

How could we improve the seminar?
Comment améliorer le séminaire ?

Project beneficiaries :

- More time in smaller groups
- an introduction of what has been done in the FLEGT Action Plan would have been useful for Friday session
- group too large – restrict to only project people
- more on interaction between FLEGT and REDD (EU future strategy)
- facilitation of sessions
- exchanging results from continental groups

EC (HQ & Delegations):

- schedules too tight
- more time in smaller groups, less powerpoint
- increased links to climate change need to be integrated in FLEGT

MS and special envoys:

- reduce amount of time of formal sessions
- improve methodologies or use the brains of the people present and strengthen their peer learning and networking
- an annual report on FLEGT distributed one month before seminar
- one FLEGT fact sheet per country
- handbook in advance

Other comments related to invitation, logistics, translation, organisation ...?

Autres commentaires liés à l'invitation, la logistique, la traduction simultanée, l'organisation ?

Project beneficiaries :

- send invitation more in advance (visa issues)
- buffet dinner instead of seated dinner would allow more networking
- keep food adapted to different cultures
- coffees and dinners were good to interact and network
- excellent translation

EC (HQ & Delegations):

- well organized
- give information on hotels

MS and special envoys:

- make sure native speakers don't speak too fast
- think of different cultures when dealing with catering
- very efficient organisation
- excellent atmosphere

Recommendations ? *Recommandations ?*

Project beneficiaries :

- give more attention to newcomers
- keep number of participants limited to encourage more discussion
- group too large, more could be achieved in smaller groups
- organize a workshop in Latin America to see illegality issues and how to use the FLEGT Action Plan

EC (HQ & Delegations):

- organize a new one next year
- organize a smaller meeting next year and again another big one in two years
- important shift to policy instead of talking about each individual project
- organise a regional meeting in Latin America

MS and special envoys:

- "just carry on"
- Use professional facilitators
- More information in advance and more interaction in smaller groups during conference
- Work towards conclusions