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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Africa-Caribbean-Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APFC</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>Convention on International Trade with Endangered Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Collaborative Partnership on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO-FRA</td>
<td>FAO-Forest Resource Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEG(T)</td>
<td>Forest Law Enforcement, Governance (and Trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAF</td>
<td>International Arrangement on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPF</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFF</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Forum on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>Monitoring, Assessment, Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td>Monitoring, Reporting, verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>National Forest Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLBI</td>
<td>Non-Legally Binding Instrument on all types of forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Non-Timber Forest Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Overseas Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFM</td>
<td>Sustainable Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDS</td>
<td>Small Islands Developing States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Secretariat of the Pacific Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCED</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFF</td>
<td>United Nations Forum on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>Voluntary Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Introduction

The “Regional Workshop/Training on Forest Policy Processes for the Sustainable Management of the Forest Resources in the Pacific” was held from 12 to 15 October 2009 at the Tanoa International Hotel in Nadi, Fiji Islands. It was organized by the Forests and Trees Group, Land Resources Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in partnership with the GTZ International Forest Policy Unit (IWP), the EU-FAO ACP FLEGT Support Programme and the SPC/GTZ Pacific German Regional Programme on Adaptation to Climate Change Project.

Twenty-five forestry professionals and key stakeholders from 12 SPC member countries, representing Governments and Civil Societies/NGOs and Industries participated in the workshop. A participants list is annexed to this report.

1. Rationale and regional context

Deforestation and degradation of forests is ongoing worldwide including in the Pacific region, accompanied by loss of vital forest goods and services such as storage of carbon, conservation of biodiversity, protection of soil and water, and providing livelihoods for poor people. Deforestation and forest degradation contribute about 20% to global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. With regard to the international discussion on climate change forest protection, therefore, offers a large potential for mitigation of GHG-emissions. On the other hand, intact forest resources have the best potential for adaptation to climate change.

Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is an internationally recognized concept for natural resources management to combat deforestation, prevent and remedy forest degradation, to maintain all forest functions and increase the benefits and yields from forests for local people and the global community. Several instruments and tools including financing means exist and emerge to support the enhancement of SFM at national and regional level.

Since Rio, 1992, the international forest policy debate has outlined policies and measures to address deforestation and forest degradation and achieve SFM as an important contribution towards sustainable development. Most prominently, in 2007, the international community has adopted the non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests (NLBI) as a common framework for achieving the shared global objectives on forests and to enhance their contribution to the achievement of the internationally agreed development goals. National forest programmes are the internationally agreed processes to be used by countries for developing policies and strategies within the forest and adjoining sectors towards this end. The concept and available experience are in place to be used to address forest issues in a comprehensive way to overcome the problem of forest destruction and to implement SFM.

Because SFM contributes inter alia to sustaining forest stocks and, thus, to mitigation of climate change, it is also a workable concept for those countries that want to participate in the voluntary and/or any regulatory market for carbon possibly deriving from the international debate on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD). But to participate in REDD initiatives all drivers of deforestation must be addressed to avoid deforestation successfully and, finally, to perform permanently. An important ingredient to succeed in REDD processes and finally to achieve SFM is the improvement of forest governance to combat illegal logging and trade with illegally sourced forest products. For this purpose, the international community has developed the
concept of forest law enforcement, governance and trade (FLEGT) that is now being implemented in various processes also in the Asia-Pacific region, mostly with emphasis on the governance aspect (FLEG).

Forests and trees are vital to the sustainable livelihoods of Pacific peoples. They provide many products and services that cater for the peoples’ economic, social, cultural and environmental needs. With the current pressure to adequately respond to the development needs of an increasing population and with the threat of climate change, the sustainable management of their forest and tree resources will afford Pacific communities the capacity to adapt to these changes. For the larger countries, there is also the opportunity to source new funding for sustainable forest management through climate change mitigation mechanisms such as REDD under both the compliance and voluntary markets. This workshop is therefore important in providing the opportunity for selected countries to gain knowledge on relevant international forest policy processes and related regimes and mechanisms which provide the necessary framework and possible support towards the implementation of sustainable forest and tree resources management.

2. Objectives of the workshop

The main objectives of the workshop were:

a. To contribute to the development/enhancement of the capacity of the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) / SPC-member countries:
   - To integrate instruments such as NLBI, FLEG(T), NFPs into SFM-strategies and their implementation.
   - To meet the requirements for participating in a REDD mechanism.

b. The workshop was expected to have the following results:
   - Participants have a common understanding of the International Forest Regime related to REDD, FLEG(T) and SFM and their implications to the sustainable management of the forest resources in the Pacific countries.
   - Participants are informed about linkages between single forest policy processes and possible synergies between related activities and initiatives in their countries and the Pacific region.
   - Participants have a better understanding on how to participate in supporting mechanisms and financing opportunities for the implementation of SFM, FLEG(T) and REDDiness measures.
   - Elements for national strategies and a joint approach / future cooperation of SPC Member Countries / integration into SPC-work programme based on aspects of international agreements, NFPs, FLEGT and REDD are identified.

3. Agenda and mode of training

The training/workshop covered several fields of interest for SPC and countries in the Pacific:

- Relevant forest policy processes, especially the NLBI, FLEG and REDD but also the contribution of concrete concepts such as national forest programmes (nfps). It introduced their interrelations and possible synergies to be tapped on national and regional level (to say it simple: REDD without FLEG is likely to fail, the NLBI offers many tools and approaches to address REDD, FLEG and CBD issues in a
coherent manner). Furthermore, relevant financing possibilities were presented and discussed.

- Practical REDD issues such as introduction into the present state of negotiations, actual developments and practical implementation of REDD measures. Measures known to contribute to “Readiness”, i.e. the ability to participate in any financial scheme for avoided deforestation, were the core element.

The training started from actual developments at the international level. It introduced good practices from other parts of the world and tailored to the specific situations/developments of Pacific Island Countries.

The workshop / training comprised 4 days of which each day was dedicated to a specific topic:

Day 1: International forest policy processes  
Day 2: FLEG(T) initiatives  
Day 3: REDD and Readiness  
Day 4: Interlinkages and synergies between processes and initiatives

The detailed Agenda is attached as an Annex to this report.

The workshop/training was conducted in a participatory manner to meet the needs of participating agencies of involved countries in forest policy formulation and implementation to ensure sustainable management of their forest resources. It consisted of input presentations by SPC, the resource persons and participants as well as discussions in small breakout groups and in plenary.

II. Opening of the workshop/training

1. Opening remarks

Mr. Sairusi Bulai, Coordinator, Forests and Trees Group, on behalf of the Director, Land Resources Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC LRD), welcomed all participants and also the resource persons.

Mr. Bulai stressed the need for Pacific countries to improve the management of their forest and tree resources. He said that a lot of activities have been implemented at the regional, sub-regional, national and community levels over the years, but deforestation and forest degradation has continued. This has resulted in the reduction of areas of intact natural forests which are still required to provide the same quality of products and services for an increasing number of people. More efforts are therefore required for countries to quickly move towards the sustainable management of their forest and tree resources, including protecting natural forests, restoring degraded forests, rehabilitation of degraded forest lands which should include the use of agroforestry.

Mr. Bulai also stressed the need for the international forest policy process to be made relevant at the national level. He said that SPC is supporting its member countries towards this. In doing this he referred to their involvement in UNFF, CBD, UNFCCC and APFC as examples. He also indicated that this present workshop is part of that continued effort.

In closing, Mr. Bulai thanked GTZ and FAO through the ACP FLEGT for their continued support in funding the workshop.
On behalf of the GTZ Forest Policy Team and the SPC/GTZ Pacific German Regional Programme on Adaptation to Climate Change Project, Dr. Stefanie von Scheliha (GTZ) welcomed all participants to the Workshop. She expressed her sincere thanks and appreciation to the SPC team for hosting the meeting and organizing it most professionally. She also thanked Mr Robert Simpson from the FAO-ACP-FLEGT-Support Programme for supporting the organisation of this event and highlighted this activity being one in a long line of a historically close cooperation between GTZ and FAO in the Asia-Pacific region. Besides, this joint effort is also a sign of fruitful donor-coordination.

Dr. von Scheliha underlined the high political attention which forest resources receive to date. This attention is likely to peak at the next COP of UNFCCC 2009 in Copenhagen. But not only forests’ contribution to mitigation and adaptation to climate change gathers attention. Last year, the COP of the Convention on Biological Diversity, forest resources and the role of forest biodiversity in adaptation to climate change were highlighted. In 2007 the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Non-legally Binding Instrument (NLBI) on all types of forests, the first agreement with universal membership which puts forests into focus with Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) as the core concept for maintaining and enhancing forest resources. The successful implementation of SFM on national level will be the key for successful implementation of international forest policies. In conclusion, Dr. von Scheliha wished all participants an interesting and productive meeting with many new relevant insights.

Mr Robert Simpson (FAO) warmly welcomed all participants. He expressed his sincere thanks and appreciation to the SPC team and the efforts of GTZ for organizing the meeting which allows for exchange of experts and an in-depth mutual learning experience. He highlighted the close interrelation between the maintenance of forests, their role in mitigation of and adaptation to Climate Change and the importance of suitable framework conditions on all levels. He introduced shortly the FAO-ACP-FLEGT support programme and invited all participants to enter into a dialogue with him on the scope and modalities of project proposals.

2. Presentation of results from SPC head of forestry meeting

Mr. Sairusi Bulai began his presentation with a brief introduction on SPC and its Land Resources Division. He then went on to discuss the importance of sustainable forest and tree management in Pacific island countries and the various issues relating to the subject, which, overall, included the increasing forest loss and degradation, and the ineffective forest resource management. Activities that have been supported by SPC over the years in response to these issues were presented. These included those that were implemented under the general headings of policy and legal framework, good forestry practices and technical capacity building. Activities were implemented at the regional, sub-regional and national/community levels.

The presentation ended with a discussion on the recent Pacific heads of forestry meeting (HOFs) which was held in Nadi, Fiji, from 21-24 September 2009. The theme of the meeting was, ‘Forests, Climate Change and Markets’, and was attended by heads of forestry and their representatives from 17 Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs). Also represented in the meeting were a number of donors and partner agencies which included the EU, FAO, GTZ, JICA, ACIAR, USDAFS, UNFF, CSIRO and SOPAC. The UNFF Secretariat participated for the first time in this meeting.
Recommendations of the meeting were also presented. These covered the following:

- Climate change
- Policies and legislations
- Sustainable forest management
- Markets
- Agroforestry
- Forest genetic resources
- Invasive species
- Land use planning
- International policy participation
- Ecosystem and biodiversity

III. Content of training

Day 1 – International forest policy processes

The first day of the training focused on international forest policy processes.

1.1 Sustainable Development and the international forest policy regime

Dr. von Scheliha introduced the participants into the international forest policy regime and the role of forests for sustainable development. Forests are the largest terrestrial ecosystem and cover appr. 30% of Earth’s surface. They harbor appr. 75% of all terrestrial biodiversity, underpin livelihoods of more than 1.6 billion people and serve needs of more than 2,000 groups of indigenous peoples. They also account for appr. 50% of terrestrial Carbon pool (~2,400 Gt) and, often underestimated, provide for a range of forest products, more than 3% of all global trade is in forest products amounting appr. 300 billion USD p.a..

She wrapped up the forest policy process starting in the early 1970’s when the role of the environment was recognized first as key for human well-being and development. Milestones were the UN Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) in Stockholm (1972) and the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro (1992). In or shortly after Rio three multilateral Environmental Agreements were agreed: the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). A single forest convention was not concluded. Mrs von Scheliha described the forest process evolving from the political momentum which started with the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF), followed by the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF). She lined out that IPF/IFF were helpful to build mutual understanding and resulted in 170 IPF/IFF proposals for action that give concrete guidance on measures that can be taken to promote sustainable forest management. In 2000 still no forest convention could be concluded by IFF, so the UN Forum on Forests (UNFF) was established as a subsidiary body under the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) which works under a multi-year programme of work. In 2006 UNFF agreed on 4 global objectives on forests and in 2007 on the non-legally binding instrument on forests which was adopted by the UN general Assembly in December 2007.

She pointed out that forests are especially recognized through their contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) agreed 2000 by the UN-General Assembly and followed up by the World Summit on Sustainable Development ‘Rio +10’ (2002) in Johannesburg. In 2015 the achievement of the MDGs as well as the forests’ contribution will be reviewed, and the UNFF is likely to negotiate a possible legally binding instrument on forests (forest convention).
1.2 Forest related multilateral environmental agreements

In her second presentation Dr. von Scheliha put the objectives of three Rio Conventions relevant for forests into context. She started by drawing a picture of the causes of deforestation / loss of trees outside forest / forest degradation and the ecological, economic and social consequences. She showed that different processes (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNFF/NLBI, FLEG-processes) address these consequences which then must be translated into national implementation. Although it seems that these conventions / processes require separate approaches for implementation Mrs von Scheliha highlighted that they have common objectives, e.g.

- avoiding deforestation - conserving biodiversity - reducing the loss of forest cover,
- sustainable use of biodiversity - sustainable management of carbon stocks - sustainable forest management.

Thus, synergies and efforts can be found and taken to design activities which serve different purposes at the same time. To that end, countries can use their capacities and resources available more efficiently, avoid double work and conflicting approaches and can integrate stakeholders coherently and with a lower chance of causing confusion and frustration.

1.3 The International Arrangement on Forests (IAF) and the Non-legally binding instruments on all types of forests (NLBI)

At the beginning of her presentation Dr. von Scheliha wrapped up the history of the forest policy process under the auspices of the United Nations after Rio. After IPF and IFF did not conclude on a forest convention but instead on proposal for action UN-ECOSOC decided to establish the International Arrangement on forests which consists of the UN Forum on Forests and the Collaborative Partnership on Forests. She described the different instruments and mechanisms of the UNFF and pointed out where and how single and groups of countries (such as the Pacific Island Countries) can raise their voice in these sessions and meetings. After that she introduced the participants to the composition and mandate of the CPF. Thereby, she emphasized the supportive role of the CPF members in the implementation of the IPF/IFF-proposals for action and the NLBI.

Afterwards she introduced the participants to the content of the NLBI while asking if such additional instrument besides the existing agreements can add any value. The participants went together through the text of the NLBI on the purpose and the scope of the instrument, its principles and the 4 global objectives on forests. This was accompanied by a short presentation of the seven elements of SFM. The participants read through all measures proposed in the NLBI for national implementation and marked actions which are relevant for their daily work. They recognized that the instrument treats all functions of forests in an equal manner and does not put emphasis only on the environmental functions like the Multilateral Environmental Agreements. They also found that the NLBI contains numerous measures which are relevant in their different contexts; however, they also noted that the implementation of these measures will face the same difficulties as the implementation of other forest related policies.

1.4 National Forest Programmes (nfps)

In her presentation on nfps Dr. von Scheliha outlined the concept of national forest programmes as an inclusive country-specific process for forest policy formulation and implementation towards sustainable forest management, based on multi-stakeholder consultation, communication and capacity building. She highlighted the nfp principles and
the approach, and emphasized that NFP processes should be embedded in sustainable development policies and address a wide range of issues at the micro- and macro-levels, taking into account cross-sectoral linkages. She further explained that NFPs do not confine to central policy planning but also include sub-national and local level policy-making and implementation. Beside, NFPs include also the positioning towards the international forest policy dialogue and integrate the implementation of international forest-related agreements and commitments according to country priorities and specific conditions. They can provide an effective framework for collaboration and partnership at all levels and for donor coordination.

1.5 Group Work

The leading questions for the Groups to reflect the input of day were:
- What is your country experience on implementing the international forest regime?
- What experiences do you have with NFPs?

Country experience in implementing international forest regime

The groups found that there is a general willingness for countries to participate at the policy and planning level. Some countries are involved in the international forest regime since Rio 1992. Their engagement included political statements e.g. on increasing the area of protected forest to 15%. However, the group recognized problems of inadequate implementation, e.g. through "paper parks".

Participants replied that international commitments are adequately reflected in government policies and planning documents. Most group members expressed that certain aspects of their work refer to the international forest regime but fall under the responsibility of different ministries/departments. Common issues of interest / work are Climate Change, Land Management policy, SFM and data collection and upward reporting (Statistical data). After the COP 13 of UNFCCC in Bali 2007 in some countries direct organisational activities were taken, e.g. establishment of an Office of Climate Change & Environment Sustainability (PNG). However, National Forest Authority, DEC, Lands, Agriculture, Transport, National Disaster Office etc were not involved properly.

All participants reported to deal with aspects of the international forest regime and sometimes, on a daily basis without knowing/understanding the connection of the different processes within the regime. The challenge appears at the implementation level due to various reasons: ranging from awareness to inadequate resources. Most group members felt they are below the policy level that could effectively influence national implementation of the international forest regime. Main problems and root national causes for deforestation, forest degradation and poor forest management identified were:
- Lack of co-ordination between various departments responsible for the various international conventions related to the international forest regime;
- Lack of political will & understanding;
- Lack of communication between all levels and across sectors;
- Laws and policies are inconsistent with IFR in spite of training and knowledge transfer;
- No clear share of responsibilities, 'finger pointing';
- Cash Industry over-rides environmental policies and laws;
- Lack of management capacity and knowledge.

Agriculture was identified by the group as the root cause for land use change and, thus, deforestation and forest degradation in all island countries represented. For islands with logging industries unsustainable logging was identified as the root cause of land
degradation. One major problem identified was the lack of awareness of landowners on consequences of clearing land for agriculture. Participants reported that land owners are converting their forests into agricultural land without any proper planning. Although it contributes to the immediate alleviation of poverty on a short term basis, problems will become apparent when people continue to farm the same land. Resulting Impacts due to Agriculture are soil erosion, watershed problems, water pollutions due to runoffs, increase in crop inputs such as fertilizers pesticides, economic impacts, flooding etc.

Country Experiences with NFPs

The formal concept of National Forest Programmes (as promoted by the NFP Facility) is not widely implemented in the Pacific Region. Only Fiji, Vanuatu and Palau have applied for support by the NFP-Facility. However, all island countries report that they have some kind of adequate process for consultation at the national level on issues of international relevance and those that are important for national development, e.g. through some form of council, meeting groups or forums where villagers discuss problems ideas or even new initiatives. Participants felt that training activities can be an avenue for awareness, where information can be disseminated to the training of trainers so these key people can return to their respective villages and educate them.

The groups agreed that the structures for dissemination of information are available, but the problem lies with those responsible for the delivery of information to the landowners. Also, the establishment of cross sectoral linkages is a challenge because it seems to be easy to talk about the link at policy level but the implementation at management level is far more difficult.

Many countries have pursued policy development and reform and some are in draft. The example of a draft national Climate Change Policy was given where stakeholders had the opportunity to provide comments. Immediate needs and areas of national economic development take the priority. Some countries have strong development partners and mostly find it easier to approach them on capacity and funding issues than to discuss these issues with other national partners and sectors.
Day 2 – FLEG(T) initiatives

The second day of the training course focused on the implementation of the International Forest Regime, in particular on the multitude of initiatives, including the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance (and Trade) process and other market and non-market based initiatives.

2.1 Overview of Initiatives

In his morning presentation, Dr. Alexander Hinrichs, the Consultant/Workshop Facilitator, introduced the participants to the large number of international forest related initiatives. He highlighted that due to the absence of a forest convention a multitude of multi-lateral and country led initiatives has developed, complementing the legally non-binding UNCED follow-up process (IPF/IFF, UNFF) and the work under the UNCCD, UNFCCC, CBD and CITES convention. He structured these initiatives into policy and trade relevant governmental approaches.

On policy related initiatives, Dr. Hinrichs highlighted the significant impact of the G8 commitments to improve forest management and to curb illegal logging, and the role of regional partnerships and dialogue forums, including the Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) process. On trade related initiatives, he discussed the significance of the EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan, of regulations aiming to exclude illegal timber from home markets (e.g. US Lacey Act, EU Due Diligence proposal) and the magnitude of bi-lateral country efforts to promote legal and sustainable timber through e.g. bi-lateral agreements to combat illegal logging and associated trade, free trade agreements with provisions on transparency, customs cooperation, and rules of origin, and public procurement policies.

He further highlighted that international environmental groups have created a ‘Non-State Market Driven Governance System’ by campaigning against poor forest management, promoting forest certification and associated trade and developing tools for a step-wise implementation of SFM. A number of private sector actions also evolved, guiding the trade in legal and sustainable timber and promoting due-diligence in the financing sector. Several questions were asked by the participants related to the non-governmental initiatives, in particular related to forest certification (see day 4).

Dr. Hinrichs explained that all initiatives target at reducing deforestation and improving forest management. The difficulties encountered in reducing deforestation have led to a broad discussion on the drivers of deforestation and degradation, in particular on the role of governance in the forest sector.

2.2 The Role of Governance

In the second part of his presentation, Dr. Hinrichs introduced the participants to the concept of good governance and the underlying perception that the rule of law and transparent and accountable governance are an integral part of sustainable development. He outlined the World Bank’s 6 Indicators for Governance (Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption) and presented current ratings for the Asia Pacific Region. He further described the role of good governance in the forestry sector.
Dr. Hinrichs concluded that tackling poor governance is a pre-condition for achieving investments into long-term forest management, including REDD, and that the large number of governance related initiatives by all players indicates this.

2.3 FLEG and FLEGT

In the last part of his morning presentation, Dr. Hinrichs portrayed more details of the FLEG and FLEGT processes. He introduced the participants to the 3 regional FLEG processes (East Asia/Pacific FLEG, Africa FLEG, Europe/North Asia FLEG) and characterized them as high-level processes aiming to create the political commitment to fight illegal logging, related trade and deforestation. With regard to the East Asia FLEG Ministerial Conference in Bali in 2001, Dr. Hinrichs outlined the broad number of follow-up processes, including the work done by ASEAN.

He then introduced the participants to the EU FLEGT Action Plan as a market based approach, and outlined how it aims at simultaneously addressing supply and demand-side measures of the international timber trade. He characterized the concept of FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) as a concrete action to identify and promote guaranteed legal timber and outlined the progress made by the EU in negotiating VPAs with partner countries worldwide. The EU is expecting that FLEGT licensed (verified legal) timber from Africa and Asia will reach the markets of its member states in early 2011, the same time the EU Due Diligence proposal shall be implemented. Dr. Hinrichs judged this as a clear indication how markets are changing from the demand side.

2.4 FLEGT-Support Programme for ACP-countries

During this session, Mr. Robert Simpson presented the ACP-FLEGT Support Programme. The objectives of the presentation were to raise awareness in the region and provided instructions to the workshop participants on eligible project topics, proposal writing and process for accessing resources. Mr. Simpson discussed with participants how the programme could support countries to address their priority FLEGT related issues. Most participants agreed that they funding source could address governance issues in the forest sector in their respective countries. Although the programme is more designed to address governance issues in commercial logging situations, Mr. Simpson clarified that having industrial logging trade with the EU was not necessarily a pre-requisite for support from the programme. All ACP countries are eligible for resources to address general governance, policy, legislative and regulatory systems reforms and pilot projects.

2.5 FLEG(T) Processes and Experience in the Region

In his afternoon presentation, Dr. Hinrichs wrapped up the current state of play of the EU VPA negotiations with Malaysia and Indonesia, by touching on the negotiation processes, their structure and complexity. He introduced the participants to the discussion on advantages and disadvantages in both countries, and on how the EU is trying to address this. He further outlined the recently agreed collaboration on FLEG between the EU and China (the so called Bilateral Coordination Mechanism on FLEG), and other trade related initiatives in China.

A plenum discussion followed the presentation. The participants were asked to reflect on the relevance of FLEG(T) and trade related initiatives for the Pacific region and the role such initiatives could play in promoting SFM.
The participants generally agreed that FLEG(T) and certification could play a strong role in promoting SFM. Participants questioned the ability of small island countries to participate in FLEG(T) programmes since their level of trade (thus their market influence) and forest management are significantly lower than several of the larger timber producing Pacific islands such as PNG, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Large market countries agreed that the market influence could create changes that would eventually influence their implementation of policy, while smaller country participants stated that the principles should be integrated in all forest management processes.

2.6 Group Work

For the last session of the day, the participants were asked to reflect on 3 leading questions:

- Root causes (facilitating environment) for deforestation, forest degradation or poor governance in their countries
- Resulting impacts (on forests, livelihoods, other land uses and sectors)
- National and regional expectations towards the international forest regime and its initiatives (instruments, information exchange, capacity development, funding)

Root causes for deforestation, forest degradation or poor governance and resulting impacts on country level

Agriculture was identified as the main root cause for deforestation in all island countries represented in the training course. Additionally, for islands with logging industries, unsustainable logging was characterized as another important cause of deforestation and degradation. The lack of awareness of the landowners was highlighted with regard to consequences of land clearing activities. Additionally, a number of governance issues were identified, as can be seen below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root causes of deforestation and degradation</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture – increase in agricultural land for crop production and cattle grazing; unsustainable farming systems (promotion of monocultures);</td>
<td>Loss of biodiversity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry – logging (unsustainable logging and side effects of “normal” logging);</td>
<td>Loss of soil fertility;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel wood gathering and collection of building materials for subsistence;</td>
<td>Flooding and downstream and coastal sedimentation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure development, including tourism;</td>
<td>Increase in invasive species;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive species and feral animals;</td>
<td>Reduced access to quality water;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: land shortage – increased population, land and forest fire, mining, encroachment, natural disasters.</td>
<td>Shortage of timber, fuel wood and NTFPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance related aspects:</td>
<td>Migration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective or lack of legislations and policies;</td>
<td>Changes to local weather conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of compliance with regulations;</td>
<td>Loss of hunting grounds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective monitoring and enforcement due to lack of manpower, financing and logistical problems;</td>
<td>Loss of medicinal plants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency and good governance in the process of issuance of licenses/authorities/permits;</td>
<td>Loss of traditional skills and lifestyle change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clear responsibilities between stakeholders;</td>
<td>Loss of awareness at community level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National and regional expectations towards the international forest regime and its initiatives

In all island countries exists some form of councils, meeting groups or forums, where stakeholders can discuss problems, ideas and new initiatives. Increased awareness raising efforts and adequate flow of information, making use of such existing channels, was a key expectation raised for the national level.

The participants elaborated the following “Global Village Scenario”: based on investigating possible avenues to increase the voice of the region on international level, including identifying a role for SPC to capture the opportunities available, the regional political bodies were asked to coordinate regional issues of concern, increase linkages and raise the role of forestry in their terms of reference, due to the fact that global warming, largely influenced by deforestation and degradation of forests, is an equal threat to all islands in the Pacific.

More detailed actions are listed in below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Expectations</th>
<th>Regional &amp; International Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Awareness raising, undertaken collaboratively by Governments, NGOs and civil societies, e.g. by strengthening of exiting forestry forums and promotion of participation;</td>
<td>• Promote a regional dialogue on good governance and provide support to country initiatives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiate/Support to a national dialogue on forests;</td>
<td>• Facilitate applications to international funding, combine funding arrangements (regional level to assist and streamline processes);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage multi-stakeholder processes towards a national “legality” definition;</td>
<td>• Improve coordination and cooperation between regional and international organizations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote SFM tools (NFP, certification), and sustainable land-use systems;</td>
<td>• Promote and disseminate success stories around the world;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote capacity building at local level;</td>
<td>• Promote regional dialogue and strategic partnerships;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote government restructuring: merge departments with relevance in natural resources management under one ministry, increase human resources/forestry staff;</td>
<td>• Promote no-timber forest products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct an assessment of current national programmes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuation of efforts to receive outside funding – necessity for the implementation of related national programmes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 3 – REDD and REDDiness (Readiness)

The third day of the training focused on the role of forests in mitigating climate change, the different options for REDD currently under negotiation including the concept of REDDiness.

3.1 Forest and climate change – the international debate and the regional relevance of REDD/REDDiness

Dr. von Scheliha introduced the participants into the ongoing discussions on how to integrate forests into an international regime for mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. She started with the results from the 4th assessment report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) including the outlook for the Pacific region. Afterwards she reflected on the reasons why deforestation was not recognized in the Kyoto Protocol and which difficulties are connected with implementing afforestation / reforestation under the CDM. She highlighted that any REDD-regime will face the same problems especially addressing the drivers of deforestation and ensuring permanence of maintaining forests, determining the baseline and verifying additionality of activities to receive compensation payments and how to allocate them to those who safeguard forests, especially local communities. Therefore, REDDiness in the broad sense and any respective REDD-strategy needs to comprise more elements than just monitoring, reporting and verification systems. Instead they must tackle issues such as forest governance, land tenure, law enforcement, putting in place mechanisms to address the real causes of deforestation, the ability to create and enforce policies on deforestation and forest degradation and the ability to reach out to forest-dependent communities. All these activities are already promoted through activities and initiatives to implement SFM.

In the second part Dr. von Schelihia lined out the coming steps after Copenhagen to implement any decision taken on REDD and associated funding opportunities. She explained that existing initiatives such as the Worldbank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and the Forest Investment Programme, the UN-REDD-initiative, but also existing organisations and bodies which promote SFM such as the UN Forum on Forests and the FAO Facility complement activities by bilateral donors. Special emphasis was put on the mutual support of the UNFCCC-REDD-mechanism, which has strong potential for funding the maintenance of forests and SFM but only few experiences and concepts how to implement this on the ground, and initiatives such as the UNFF and the NFP-Facility, which provide profound guidance on implementing SFM but have not succeeded yet in supporting countries to provide for sufficient funding, too.
### 3.2 From RED to REDD+

Dr von Scheliha developed with the participants the following table to highlight the core elements of the three different concepts RED, REDD and REDD+ which were evolving since Bali 2007. Thereby, she also mentioned pros and cons connected with them. These focus mainly on the costs of monitoring and the risk of leakage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>MRV</th>
<th>Other issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Deforestation counts for 20% of GHG-emissions</td>
<td>- avoid deforestation</td>
<td>~ easy, cheap (Landsat-remote sensing)</td>
<td>national and international leakage is very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Degradation: Intact forests -&gt; non-intact-forests</td>
<td>- avoid deforestation - avoid forest degradation (major Carbon stock degradation)</td>
<td>Problem to define and detect „degradation“</td>
<td>leakage still likely carbon gains are excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+</td>
<td>include countries with increasing forest cover, avoid negative incentives</td>
<td>- avoid deforestation - avoid forest degradation - enhance Carbon stocks through: * SFM * afforestation * reforestation * conservation</td>
<td>Expensive, combination of remote sensing and field tests, use proxies -&gt; combine with MAR for other purposes (FAO-FRA)</td>
<td>All countries have incentive to participate -&gt; (no) leakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For all options:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- additionality - baseline - permanence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questions for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiji and Vanuatu-Group</th>
<th>PNG and Solomon-Islands-Group</th>
<th>Polynesian countries group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Identify 3 key issues of relevance in your country with regard to Deforestation, Degradation and implementation of SFM | • Deforestation due to unsustainable agricultural practices  
• land expansion | • Agricultural Development  
• Other Land Use Development  
• Infrastructural Development |
| 2. Identify how these are reflected in the list of actions under the NLBI (in brackets: elements of para 6 NLBI – national activities) | • (k)  
• (c)  
• (v) | • (a), (d), (h), (k), (l), (m), (n)  
• (a)  
• (v), (d), (s), 
1st priority: (d), (i), (k), (l), (n), (o), (t), (u), (v), (w)  
2nd priority: (e), (g), (m), (p), (r), (s) |
| 3. Describe how your country could address these issues and define who’s responsibility this would be | • initiate national program building on existing processes and structures,  
• to define an action plan to achieve a harmonized implementation:  
1. National Forest Policy  
2. Rural Land Use Policy  
3. Fiji & Vanuatu NBSAP | • Evaluate alternative revenue sources,  
• evaluate options for downstream value-added or other investment options,  
• improved monitoring and law enforcement, 
Responsibility:  
• Government – driver and facilitator of policy change  
• Civil society – advocacy, participation in policy development  
• Industry – Compliance, add practical experience, support policy development  
• Pursue a FLEGT or VPA strategy  
• Diversify revenue sources or streams, education programmes |

**Subsequent set of actions for relevant policies:**  
- Review  
- Proposal  
- Coordination  
- Consultation  
- Budget negotiation  
- Training  
- Extension  
- Monitoring/ evaluation  

**Responsibilities:**  
- Forest departments  
- Line ministries  
- Budget planning commissions
4. Analyse and describe the contribution or impact you think your activities could have on the international level

| Fiji & Vanuatu NBSAP (addresses the CBD objectives) | demonstrate compliance with conventions, demonstrates commitment, enhance reputation and trust, reducing deforestation – greenhouse gas, etc., |
| Global Objectives on forests 1&2 | Same as above |
| Same as above | Same as above |

5. Identify relevant instruments of the International Forest Regime and related funding sources

| NFP facility | CBD |
| GEF | UNFCCC |
| (FLEGT) | IAF |
| | NLBI |
| | MDG 1 & 7, |
Day 4 – Interlinkages and synergies between processes and initiatives

The fourth day of the training course aimed to add complementary information necessary for implementing SFM and to bring all elements of SFM and international forest-related policy processes presented into an overall context.

4.1 Presentation on draft REDD-strategy (Fiji)

Mr. Samuela Lagataki (Forestry Department, Ministry of Primary Industries, Fiji) gave a short presentation on the draft REDD-policy of Fiji. He explained how the policy was designed and supported by stakeholder consultations. He also stressed that the final policy will need to be adapted to the outcome of the Copenhagen meeting to ensure that all definitions and activities match the UNFCCC framework.

4.2 Forest certification

Following a request of the participants, Dr. Hinrichs provided spontaneously an overview on forest certification initiatives, their main characteristics, standards, assessment procedures and propagation. He highlighted the certification of timber and non-timber products by the Forest Stewardship Council and the Rainforest Alliance, and stressed the existence of other national and international schemes. He described that the FLEGT VPA concept can accept certification as a proof of legality as long as the certification standard covers all aspects of a country’s legality definition.

In the following Questions and Answers session, more details on third party certification, FLEGT legality, and the certification of cacao, coconut and bamboo were given. The participants from PNG and the Solomon Islands outlined their positive experience with forest certification, leading to the general proposal by the participants to promote certification as a tool for improving the management of forests and agricultural lands in the Pacific.

4.3 Financing and financing strategies for SFM

In her presentation Dr. von Schelihna introduced participants into the complex picture of available funding opportunities for SFM. She distinguished between multilateral and bilateral official development assistance (ODA), markets and payments for environmental services (PES), initiatives to support and implement private investment and the activities of NGOs and philanthropists. Thereby, she informed the participants about the lack of transparency of different funding opportunities and bilateral initiatives (e.g. bilateral donors implement their pledges through multilateral mechanisms) which fuel the impression that more money might be available than exists. At the same time she quoted figures that an estimated amount of 16 – 33 billion USD is needed per year to stop deforestation or at least half emission from deforestation and forest degradation. At the same time an amount of approximately 1.8 billion USD is transferred into the forest sector of developing countries and countries in transition by ODA, accompanied by private investment of appr. 12 – 22 billion USD per year.

Dr von Schelihna highlighted that the availability of several funding opportunities is often difficult to handle on national level due to high transaction costs. Therefore, countries should assess and select appropriate funding sources in a strategic manner by applying financing strategies. Such strategies can be embedded in National Forest Programmes.
which helps to ensure that the funding is coherent with the national objectives for the forest sector.

4.4 Synopsis of international forest policy processes

In the final presentation Dr. von Schelilha wrapped up the different training contents in one coherent framework. Thereby she highlighted the coherence of objectives of the major environmental agreements which are most relevant for forests (UNFCCC, CBD) and the NLBI. The definition and role of SFM was put into relation to all processes. She drew upon the role of governance and participatory mechanisms to implement SFM while meeting local needs.

IV. Training results and key messages from the monitoring

An evaluation conducted towards the end of the workshop indicated that almost all participants had a positive overall assessment of the workshop. Over 75% rated the workshop in terms of content, facilitation and organization between 2 and 1 or good to best. The experience and knowledge of the resource persons, the use of group works and the excellent hotel facilities were commonly mentioned as some of the best aspects of the workshops. Overall, the participants indicated that they gained very good knowledge of the international forest policy process and the related conventions and regimes, and how these were linked to the national and community levels. Most participants responded positively to the need to organize follow-up activities although some were not quite clear on what they needed to do.

In terms of the negative aspects, most had indicated that some of the sessions were too long, and the general feeling that too much information was provided within a short period of time. A couple of participants thought that a field visit would be good to organize as part of the programme. There were also some concerns regarding the participation of countries with little or no forests along with the larger countries with forests and which were also undertaking logging.

For future improvements, some suggestions included:

- Lengthening the duration from 4 to 5 days
- Inclusion of country presentations and country case studies
- Inclusion of a field visit
- Consider having separate workshops for bigger and smaller countries
V. Conclusions and follow-up

The workshop evaluation as well as the discussions with individual participants indicated that, overall, the workshop was a success in meeting its objectives and its expected outcomes. This has resulted from a number of factors including the good knowledge and experiences of the resource persons, the appropriateness of the content of the workshop and the overall organization including the good meeting facility.

However, a number of important areas were pointed out by the participants and which have been noted for future consideration in our continued efforts to improve the way we organize and run workshops of this nature.

The participants spontaneously made the following suggestions for follow-up-activities (excerpt from workshop evaluation):

- Make presentation to my organisation on the REDD issues leading to Copenhagen, work with government authorities to pursue dialogue on REDD;
- Discuss with senior officer benefits of REDD, in particular with the FLEGT and NLBI as an approach to improve SFM in relation to REDD+;
- National REDD awareness in Feb 2010;
- Support national initiatives on SFM, national workshop to formulate national forest plan and action plan, Follow up on FLEGT and NFP process, For Forestry to convene a national FLEG process;
- Submit a proposal to ACP FLEGT / FAO;
- Work on certification of plantations;
- Brief staff of my organisation, meet with responsible national agency;
- Hold a multi-stakeholder consultation to discuss what I have learned;
- Inform partners and stakeholders of the international forest process and instrument;
- (recommend to) organise a follow-up workshop before end of the year.

The next immediate step as far as this workshop is concerned is to further discuss with participants what they had indicated as their follow-up national activities to see how they could be effectively supported in bringing these to a reality. Further regional or sub-regional activities would be considered after some national follow-up activities have been undertaken.
# ANNEX 1 - Tentative Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday, 11 October 2009</strong></td>
<td>Whole day</td>
<td>Arrival of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation by organisational team and trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:30</td>
<td>Ice breaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, 12 October 2009</strong></td>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09:00 – 09:10</td>
<td>Devotion – Rev Flint Hicks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lautoka Full Gospel Assemblies of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09:10-09.30</td>
<td>Welcoming remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPC/GTZ /FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 – 9.45</td>
<td>Group Photo/Coffee/Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1</strong></td>
<td>09:45 – 10:30</td>
<td>Introduction to the Workshop</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Objectives and expected results of the training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshop programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Organisational matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2</strong></td>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Outcome of the Pacific Heads of Forestry Meeting in September 2009</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>SPC (Sairusi Bulai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Key issues in regional forest policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevance to SFM and climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Sustainable Development and the international forest regime</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Overview of SD processes and the international forest regime, from Rio to UNFF/CPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>11:30 – 12:30</td>
<td>Forest-related Multilateral Env. Agreements</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD and their relevance to forests (e.g. climate debate/REDD, conservation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3</strong></td>
<td>13:30 – 14:15</td>
<td>The International Arrangement on Forests</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNFF/CPF – Results so far, future challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NLBI as the international instrument on forests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3 (cont.)</strong></td>
<td>14:15 – 15:00</td>
<td>National forest programmes – introduction</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nfps – the concept and lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nfps, REDD, FLEG'T – Definitions and how they fit together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:00 – 15:15</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tuesday, 13 October 2009 | 08:30 – 09:00 | Feedback on previous day  
Introduction to the day | Presentation | Feedback Group Facilitator |
| Session 5    | 09:00 – 10:15 | Relevance of the international forest regime to the Pacific  
Presentation of Group Work | Presentation + Discussion | Group Rapporteurs |
|              | 10:15 – 10:30 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                       |                   |                     |
| Session 6    | 10:30 – 11:30 | Implementation of the international forest regime:  
Overview of initiatives – concrete actions by governments and the private sector  
Combating Illegal logging and deforestation – lessons learnt  
The role of governance | Presentation + Discussion | Trainers |
| (cont.)      | 11:30 – 12:30 | FLEG(T) – introduction to the current debate  
FLEG – concept and implementation  
FLEGT – concept and implementation  
Related trade relevant legislations (Lacey Act, EU due diligence proposal, green public procurement policies) | Presentation + Discussion | Trainers |
|              | 12:30 – 13:30 | Lunch                                                                   |                   |                     |
| Session 7    | 13:30 – 14:00 | FLEG and engagement of FAO in the region  
FLEG-support programme for ACP-countries | Presentation + Discussion | Trainers |
| (cont.)      | 14:00 – 15:00 | FLEG processes and experience in the region  
Presentation: Experience from negotiations between the EU and Malaysia/Indonesia on a Voluntary Partnership Agreement  
Presentation: State of play of the EU and China collaboration on FLEG  
Discussion: Relevance of FLEG and trade related initiatives for the Pacific region – opportunities and constraints | Presentation + Discussion | Facilitator, Participants |
|              | 15:00 – 15:15 | Coffee/Tea Break                                                        |                   |                     |
| Session 8  
15:15 – 16:30 | Diagnostic and discussion on main forestry related governance issues in the region and expectations towards the international forest regime  
• Root national causes (facilitating environment) for deforestation, forest degradation or poor governance  
• Resulting impacts  
• National and regional expectations towards the international forest regime and its initiatives with regard to instruments, information exchange and capacity development | Group Work  
(3 groups: PNG, Fiji/Solomon Island, and other islands) | Participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| Session 8  
(cont.)  
16:30 – 17:00 | Main forestry related governance issues in the region and expectations towards the international forest regime  
• Presentation of Group work  
• Recommendations for follow-up (to be continued on Thursday) | Presentation + Discussion | Group Rapporteurs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, 14 October 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Forest and Climate Change – REDD and REDDiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08:30 – 09:00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback on previous day</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Feedback Group Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09:00 – 10:15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the day</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:15 – 10:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10:30 – 11:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional relevance of REDD – country relevance and challenges</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:30 – 12:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building REDD in SPC member countries – introduction to concepts and options</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12:30 – 13:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13:30 – 14:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaping and implementing REDD</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14:30 – 15:15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building REDD in SPC member countries</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15:15 – 15:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15:30 – 16:30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building REDD in SPC member countries</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Group Rapporteurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16:30 – 17:00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>How to address key questions and challenges in a strategic manner</td>
<td>Plenary Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session 11 (cont.)**

**14:30 – 15:15**

Building REDD in SPC member countries
- What to do to implement a Copenhagen-Agreement?

**15:15 – 15:30**

Coffee/Tea Break

**Session 12**

**15:30 – 16:30**

Building REDD in SPC member countries
- Presentation of Group work

**16:30 – 17:00**

How to address key questions and challenges in a strategic manner
- What further information is needed
- What to address in detail
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 15 October 2009</td>
<td>08:30 – 09:00</td>
<td>Feedback on previous day</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Feedback Group Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09:00 – 09:30</td>
<td>Draft national REDD-policy</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Participant from Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09:30 – 10:15</td>
<td>Forest Certification</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:15 – 10:30</td>
<td>Coffee/Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 – 11:15</td>
<td>Financing and Financing Strategies for SFM</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:15 – 12:15</td>
<td>Synopsis</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:30 – 14:45</td>
<td>NLBI, nfp, FLEG(T) and REDD – how to achieve synergies</td>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:45 – 15:15</td>
<td>NLBI, nfp, FLEG(T) and REDD – how to achieve synergies</td>
<td>Presentation + Discussion</td>
<td>Group Rapporteurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:30 – 16:30</td>
<td>Conclusions and follow-up</td>
<td>Plenary Discussion</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:30 – 17:00</td>
<td>Closing remarks/comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Official closing of the workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX II – Participants List

COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES:

COOK ISLANDS
Mr. Nooroa Tokari
Senior Project Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 96, Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Tel: (682) 28711
Fax: (682) 21881
E-mail: noot@agriculture.gov.ck

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA
Mr. Mayoriko Victor
Pohnpei Forester
P O Box 158
Kolonia, Pohnpei FM 96941
Federated States of Micronesia
Tel: +320-7457
Fax: +320-5706
E-mail: pniforestry@mail.fm / pniforestry@mail.com

FIJI ISLANDS
Mr. Samuela Lagataki
Acting Deputy Conservator of Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Primary Industries
P.O. Box 2218, Government Buildings
Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 330 1611
Fax: (679) 331 8692
E-mail: samuela_lagataki@yahoo.com
Mr. Eliki Senivasa  
Acting Divisional Forest Officer (Northern)  
Forestry Department  
Ministry of Primary Industries  
P. O. Box 2218, Government Buildings  
Suva, **Fiji Islands**  
Tel: (679) 330 1611  
Fax: (679) 331 8692  
E-mail: [senivasa@yahoo.com](mailto:senivasa@yahoo.com)

Mr. Ilaisa Tulele  
Chief Executive Officer  
Fiji Pine Limited  
P O Box 521, Lautoka  
**Fiji Islands**  
Tel: (679) 666 1388  
Fax: (679) 666 1561  
E-mail: [itulele@tropik.com.fj](mailto:itulele@tropik.com.fj)

Mr. Sefanaia Nawadra  
Director  
Conservation International Fiji  
P O Box 2089, Government Buildings  
Suva, **Fiji Islands**  
Tel: (679) 330 1809  
Fax: (679) 330 5092  
Mobile: (679) 935 1696  
E-Mail: [s.nawadra@conservation.org](mailto:s.nawadra@conservation.org)

**KIRIBATI**  
Ms. Tearimawa Natake  
Senior Agricultural Officer (Agroforestry Section)  
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development  
P O Box 267 Bikenibeu  
**Kiribati**  
Tel: (686) 28211/ 28108  
Fax: (686) 28334  
E-mail: [tearimawa21@yahoo.com.au](mailto:tearimawa21@yahoo.com.au)

**NIUE**  
Mr. Brandon Tauasi  
Head of Forestry  
Department of Agriculture  
Box 74, Alofi, **Niue**  
Tel: (683) 4032  
Fax: (683) 4079  
E-mail: [flex@niue.nu](mailto:flex@niue.nu)

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA**  
Mr. Constin Otto Bigol  
Manager, Inventory and Mapping  
Forest Policy & Planning Directorate  
Papua New Guinea Forest Authority
P.O. Box 5055, Boroko NCD
Papua New Guinea
Tel: (675) 327 7868
Fax: (675) 325 4433
E-mail: cbigol@pngfa.gov.pg

Mr. Simon Peter Tomiyavau
Compliance Manager
Rimbunan Hijau (PNG) Group
P. O. Box 102, Port Moresby NCD
Papua New Guinea
Tel: (675) 325 0662
Fax: (675) 323 1485
E-mail: speter@daltron.com.pg

Mr. Patrick Nimiago
Forest Research Institute
P. O. Box 314
Lae, Morobe Province
Papua New Guinea
Tel: (675) 472 4188
Fax: (675) 472 4357
E-mail: pnimiago@fri.pngfa.gov.pg

Ms. Effrey Joice Begada Dademo-Kaili
PNG Eco-Forestry Forum Inc.
Suite 1, Level 1, Nonian Haus, Boroko, Moresby
Papua New Guinea
Tel: (675) 323 9050
Fax: (675) 325 4610
E-mail: policy.teff@global.net.pg

PALAU

Mr. Larry Mamis
Forester, Bureau of Agriculture
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism
P. O. Box 460
Koror
Republic of Palau 96940
Tel: (680) 544 5804
Fax: (680) 544 5090
E-mail: palauforestry@palaunet.com

SAMOA

Mr. Tolusina Pouli
Forest Officer
Forestry Division
Min.of Natural Resources & Environment
Private mail Bag, Apia
Samoa
Tel: (685) 23800
Fax: (685) 23176  
E-mail: sprig@samoa.ws  

Dr. Walter Vermeulen  
Executive Director  
Matuailo Environment Trust Inc. (aka METI)  
Malifa  
**Samoa**  
Tel: (685) 30550  
Fax: (685) 21896  
E-mail: walter@meti.ws  

**SOLOMON ISLANDS**  
Mr. Kedson Ago  
Chief Forester – Policy Planning  
Ministry of Forestry  
P. O. Box G 24, Honiara  
**Solomon Islands**  
Tel: (677) 24215  
Fax: (677) 24660  
Mobile: (677) 747 6834  
E-mail: agokedz@gmail.com  

Mr. Jacob Zikuli  
Country Manager  
Live and Learn Environmental Education  
Live and Learn, P. O. Box 1454, Honiara  
**Solomon Islands**  
Tel: (677) 23697  
Fax: (677) 23697  
E-mail: jacob.zikuli@livelearn.org  

Mr. Vaeno Wayne Vigulu  
Forest Manager  
Kolombangara Forest Products Limited  
P. O. Box 382, Honiara  
**Solomon Islands**  
Tel: (677) 60230  
Fax: (677) 60020  
E-mail: vvigulu@gmail.com ; viguluvaeno@yahoo.com.au  

Mr. Barnabas Bago  
Principal Planning Officer for Natural Resources  
Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination  
P.O.Box G30, Honiara  
**Solomon Islands**  
Phone: (677) 38255 (Extn 35)  
Fax: (677) 38199  
Mobile: (677) 66736
TONGA

Mr. Tevita Faka’osi
Deputy Director & Head of Forestry Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Forests and Fisheries
P. O. Box 14, Nuku’alofa, Tonga

Tel: (676) 23 038
Fax: (676) 23 093
E-mail: forestry@kalianet.to

Mr. Heimuli Likiafu
Forestry Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Forests and Fisheries
P. O. Box 14, Nuku’alofa, Tonga

Tel: (676) 29 500
Fax: (676) 30 040
E-mail: hlikiafu@yahoo.com

TUVALU

Mr. Uatea Vave
Senior Agricultural Officer, Extension Section
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Private Mail Bag, Funafuti, Tuvalu

Phone: (688) 20836
E-mail: vaveuatea@yahoo.com

VANUATU

Mr. Tate Hanington Tamla
Principal Forestry Officer
Department of Forests
Private Mail Bag 9064, Port Vila, Vanuatu

Phone: (678) 23171
Fax: (678) 23856
E-mail: hanington_tate@yahoo.com

Mr. Fred Kalo Noel
Secretary
Eratap Chiefs and Community Association
c/o Department of Forests
PMB 9064, Port Vila, Vanuatu

Phone: (678) 26713
Mobile: (678) 555 0241

Ms. Gina Sylvia Tari
Project Coordinator Sustainable Forest Management
Live and Learn Environmental Education
P. O. Box 1629, Port Vila
Vanuatu
Tel: (678) 36807
Fax: (678) 25308
E-mail: gina.tari@livelearn.org

RESOURCE PERSONS
Dr. Stefanie von Scheliha
Project Officer, International Forest Policy IWP
Section 4702 - Biodiversity, Forests, Governance of Natural Resources, Division 47 - Environment and Climate Change
Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (gtz) GmbH
Postfach 5180, 65726 Eschborn, Germany
Tel: ++ 49-6196/79-1278
Fax: ++49-6196/79-80 1278
Mob: ++49-160/8808756
E-mail: stefanie.scheliha@gtz.de

Mr. Robert Simpson
Programme Manager
ACP-FLEG Support Programme
FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Italy
Tel: +39 06 570 54471 Ext. 54471
E-mail: robert.simpson@fao.org

Dr. Alex Hinrichs
Consultant/Workshop Facilitator
Duffernbachstr 11
79292 Pfaffenweiler
Germany
Tel: +49-7664-612992
Mobile: +49-17040-58523
E-mail: alex.hinrichs@ifmeg.com

SPC/GTZ Pacific German Regional Adaptation to Climate Change Project
Dr. Hermann Fickinger
Project Team Leader
SPC/GTZ Pacific German Regional Programme on Adaptation to Climate Change Project
House 10, Forum Sec Complex
P. O. Box 14041, Suva
Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 330 5983 / 330 7543
Fax: (679) 331 5446
E-mail: Hermannf@spc.int

SOUTH PACIFIC GEO-SCIENCE COMMISSION
Dr. Wolf Forstreuter
SOPAC
Suva, Fiji Islands
Tel: (679) 3381377 Ext237/9272462
Fax: (679) 3370040  
E-mail: wforstreuter@yahoo.co.uk

SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

Mr. Sairusi Bulai  
Coordinator, Forests and Trees and Forestry and Agriculture Diversification Groups  
Land Resources Division  
Secretariat of the Pacific Community  
Private Mail Bag, Suva  
Fiji Islands  
Tel: (679) 337 0733  
Fax: (679) 337 0021  
E-mail: sairusib@spc.int

Mr. Cenon Padolina  
Regional Forest Genetic Resource Officer  
E-mail: cenonp@spc.int

Mr. Jalesi Mateboto  
Community Forestry Technician  
E-mail: jalesim@spc.int

Ms. Bale Wilikibau  
Programme Assistant  
E-mail: balew@spc.int

Mr. Salend Kumar  
SPC-LRD Phd student  
The University of Queensland  
E-mail: salend.kumar@uqconnect.edu.au