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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACODE</td>
<td>Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBBEE</td>
<td>Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF</td>
<td>Chinese Academy of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPA</td>
<td>Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCWG</td>
<td>Climate Change Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>community forest management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of the parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>civil society organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTV</td>
<td>Centro Terra Viva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTI</td>
<td>Department of Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFI</td>
<td>European Forest Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDF</td>
<td>Enviro-Legal Defence Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGLG</td>
<td>Forest Governance Learning Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGLP</td>
<td>Forest Governance Learning Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Forest Rights Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEKT</td>
<td>Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI</td>
<td>Global Environmental Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUAFA</td>
<td>Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIEED</td>
<td>International Institute for Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILCF</td>
<td>Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFM</td>
<td>Joint Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>(Indonesian) Eco Labelling Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>monitoring and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMC</td>
<td>Mama Misitu Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEF</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBSAP</td>
<td>National Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>non-timber forest product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOFTC</td>
<td>Regional Community Forestry Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD</td>
<td>Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRN</td>
<td>Reseau Ressources Naturelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPPI</td>
<td>South African Pulp and Paper Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>State Forest Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFM</td>
<td>sustainable forest management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMFE</td>
<td>small and medium forest enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNRF</td>
<td>Tanzania Natural Resources Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>Voluntary Partnership Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information on the Forest Governance Learning Group

The Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) is an informal alliance of in-country teams and international partners, currently active in seven African and three Asian countries, facilitated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). It aims to connect those marginalised from forest governance to those controlling it, and to help both do things better. A shared belief motivates the group: that forestry can contribute to the eradication of poverty and to sustainability, but only with good forest governance – the right leadership, institutions, policy decisions and practical systems. FGLG became firmly established in 2003 and in subsequent years had the benefit of financial support from the UK and Dutch governments and the European commission (EC). Since 2009, a five-year phase of work has been underway with finance from the EC and the UK government.

In each country there are four interconnected parts to the work:

- Team of ‘governance-connected’ individuals from a mix of agencies with experience and ideas
- Policy work on forest livelihood problems due to people being marginalised from decisions
- Development of practical guidance and tools for making progress
- Creating and taking opportunities to make governance improvements

FGLG country teams are well networked, motivated and targeted in their approach – each has a communication strategy within its work plan, and these are made publicly available on the web. Country teams, backed by IIED and international partners, carry out focused studies, learning and training events, network building, supported uptake of governance tools, and taking direct opportunities for governance reform. Inter-country capacity-building work and engagement with key international policy processes aims to achieve creative transfers of insight from one location to another, and to install findings in international policy.

The main partners involved in FGLG, in addition to IIED, are:

- Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia-Pacific (RECOFTC) – backstops the work in Asia and convenes the team in Vietnam
- Civic Response – convenes the team in Ghana
- Forestry South Africa – convenes the team in South Africa
- Centro de Integridade Pública – convenes the team in Mozambique
- Centre for Development Management – convenes the team in Malawi
- Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment – convenes the team in Uganda
- NESDA-CA and the African Model Forests Network – convenes the team in Cameroon
- Enviro Legal Defence Firm – convenes the team in India
- Inspirit – convenes the team in Indonesia
- Tanzania Natural Resources Forum – convenes the team in Tanzania

Since FGLG began it has produced:
• 10 country teams engaged in forest governance improvements in Ghana, Cameroon, Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Indonesia, India and Vietnam
• 7 major international learning events focused on impacts achieved, lessons learned and plans ahead, involving participants from all the teams and other players
• 100+ policy research outputs and tools
• 120+ press, TV and radio advocacy outputs – and a set of films on ‘Justice in the forests’
• 40+ international organisations and forums engaged with to achieve capacity-building, transfers of insight between locations, and to install findings in international policy
• An independent evaluation, which concluded that FGLG has had major impacts: a good balance struck – targets hit whilst fostering processes, learning and innovation; international organisations influenced; strong governance impact with local effects in Uganda, Ghana, South Africa, Indonesia and India and conditions for achieving impact in Mozambique, Malawi and Vietnam.

For further information on FGLG:

Contact James Mayers (james.mayers@iied.org)

Website: http://www.iied.org/forest-governance-learning-group
Summary

The Ninth International Learning Event of the Forest Governance Learning Group, facilitated by the International Institute for Environment and Development, took place in Tengchong, Yunnan province, in south west China, from 7th to 11th March 2013. It brought together international participants from the FGLG country teams in Africa and Asia, as well as participants from RECOFTC in Bangkok, new participants from the Democratic Republic of Congo and Congo-Brazzaville, and IIED. Participants from China were drawn from the Chinese Academy of Forestry, the State Forest Administration, the Global Environment Institute, Forest Trends, the UK Department for International Development, China, and our hosts from the Tengchong County administration. The learning event was hosted jointly by IIED, the Chinese Academy of Forestry and the Global Environment Institute.

The first day was devoted to reporting by each country team on activities completed over the last year, with a peer review process by other teams following by plenary question and answer sessions. On the second day, a field trip took us to a community forest and a wood processing factory, including an opportunity for extensive discussions with our hosts in each location. The final day was spent planning activities to be completed by the end of the project (September 2013, in the case of the country teams), again under the scrutiny of peer review and plenary discussion. Being the final year of the project under current funding from the European Commission, much of the focus of discussions was on the outcomes and impacts of the teams’ activities over the last five years, and in most cases, a chance to reflect on up to ten years of activity.

FGLG teams have been working to the initiative’s four outputs, which are concerned with forest rights and small forest enterprise; legitimate forest products; pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry; and trans-national learning and preparedness. All teams demonstrated considerable impact on at least one of these outputs, and in many cases country level work addressed multiple outputs effectively. Participants expressed considerable enthusiasm to continue with activities under the FGLG ‘umbrella’ beyond the end of current funding, and all country teams presented indicative ideas for future research, advocacy, bilateral learning, and influence at local, national and international levels.

This learning event followed a separate but linked meeting in Beijing, the ‘China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform’ (FGLP) inception event. This was held on 5th and 6th March 2013, and many of the participants attended both events. The full report of the FGLP inception event is available on IIED’s website: http://pubs.iied.org/G03633.html.

At the FGLP inception event, participants discussed and debated the perception and available evidence on China-Africa links, from Chinese and African perspectives. They identified huge potential for Chinese engagements in Africa’s forest sector to support good forest management and a sustainable forest product trade between Africa and China. The participants identified priority issues for joint research and action focused on: guidelines, standards, principles and legislation in Africa and China affecting the activities of Chinese forest enterprises in African countries, scales and types of effective forest management, and related issues such as land and forest tenure; cross-sectoral analysis to understand how Chinese investments in non-forest sector investments impact on forest governance; timber trade and forestry investments involving Chinese companies in specific African countries, and Chinese domestic market regulations and consumer priorities.
1. Introduction and opening session

Mr Ji Chaoxian, Deputy Mayor of Tengchong County, welcomed the participants and presented a general introduction to forest resources governance in Tengchong County. Tengchong lies in the southwest of Yunnan province, bordering Myanmar and India, and is regarded as China’s ‘gateway’ to South Asia and Southeast Asia. It contains the Gaoligong Mountain area which is noted both for its biodiversity and its volcanic and geothermal areas, which resulted from the collision of Eurasian and the South Asian continental plates. Tengchong also has cultural and commercial significance as it was a key trading centre on the southern silk road 2,400 years ago – as well as military significance given its position on the Sino-India highway (‘Burma road’) during World War II. In the present day, there are international routes into northern Myanmar.

Forestry accounts for more than ten per cent of the county’s total output by value, and about seventy per cent of the land is under forest cover. The county has a range of strategies for managing its forest:

- Strengthening afforestation and greening to build an ecologically good environment: Tengchong is the national demonstration country in terms of economic forest development, information-based forestry development and forest farmers’ cooperatives. It includes several international cooperation projects on afforestation and carbon sequestration.

- Strengthening forest resource governance to ensure ecological security: Tengchong is also the national demonstration country of forest resource governance, the national representing county of forest tenure reform and the national pilot county of harvesting governance. The logging quota is strictly enforced, transport inspection improved and in the event of construction projects, compensatory afforestation is required. Illegal wildlife trade is strictly controlled and forest fire prevention measures are proving effective.

The ‘four focus and four promotion’ approach to promotion of the scientific development of the forest industry. This approach includes forest industry demonstration areas; education to improve the scientific and technological skills of both forest service staff and communities; introduction of payments for environmental services schemes; emergence of a number of forest product processing enterprises; and scientific development of forest eco-tourism.

Mr Ji reflected on the significant advances made on forest governance in Tengchong county, and the potential for further advancement, which can draw on the experience of other countries. He considered that the FGLG learning event provides an opportunity for just such learning from each other, an opportunity which Tengchong county will use to further strengthen the governance of its forest resources.

James Mayers, Head of the Natural Resources Group at IIED, presented an overview of the FGLG initiative, including some recent highlights from country teams:

- Since 2003, FGLG has focussed on getting at the truth – and then using it, through:
  - 10 small country teams of “governance-connected” individuals
  - Teams challenged by policy research on issues facing those marginalized by governance
  - Practical guidance, tools, events, media, opportunistic action

By 2013, the following had been delivered:

- 10 active country teams
- 9 international learning events
- 110+ policy research outputs/tools
Five tactics for governance work that have been shaped by experience in FGLG are:

- Securing safe space – mutual trust and independence
- Provoking dialogue - connecting stakeholders
- Building constituencies and networking
- Wielding evidence - generating and presenting information
- Interacting politically – engaging with political players

An independent evaluation in 2009 identified some examples of local impact:

- Forest-linked livelihoods around Mabira in Uganda more secure after reversal of government decision to convert forest to sugar
- Increased access rights to NTFPs in state forest land for indigenous community groups in Orissa state, India
- Investments in locally over-exploitative logging deals questioned and prevented by high-level action in Mozambique

The evaluation also notes that FGLG has had high impact despite relatively small resources, because the goals clear, with flexible action; participants were voluntary and well networked; additional funding has been leveraged; and also due to the inspiration of the conveners.

In 2013, FGLG continues to aim to deliver on its four outputs:

- Forest rights and small forest enterprise
- Legitimate forest products
- Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry
- Trans-national learning and preparedness

Some recent FGLG team highlights include the following:

- Community forestry – rights and enterprise
- Forest rights to communities – the team’s core business – Vietnam
- Forest Rights Act – going beyond securing rights to securing real benefits – India
- US$3.5m to get community forests investable, new government small enterprise programme – South Africa

Timber trade – legitimacy. FGLG now has much to say about how useful legality and legitimacy is done. Perhaps we could put together guidance on paralegal work?

- Smallholder timber legality for VPA – Vietnam
- Cross-border trade film – Tanzania
• Regulations, concessions review, harvest ban – *Uganda*
• Public information focus through TV and high exposure in meetings – *Mozambique*
• VPA progress - *Republic of Congo (Brazzaville)*
• Exploitation licenses – *DRC*

REDD+ and forest climate strategies. Many FGLG teams are using the prospect of REDD to stimulate new thinking about integration of land use at practical level, thus using REDD as a catalyst for resilient integrated land use. Work on REDD+ and forest climate strategies is increasingly hitting policy levels and finding practical ways forward.

• Community guide to REDD – *India*
• Catalysing national REDD strategy – *Malawi*
• REDD pilots joint statements on governance – to national task force and climate COPs – *Tanzania*
• Climate and REDD strategy – on conflict management and communications – *Uganda*
• Deforestation assessment data transparency and community level REDD frameworks - *Indonesia*

National governance tracking. Many FGLG team members are now in positions where they can be effective in tracking national governance issues. There is a range of work assessing the state of forest governance at national levels. Could more teams be developing this approach in this year? Should we put down a marker in every country?

• National natural resource governance monitoring reports – *Mozambique*
• Citizens’ state of forest governance report – *Uganda*
• Forest hearing – *Tanzania*
• What we learn from forest governance for a green economy, and work with MPs – *Cameroon*
• Forests in national development strategy – *Malawi*

Ways of working. We are doing more on stories of change, and integrating the ‘looking back’ to look forward in our work.

• Confidence and methods for attributing effect - *all*
• Stories of change - *RECOFTC*
• Members rising to influence over time, with direct impact on government policy – *Indonesia, India*
• Cross-team collaboration on charcoal trade – *Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique*
• Paralegals network – *Mozambique*
• Leveraged partnerships and FGLG work supported by others – *Vietnam, Cameroon, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda*

Recent FGLG international highlights

• South Asia Climate Resilience Alliance and small-scale mining sustainability initiative – adopting FGLG model
• *Improving governance of forest tenure: a practical guide*
• *Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry* – a review, a guide, a vital way forward
• Farm and Forest Facility
• China-Africa forest governance platform

With all of the above in mind, it was suggested that the objective of the learning event should be:

“To share and peer review experience from forest governance work - in Africa, China and other Asian countries - and to plan for having optimum impact in the year ahead”.
2. Looking back: reviewing FGLG progress, sharing achievements and lessons learnt amongst country teams

On the first day, each country team presented progress over the last year, in terms of actions taken, and results and impacts of those actions. A panel comprising participants from other teams then ‘judged’ each team’s work – in an informal yet constructively critical way – in terms of performance, innovation and impact. A selection of comments is included below. The judges also gave a score out of ten to the presenting team, in a spirit of informal, friendly competition. (These scores are not included here – the strong relationships built up over years of FGLG interactions meant that the scoring was well-meaning, yet also sometimes humorously biased, and open to persuasion! These scores are thus difficult to interpret after the event). Each team then invited comments and questions in plenary; these are listed below, along with responses where time allowed.

In addition to the country team presentations, participants invited from the Democratic Republic of Congo and Congo-Brazzaville presented a summary of forest governance issues in their respective countries. As new members of the informal FGLG alliance, their presentations generated much interest, appreciation and discussion, particularly in light of China-Africa discussions.

The Ghana team was unable to attend the learning event, hence there is no presentation from them included below. However, reports of activities in 2012, and plans for 2013 for all teams are available on IIED’s website (www.iied.org/forest-governance-learning-group).

Cameroon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Results and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The team's tactics have changed. Realising the importance of sharing experience more within the group, the team had several internal learning events – an innovation for the team. They also went beyond forest sector issues, for example to explore problems arising from mining.</td>
<td>Impact: there has been good recognition by policy makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate forest products</td>
<td>Regarding work on land grab issues, the University of Yaounde requested FGLG comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked on how to improve community livelihoods around protected areas. Why are</td>
<td>• The Ministry of Environment requested FGLG to contribute to NBSAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• The FPP was finalised with very good contributions from civil society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The team has also brought the debate to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost 200 elephants were killed around a national park last year. Discussions with ministries led to FGLG being asked to contribute to the National Biodiversity Action Plan. FGLG has achieved recognition and influence at the highest level, with the Prime Minister and government Ministries.

In 2013, the team will continue to work with MPs, ministries, etc.

Forest rights and small enterprise
- SMEs are not well developed in Cameroon.

Climate change mitigation
- Civil society is strong in Cameroon. The team wanted to develop a common understanding of how they perceive their rights, etc. – asked them to have a guideline on how they will contribute to policy discussions.
- Working with MPs – there are laws directly or indirectly related to REDD. So the team wanted MPs to understand what REDD is, then to go back to their constituencies to explain it locally.
- Policy brief shared with ministries – the Prime Minister now wants to see any document that FGLG produces so that he can call the relevant Ministry to work on their recommendations.

Q&A
- Can you come up with a sharply defined agenda with MPs?
  - MPs have a four year mandate, so we have to keep starting again with new MPs. Also they don’t master all the forest governance issues – they need training. We need them to go back to their constituency to discuss locally, then come back to the national assembly to discuss and initiate laws. We already have a network of MPs working on several issues, some outside the forest sector but with impacts upon the forest sector.
- Are you losing your impact (given limited resources) by moving beyond forestry?
- What are the main barriers to the development of SMFEs in Cameroon?
- What lessons are being learnt from other FGLG countries through FGLG?
- How did you cultivate the ‘strong connection’ you have with policy makers? Is it on an individual level or also institutional?
Why did you change your tactics to focus on internal learning events?

Going beyond forest sector to look at the transport sector, how are vehicles imported? Are the regulations good? Is there a need to focus on the impact of logging transport on the forest sector?

What is the perception of agribusiness in Cameroon and the impact on forests? Refer to work on land grabs – there’s a need to have regulations in place. The law is not clear on whether mining is allowed at all in protected areas.

India

Action taken

FGLG India has three main foci:

- FRA, CFM: a key development is the new amendment made to the Forest Rights Act in September 2012, which provided revised Rules for implementation: FGLG members were involved in drafting the Rules. ELDF, an FGLG member, set up an Advice and Reference service on FRA. The team is also designing intervention plans on Community Forest Rights; and is working on a post claim strategy – i.e. once you have the rights, what next?
- Investments in forestry sector/ tree plantations. Study of wood supply to understand its current status – exploring ways to enhance the contribution of tree plantations. India has one of the largest areas under tree plantations in the world, yet imports large quantities of timber. A discussion paper is in preparation. The team is also looking at FLEGT and Lacey amendments and their effect on India: they may affect artisanal products which are exported.
- REDD. The team is looking at how communities can become involved, and community measurement of carbon. They are bringing out simple communication materials on REDD for use at the community level.

Lessons learnt:

- Flexibility of FGLG – a big strength of the team is its ability to adapt to new issues and challenges as they emerged.
- Limited financial resources but the impact has been over and above that by doing ‘critical gap filling’ in other programmes – so impact multiplied
- Getting senior government people involved has paid off: they understand what FGLG is and take part in the meetings
- The team has rotated the convenorship: this has a positive impact as new ideas are brought in
- But there is a need to keep the critical mass of the group or energy is wasted in bringing others up to speed.
- FGLG could be effective because of its members’ existing longer term engagement with policy.

Ways forward:

- India has more than 100,000 JFM committees. Trying to develop JFM+ concept.
- India has diverted much forest for development processes – what to you do with the diverted forest land and how do you compensate? CAMPA (compensatory afforestation fund): how should it operate and what are the challenges? There is already US$5-6 billion collected.
- FGLG are handholding the FRA implementation with the state authorities in Jharkhand.

Other specific actions:

- Tree farming on private lands – three FGLG members were part of a Government commission which fed into new policy
- Paralegal programmes
- Sanjay Upadhyay has been an advisor to Ministry of Tribal Affairs regarding FRA legislation – thus has direct intervention at Ministry level
- Publications and studies eg forest governance
and tribal governance; Sushil Saigal’s contribution to a book on conservation across landscapes; forest governance and institutional reform document.

**Judges’ comments**

This is a small group that’s achieved a lot. There is great potential for long term impact, through supporting the ‘what next’ after securing tenure through FRA.

**Q&A**

- Has there been any real long term impact on the ground?
  - The group has really grown and most are in key positions, from where they can make direct interventions in policy reform – so the group is trying to be the change. It will be good to share Stories of Change with India as a means of sharing information.

- How important is FRA?
  - Especially in the context of governance, FRA is one of the most radical legislations and has immense significance, as it is the only one that states it aims to ‘undo historical injustice’. But it is hosted in the Ministry of Tribal Affairs and not the Ministry of Environment and Forests, hence there is a shift of control. Out of the total forest estate of 77 million ha, 2 million ha has already been allocated under FRA, and the rate of allocation is accelerating.

- What does CAMPA mean?
  - CAMPA is the Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority. When forest land is diverted for other purposes, the Net Present Value of that forest land is calculated and compensation paid to CAMPA: the money collected is then to be used for sustainable forest management. It's monitored by the Supreme Court. US$ 6 billion has been collected so far. FGLG is calling this ‘blood money’ – we need to scrutinise how this money is used.

- How participatory is FGLG India in your inputs to FRA? Do you have a framework in place to ensure this?

- Is there any similar group providing impact to FRA? If so, how participatory is it? Do you work with them? Is there a formal network?

- What activities do you do to ensure that India does not encourage ‘bad’ practices elsewhere (neighbouring countries and in Africa)? What about an FGLG India-Africa platform (event)?

- With limited resources – and considering the diversity of the challenges and the size of India - how do you prioritise your activities?

- How do you formally guarantee the sustainability of FGLG India beyond September 2013?

- Is ‘post claim strategy’ about Investing in Locally Controlled Forestry, ILCF? IIED has a guide!
**Indonesia**

### Actions taken

Indonesia has had an FGLG country team since 2005: members are mostly from government, but the number of NGOs is increasing (TNC, WWF, Indonesian NGOs, universities): “new blood” is coming in. The team develops ‘champions’ or ‘alumni’ who then may have key positions in NGOs, Ministry of Finance etc. A key strength of the team is the capacity building of its members, who will influence decision-making processes. Key actions:

#### REDD+ and communities and government

- There has been a National REDD+ strategy since 2011, approved by the president. FGLG informed its national development, and is now working at the provincial level.
- Benefit sharing – FGLG initiated a review of regulations, bringing stakeholders together, and meeting with Ministries of Finance and Forestry. Most important – assessment, and development of policy recommendations to improve regulation.
- Assessment of demonstration activities: learning lessons to improve regulations on procedures for implementation of REDD+.

#### Production and communications

- REDD+ and gender – issues and initiatives mapping, linked to RECOFTC, UNEP + UNREDD.
- ‘REDD ready in the forest’/ Story of Change in eastern province of Indonesia, sandalwood in poor provinces – creating community plantations. Ineffective regulations on endangered species: since 2010, FGLG has tried to intervene to develop a proposal to fund improvement of the regulation, to plant sandalwood. FGLG working with both legislation and the executive.
- Story of Change – also describes intervention at the district level, specifically a teak community initiative with FSC and LEI certification. The teak plantation was not bankable, so FGLG helped with introducing a funding scheme for a community plantation.

### Results and impact

- Strong connected like-minded network e.g. most REDD+ negotiators in UNFCCC are FGLG members
- Formulation of regulations by a working group on climate change
- FGLG ‘champions’ have risen to high-level positions, and have had much influence on the national REDD+ Strategy
- Intervention in robust deforestation calculation/ methodology: the figures changed to 350,000 ha/year, down from 1.2million ha/year in 2009. NGOs at Doha questioned the different approach, so FGLG convinced the Government of Indonesia to review data and methodology and convened a roundtable. This led to a robust method being developed in February 2013, with transparency on data sources key: it’s all on the website now. It was found that international and Indonesian approaches were quite different (e.g. 600 sample plots versus models; definition of forest areas differed e.g. state versus outside state areas).
- Communities are more confident in making demands on the government
- More pro-community regulations at local level.
- Changed policy so community forest on private land eligible for reforestation fund
from reforestation fund. FGLG brought both the Ministries of Finance and of Forestry to the field.

Judges’ comments

Stakeholder involvement is very strong. The team chose one area that leads the whole operation (i.e. REDD+) – including strategic work on regulations, work with the Ministry of Finance and promotion of pro-community work. What timeframes are needed to get to the local level?

Q&A

• Is FGLG Indonesia involved in UNREDD Indonesia programme implementation?
  ➢ Yes we work together with UNREDD: it is a member of FGLG.

• You are being very strategic by focusing on REDD+ processes
  ➢ This is part of the REDD process!

• How did you manage to get a transparent process on REDD+?
  ➢ After Doha CoP18, FGLG met with the Ministry of Forestry to ask them to review methodology, ask to sit together to discuss. Sometimes the problem was the definitions, eg forest area (state versus outside)/ methodology; data is now put online for easy access.

• Do you have a good working relationship with government? Who is involved? In Indonesia it is very government led.

Malawi

Actions taken | Results and impact
--- | ---
FGLG Malawi has three main foci: | • Of the FGLG team, six or seven members have become politicians/ ministers, and five have become permanent secretaries. Some have retired.

• REDD: FGLG set up a technical team in 2010 to push Government to consider REDD. NORAD provided some funds, but it was a slow start. Then the Ministry approached USAID, which gave support, like in India. FGLG is facilitating a big meeting on REDD next week. The lead people in all the REDD technical teams are FGLG members.

• Studies: on legality, institutions for improved governance, charcoal, case studies on traditional forest management, benefit sharing mechanisms, timber value chains, etc. Recommendations are leading to reforms in the forest sector. But the government argues it doesn’t have the resources to implement reforms. Now the EU has provided support and the Government is building on the recommendations of all the studies –

• Of the FGLG team, six or seven members have become politicians/ ministers, and five have become permanent secretaries. Some have retired.

• Expectations on FGLG are too high – all the Ministries want more! The formal institution for forest management is weak, so ministries turn to FGLG to build up the sector.

• One lesson is that the team has built up a network of supporters of former members.

Future plans:

• The EC is providing support for a national forest forum in August. The plan is to do a stocktake and reflect on ten years of experience.

• FGLG lobbied for a Forest Management Fund – now instituted – and want to monitor its
institutional assessment, financial assessment, valuation of forest resources (forest resources are undervalued). The team contracted to come up with the true value of forest resources includes an FGLG member. FGLG Malawi is also reviewing the forest policy.

Traditional forestry management. Building on the case studies, the team is looking at traditional systems linked to land tenure. This can be promoted through REDD. FGLG is assessing a catchment area to an important reservoir where some degradation is happening.

Judges’ comments

The team has positioned FGLG in the REDD process. It's impressive that FGLG is lead in the forest sector reform process. FGLG is now expected to make the Forest Department more vibrant. What about investment in younger team members? Perhaps building capacity was not a deliberate part of the strategy.

Q&A

- Is there formal, legal recognition of traditional management systems?
  - This will be presented and discussed at the REDD meeting next week.
- Where does the money in the Forestry Management Fund come from?
  - Concessions, taxes, penalties.
- What about the sustainability of FGLG? Is there potential for funding from USAID/ NORAD/ the Scottish government?
  - FGLG is institutionalised – people provide time and resources in kind.
- What is the legal status of the National Forest Forum?
  - Informal.
- Internal (national) financial support is very limited. What about other areas of capacity internally? What is the sustainability/ danger of relying on foreign funds and how can this be addressed?
- Is there an over-reliance of the Department of Forestry on FGLG? Considering the end of EC funding in September 2013, do other groups similar to FGLG exist?
- Is the National Forest Forum more than a talk shop?
Mozambique

The FGLG Mozambique team was established in 2003. In the last year the group, its operation and its strategy have been reorganised.

- FGLG held an event in Maputo: a national meeting of civil society actors to improve the movement – the Civil Society Forest Dialogue. This brought in new members, including some from the provincial level. The meeting took place in the absence of the National Forest Forum, and aimed to work together and to build dialogue with government and the private sector.

- In Manica province, the team gave support to forest companies, through fairs for community products

- Two natural resource governance monitoring reports were produced

- Publication on charcoal production and trade was produced and debated publicly: press uptake

- Environmental education campaign – working in schools with teachers and children, books for children

- Took government staff to field based seminars.

- Working on link with land issues. Campaign against land grabbing and maximise Mozambique land law. This included production of a documentary, covered with press launch of report

- Inputs to REDD strategy (RPP)

- Book on environmental awareness – drawing on other FGLG country experience

- TV panel discussion on illegal logging with SMS comment (stimulated by EIA report)

Lessons:

- FGLG can get beyond community as ‘victim’ and investor as ‘predator’ – point to good examples and conditions

- Vital FGLG role to help generate momentum to make government functions or innovations actually work.

Judges’ comments

Good innovation by using a community fair to mobilise community engagement in forest governance; good impact through a national paralegal network and participation in a TV panel on illegal logging

Q&A

- What are FGLG’s roles in revising national forest regulations?
The video about legality in the forest sector identified some weaknesses in the forest framework; the FGLG team drafted a revision of the regulation.

- Could the young lawyers’ fellowship programme learn from the barefoot lawyers’ programme in India?
  - We need some support on the paralegal programme. We will have an event at the end of the year, and will share international experience.

- What about gender considerations in your issues/implication of women in your country team?
  - We have a new programme. A long time ago, CTV initiated a Gender programme. Now we are training paralegals (women), and continue a strong involvement with women – the team is largely composed of women.

- Why don’t Mozambique, Tanzania and Malawi synergize on charcoal as a three-country team?
  - It’s not just a question of cross-border trade: there is trade within Mozambique, in remote rural areas. There has already been some research done on the charcoal trade between Malawi and Mozambique.

- There could be some cross-learning from India on Special Economic Zones, forest rights, and land alienation.
- On initiating a process of education, the team could share learning from the advice and referral service of the India team, including use of SMS.

### South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Results and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The team is convened from ‘home’ in private sector agency Forestry South Africa.</td>
<td>The convenor and some of the team are the ‘go-to’ people on small enterprise governance and support issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The team’s work context is in pulp-oriented forest sector – with 3-4 players, big companies SAPPI and MONDI plus cooperatives like NCT, and the timber sector (construction and furniture)</td>
<td>The FGLG lobby has a voice in SMFEs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGLG is engaged with privatisation of government forests and land reform</td>
<td>Key focus is on land reform, tenure reform, financial support to SMFEs, policy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sits on key group for land transfers</td>
<td>Base of small enterprise work led to convenor of team being able to lever and help manage this funding. The programme covers 13,000 ha for 96 communities; about 1,000 ha covered so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Encouraged support services to enterprises following support transfers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Helped lever $650,000 from DTI for land use planning by communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o IDC $3 million for communities to enable “payment to occupy” of communities to be converted into effective collateral.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Steven Ngubane moved from Forestry South Africa to IDC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with communities on water and management of plantation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with industry development plan (IPAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– FGLG developing/contributing to forestry plan particularly for small enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• FLEGT + climate strategies
  o Engagement in the early stages
• Developing models and support systems for community enterprises in plantations transferred from big companies
• Briefing routinely produced – limited media work.

Judges’ comments | Clear direction of work and good focus on use of community funds

Q&A

• What is your unique identity, your unique role in all the committees and structures that you are a part of? What argument are you advancing?
  ➢ Forestry South Africa’s structure has given SMFEs support. It’s all about sustaining business.
• Question on licensing of water use.
  ➢ There is a quota system for water use, which was introduced to make sure there is a balance between mining, agriculture, and forestry.
• Is privatisation of government forests the way forward? Many in India would disagree!
  ➢ It would be based on the context of the transformation that’s happening in South Africa. These plantations are not indigenous: they were previously owned by private companies (different to in other FGLG countries). The Government is engaged in economic empowerment, taking land back to communities, owned MONDI, SAPP, community claimed land. The Government is trying to devolve forest management. Because of land reform through BBBEE – this is a principle on which it’s based. Government is trying to run away from mining issues (for example).
• What about benefits accrued from forest resources by communities – income generating sources to communities?

Tanzania

Actions taken | Results and impact

The Tanzania team works alongside a number of other organisations, at the national and grassroots levels. It works through dialogue, meetings, sharing of experiences and in collaboration. FGLG works to bring actors together – by combining expertise, it becomes possible to tackle challenges. How can we engage better with government? There is an information gap between the grassroots level and the policy making level: how can we best bring issues ‘up’ to the policy level?
• Forest Hearing – communities’ voices were given a platform.
• Team’s work supports ‘Mama Misitu’ forest

Government has been reacting to advocacy work and the Forest Hearing, for example:
• A timber harvester in a forest without a management plan was stopped and jailed
• One district stopped harvesting until the resource was assessed.
• District-level harvesting committees are beginning to be more effective, and some village committees strengthening too.
• The relationship between Government and ‘Mama Misitu’ is quite constructive
management and trade advocacy programme.
  o Advocacy radio + TV
  o ‘Whistleblowing’ on illegal actions
• Film – documentary on the Tanzania-Mozambique timber trade (along the Ruvuma river): this shows timber from Tanzania going to Mozambique and coming back with Mozambique ‘permits’ (this is linked to the Forest Hearing)
  • It is early days but FGLG is influential on national strategy

The team identified the need to:
  • increase engagement with private sector, government
  • bridge with good research which is underway.

REDD
• Team convenes REDD pilot projects (there are ten)
• FGLG also has a member on the national task force to voice governance issues

Judges’ comments
Good approach in involving both local and national level stakeholders. Good interventions through talking and writing – now need to act and show impacts and results. Innovative use (to FGLG) of public hearing which has a democratising effect beyond forest governance, and of documentary to communicate issues. Impact through good communication about forest trade issues and more awareness at community level. What about private sector engagement?

Q&A
• Q1: Is a public hearing a legal requirement for projects affecting environment (including forest)?
  ➢ No – it’s not a legal requirement when undertaking projects/ big infrastructure developments. However, anyone is allowed to organise a public hearing, as long as they know the topic.
• Q2: In collaborative initiatives, which actors are usually left and why?
• Q3: What about gender issues – for example is gender mainstreamed into REDD?
Uganda

Actions taken

The team is composed of individuals from government, private sector, NGOs and media, and it does research, networking and advocacy.

- “Trouble in the forest” report on problems with concessions and illegal activities
- Studies – whether community near forest reserve, do they benefit from land allocation?
- State of governance report – a process underway which includes an expert task force and outreach to citizens
  - A learning process for the experts
  - Dialogue with citizen’s groups
  - Score cards and Forest Governance symposium to feed into the report.
- Forest Governance symposium: a two day debate with major stakeholders. Groups from all over country are involved. Uganda has been engaged in lots of reform from last 20 years, with new institutions created, but still see increased evictions. FGLG has set up a meeting with parliament to discuss outcomes and proceedings
- Governance of Africa’s Forests event - engaged with South Africa Institute of International Affairs
  - – a number of countries are involved, learning from Uganda and FGLG set-up
- Engaged in climate change work, intensive discussion on climate change policy, new policy finalised few months ago.
  - FGLG is part of a thematic group and presented submissions on climate change finance policy
  - Triggering discussion on benefit sharing in forestry resources, revenues from forest trade.
  - Submission on REDD conflict management/ communication and strategy on conflict mitigation.

Results and impact

- High level of media activity and debate then government announced temporary timber harvest ban and regulatory review
- Ministry stimulated to form own governance working group (and address weaknesses in Ministry of Natural Resources) and FGLG defined the modality of this working group.
- High levels of discussion in media and government stimulated by work on symposium, climate and local governance.
- Triggered discussion on natural resources use benefit sharing, especially sharing between central and local government, and government and communities. The team is strongly nationally focused but engages with communities and citizens’ groups through members.
- Government agencies value FGLG as ‘shield from political interference’ - a way to air evidence and plan professional actions.
- Has led to FGLG as a platform with central government for confidence building with sectoral agencies on issues FGLG has worked on
-How many of the impacts were strategically planned? Much forest sector reform has FGLG footprints on it, but this in itself does not lead to good governance, so the team has to keep engaging and broadening influence to national governance.
- Forest SMS work builds on prior work on budgets, mining and local governance.

Two highlights:

- Built FGLG work in other initiative: assess performance of local leaders using a scorecard
Use of media – print and TV: Ecotalk on national TV feature, picked up on country team’s Mabira campaign work on reserves

ACODE use of SMS media, expanding SMS media for outreach work. Messages of advocacy – SMS media platform. 200 key people reached: district level officers, environmentalists, trying to reach elected political leaders. There are 1 million internet users, but 10 million cell phone users.

Judges’ comments

Critical element of performance was time and effort invested in the Symposium, where the team was ready with concrete information and action. Good impact – but when approached by government for solutions, beware of being dragged into issues and mechanisms that do not fit with the country team strategy. Consider how best to enable citizens to own reforms: what role does SMS play?

Q&A

- How accessible is (government) information, and does government have shared interest?
  - Officials rely on FGLG to shield to political interference. The working relationship, at a technical level, works very well as a mutual relationship. In the national forestry agency, officials didn’t feel they had impact. Recently the head of agency asked FGLG for help in order to make a convincing case, and to reach agreement for action. FGLG team wrote the concept note for the consultation.

- Is there a plan to get institutional membership?

- Most issues are at national level: how are local communities involved?

- What about promotion of individual and private forest woodlots; and strategies for reducing dependency on forests/alternative income?

- The FGLG team working on media (TV) is a good way to promote the FGLG/SMS media platform: it’s suggested you use other social networking media as well.

Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions taken</th>
<th>Results and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest rights and small enterprises</td>
<td>• Communications: published documents, held workshops. Greater awareness of legal rights eg in the sandy forest: before, they did not care about legal rights, but with FGLG intervention, the community is now aware and District has agreed to allocate rights – pending provincial approval. In Hue University of Agriculture and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for allocation of forest rights to communities: focused on community forest management. There have been many pilot projects, from which FGLG has been drawing lessons and policy implications. Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
building for national to local level. FGLG gets Government officials to go to the field and discuss directly with farmers. The team has also done case studies in the field. FGLG Vietnam has put emphasis not only on the short term allocation of forest rights but is also doing capacity building for current and future forest officers on recognising the need for forest rights.

Forestry, they have developed a training component on forest governance as part of BSc degree.

- The international learning event had a great impact for the Vietnam team. There were follow up discussions after the event eg FAO and WB invited FGLG Vietnam to provide comments on international documents. For many Vietnamese participants it was a new way of holding discussions, much appreciated.

Pro poor Climate Change mitigation and REDD+ action plan

- Support development and implementation of national REDD+ action plan – this continues work started in 2008. FGLG is involved in several technical working groups – a forum for bringing lessons learnt from the ground, which draws on the team’s analytical skills. Carried out awareness raising at national and local level. Development of social safeguards for REDD. National REDD action plan now includes discussion of forest tenure by local communities and need for allocation – FGLG contributed to this.

Organisation of international and country learning events

- Organisation of 8th international learning event in Hue, March 2012. This was a great chance for FGLG Vietnam to position themselves in the governance discussions in Vietnam. Much interest in the meeting (within Vietnam) – many were very happy to see governance discussed in that way.

Judges’ comments

Very successful International Learning Event in Hue. Good performance and impact at community level in that people are now aware of their rights, and even ask for rights – a great achievement.

Q&A

- Impressed that land rights are being claimed by communities! But what is government’s role?
  - The community claimed the legal rights to be given to them – and after allocation of legal rights, government officers are responsible for backstopping the local community in managing those rights.

- Can you cite a request from communities on what they would like to see happening?
  - Yes – this is illustrated in the ‘Stories of Change’ products.

- Regarding the development of social safeguards for REDD+ implementation: are you working with UNREDD? Are you learning lessons from elsewhere, perhaps through FGLG?
Consultations on REDD+ social safeguards are being conducted in part with UNREDD, and also with many other partners, including VNForest, CCWG, HUAF. The Vietnam team is interested to know if other teams are working on social safeguards?

- Are you seeking funds to continue FGLG Vietnam beyond September 2013?
  - Yes, FGLG Vietnam has submitted a concept note to the EU in Vietnam on capacity building for CSO and private sector entities, to enable them to participate in FLEGT VPA.

- Why is the forest governance monitoring work not FGLG and not mentioned?
  - There is a project working on this and a member of FGLG Vietnam is involved. FGLG contributed to development of manual to be published by FAO/WB.
Democratic Republic of Congo: overview of forest governance issues

DRC contains 10% of the world’s tropical forests, and 47% of Africa’s tropical forests. It is a high biodiversity area.

The Forest Law was enacted in 2002, to replace the 1949 Law. Between 2002 and 2005, there was a moratorium on new forest allocations. In 2006, a regulation/order on forest exploitation was implemented. Forest sector reform, with the support of the World Bank, led to the declaration of 80 forest concessions.

The contribution of the forest sector to GDP is only 0.7% because of corruption, despite a large volume of timber leaving the country. No company can say that wood is certified at present.

DRC has a big problem of artisanal exploitation of forests. It can only be done by Congolese, and permits are for up to 50ha. Each person may have only two permits, each of 50ha, and may extract a maximum volume of 350m3 per permit/annum. Permits are also required for extraction of firewood and NTFPs. Permits have to be signed by the provincial governor. This means that if you have a permit signed by the Minister, it is illegal.

Officially, 45 artisanal permits are recognised. Many Chinese, Lebanese, and Indian companies are doing artisanal exploitation, though they are not authorised to do so. Also most of the time, permits are signed by people who don’t have the right to sign. Furthermore, they are signed over to companies, whereas the law states the permit should be with an individual Congolese. Civil society denounces this (including Greenpeace, Global Witness, Reseau Ressources Naturelles).

A further problem is that it is very hard to tell which is artisanal and which is industrial timber – and sometimes it’s mixed.

The top exporters are China, India, UAE, Syria, France, Belgium, Portugal, USA and Canada. Examples of the volumes exported to China are 38,000m3 in 2009, and 80,744m3 in 2011 – yet all this was illegal as there’s no industrial concession to Chinese, hence there is no legal Chinese exploitation. Timber going to France is legal.

Even if a Congolese national does the logging then sells the timber to a Chinese trader, it is only legal if the Chinese company has authorisation to export. Some Chinese companies had such authorisation, but this has since been cancelled. Other companies buy timber, then make it legal because they have authorisation, then export to Europe (this also happens in Malawi). At present, all illegal timber goes to China because there is no VPA requirement.

Opportunities:
- Institutional reform of the forest sector
- Basic principles for regulation of forest sector are in place eg the moratorium
- Availability of official information
- Opportunity for investors, but they have to respect the law
- Civil society is involved in lobbying etc.
- Support of donors, international NGOs which support either civil society or government
Challenges:
- Forest governance is weak
- The law on community forests is not yet published
- Management plan/zoning for land tenure is not yet published

Recommendations:
- Development of map for the platform
- To strengthen contacts within the China Africa platform
- Try to organise meetings so that all forest stakeholders are involved.

[The presenter] Juvin Akiak-Buma's own work includes research to identify the main problems – predominantly illegal exploitation using artisanal timber. This research has to be done in the field; in addition to mobilisation of communities through focal points, so that they collect information and send it to Reseau Ressources Naturelles. A petition and memorandum sent to the Minister has had good results – for example, about ten permits were cancelled by the Minister. RRN will continue to put pressure on the Minister to cancel more.

Q&A
- Is there an equivalent group to FGLG in DRC?
  - There are two structures: a coalition to fight illegal exploitation (including industry, private sector, NGOs and government); and a second group which includes Greenpeace, Global Witness etc.
- Is the moratorium effective in reducing illegal logging?
  - Yes it is effective. Until now there was no allocation of forest title but on the other hand, this encourages illegal exploitation through artisanal exploitation, so there is a need to maintain the moratorium and fight illegal exploitation.
- Could FGLG help you in your work?
- Where does your funding come from?

Congo Brazzaville: overview of forest governance issues

The Congo basin is the second largest forest area after the Amazon basin. 29 million people live in the Congo basin, including 0.5 million Pygmy.

Congo Brazzaville is 65% forested and has a population of four million people. Until 1980, the main source of income was forest exploitation, but now oil extracted is the main income. Civil society has identified six themes regarding governance in the forest sector:
- Corruption
• Insufficient participatory management
• Lack of transparency, communication and information
• Limits of legislation
• Weakness in monitoring, control and assessment of forest activities
• Lack of capacity.

The VPA/ FLEGT process started in 2009. More than twenty NGOs participated in the negotiation phase, and most of their contributions were accepted. The process was approved in 2011 and then came into force; operational mechanisms now being put in place. VPA is a response from EU regarding the illegal timber trade. The principal objective is the improvement of the legal framework; the traceability system also needs to be improved. The process will also put in place an independent monitoring system by civil society, and a report from that monitoring system will be given to the EU and to the Government of Congo. At the end of the process, all timber will have FLEGT authorisation before being exported, so it will all be legal.

Given VPA/ FLEGT processes in Congo-Brazzaville, what are the implications for China? As regards forest governance and China:

• It is a surprise to learn that China has strong regulations for Chinese companies: this is not known in Congo
• Whilst there are other (foreign) forest companies in Congo, it’s China that exports a lot of timber without taking into account certification, social aspects, etc. Some communities are not happy about how Chinese companies are operating.
• The China Africa platform is a great opportunity: the Congolese participants hope they can contribute to this work.

Those foreign companies most in evidence are Chinese and Indonesian; there may be other Asian companies but it was not known from which countries.

How to distinguish between Chinese companies/ residents etc? There are some companies recognised as (Chinese-) Congolese companies. The VPA context makes it easier to get information and to classify those companies.

How was civil society working in Congo? (compared to Cameroon for example, where every NGO wanted to lead). In Congo, there were 15 organisations working informally, without a leader or regulation. The government and the EU asked NGOs to be organised so that they could present a unified message, so a coordination unit was established, with Sylvie Mfoutou Banga as the coordinator. This is now formally recognised as the civil society entity which can negotiate with the Government or the EU. The platform is open to any new NGOs wanting to join. All documents have to be validated by the platform before being sent to the Government or the EU, though in an emergency, the coordinator can decide.

The presenter, Roch Euloge N’zobo’s own organisation receives financial and technical support from a Belgian NGO. They work to prepare civil society before each negotiation. Their platform prepares one month in advance so that when the meeting takes place, the proposal is ready. About 60% of the proposal was accepted.
Q&A

• What would be the first issue you would like to see on the China-Africa platform agenda?
  ➢ The first thing to do is to analyse the situation of Chinese exploitation. When we see Chinese in Congo, we think only about anarchy and no respect of the rule of law. So it's a good thing we have discovered that there is some regulation in China.

• What do you expect/want/need from the China-Africa platform?
  ➢ We need an analysis of Chinese companies in Congo – which are legal, which are not legal? We need a database. But we don’t want to focus only on China, but also to look at India, Malaysia etc. The main idea is to document their activities then share results at the platform.
3. Looking ahead: planning activities for 2013

On the final day, country teams worked together in pairs, with each team preparing and discussing its 2013 workplan with another team, which gave feedback, suggestions and constructive criticism. The teams then presented their revised workplans to the whole group for further discussion and feedback. Workplans were presented in summary form, according to activities, who will carry out each activity, beneficiaries, how (methods and tactics), impacts, and when each activity will take place. Teams also considered the longer-term sustainability of FGLG in their respective countries, and discussed plans for ‘beyond 2013’.

The following does not include 2013 workplans from the Ghana team (who were unable to attend the event) or the Uganda team (who had to depart before the final day). However, reports of activities in 2012, and plans for 2013 for all teams are available on IIED’s website (www.iied.org/forest-governance-learning-group).

Cameroon

Activities which cut across the specific activities listed below:

1. Advocacy: based on results of FGLG work to date.
2. Capacity building: discussion notes in relation to previous work and issues arising throughout the year (i.e. internal learning and capacity building to others stakeholders).
3. Communication – share success stories with IIED and other FGLG country teams. Also communication through radio, TV programmes, newspaper articles, films, etc. – learning from the example of Tanzania.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1: Forest rights and small forest enterprise. Wood residue (working with SMFEs to improve performance)</strong> Green agriculture – community produce, lack of transformation.</td>
<td>FGLG African Model Forests</td>
<td>small forest enterprises</td>
<td>studies and reports (data collection)</td>
<td>improve SMFE performance</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out a participatory assessment of key natural resources stream for very small forest enterprises (agroforestry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2: Legitimate forest products: still problems with NTFPs and access to markets. Restrictions still in place to market products.</strong></td>
<td>FGLG/FAO</td>
<td>local communities</td>
<td>Analysis – policy brief, discussions with policy makers</td>
<td>improve local livelihoods who most rely on NTFP</td>
<td>April – June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying to improve the market regulatory environment for local non-timber products, markets, and businesses. Work with policy makers and local communities to enhance regulations in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3: REDD – pro-poor climate mitigation and adaptation through forestry</strong></td>
<td>FGLG/World Bank</td>
<td>Local communities and Ministry of Environment</td>
<td>Enhance report, share recommendations with policy makers, but also observe dynamics at national level</td>
<td>REDD does not necessarily impact negatively communities. Looking at all issues for communities livelihoods.</td>
<td>April–June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the report on REDD and relevance and opportunities in relation to local livelihoods and carbon smart local business; submit to IIED as occasional report. Report on REDD relevant related to local livelihoods – enhance the report, as IIED occasional paper but also to engage with other stakeholders. Move towards national strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other important issues

Land grab issues and overlapping mining/ forest/ conservation concessions – position paper with MPs (working with since a while)

Questions

- Under Output 3 on pro-poor climate change mitigation, does the activity only relate to REDD and mitigation and not to adaptation? Is there another activity to do with adaptation?
  - It depends on capacity: the team may not be doing both. There is more on adaptation thinking and REDD+ going on elsewhere. REDD also aims at adaptation in developing countries. Contribute to adaptive capacity of forest communities nationally.

- Is the study assessing natural resources for SMEs (output 1) related to forest governance? Does it feed into the second output on enabling environment for small businesses? Which policy/institutional framework are you targeting?
  - The regulations in place are weak, and the existing laws are not coherent for NTFP marketing. So we are looking at how to improve market system; how to improve existing laws; benefit sharing from forest (market). Some products do not endanger forests, so we should enable communities to sell these. Identify kind of products that are key to communities’ livelihoods.

India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Audience/ Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Forest Rights Act 2006: Focus on the ‘post claims strategy’. Through this landmark legislation that came into force in 2006, rights over forest land will be handed to indigenous forest dwellers. The team is working particularly on community forest rights: once the rights have been given, what happens next? Better for long term for larger community. The team will do a needs assessment for a post claim strategy and the kinds of assistance required; provide an illustrative framework for implementing the strategy, and will focus on Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Odisha.</td>
<td>FGLG team</td>
<td>Up to September 2013 (and beyond)</td>
<td>Policy briefs will be targeted at a) the district administration level, as they have a big role in identifying who is given forest land; and b) at the state administration level.</td>
<td>Under FRA the scope for impact is high. About 2 million hectares have already been handed over to communities. Individual versus community rights. Strategic meetings with Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), Ministry of Tribal Affairs, state Forest Departments, Revenue Departments, NGOs, activists, community organisations. The policy briefs will also be used to influence the potential for replication at the state level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDD+ readiness - stakeholder consultation, nationwide on REDD+ now...

A community guide (farmers guide) is planned. FGLG is contributing to the formation of a national REDD+ strategy and will produce a position paper on it. Team members are already engaged in training/capacity building, as well as outreach work. India is an important player internationally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>FGLG team</th>
<th>National position paper under development</th>
<th>State Forest Departments, donors (eg. JICA which is now operating many projects in India), Green India Mission (aiming to ‘green’ 10 million ha over next few years), NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to September 2013 (and beyond)</td>
<td>Position paper:</td>
<td>Participation in stakeholder consultations and capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January to June 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Forest Management programme ‘JFM+’ (micro enterprise, legal backup, move to next level), CAMPA. JFM+ is a new development, intended to strengthen the JFM programme. Focus on self-help groups, legal backup, need for intense monitoring as there are substantial funds injected here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>FGLG team</th>
<th>Position paper on JFM+ by 5th June: World Environment Day</th>
<th>Governance advocacy on JFM+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position paper on CAMPA by August 2013</td>
<td>Position paper on the role of CAMPA.</td>
<td>MoEF, donors, State Forest Departments, NGOs, universities, researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy from June to September 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts could be large: there are 100,000+ JFM groups, 20 million ha under JFM, and some large projects (eg Rs 1 billion invested by JICA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond 2013

- Develop and continue links to other initiatives (eg Forest-Plus)
- Continue involvement in Green India mission
- Continue monitoring and commenting on CAMPA (which currently holds USD 6 billion)
- Continue FGLG in some form

Questions

- Why are you working with activists in the last phase of the programme? Won’t it bounce back - acting with activists?
  - Certain groups who identify themselves as activists, are key players. We don’t want to exclude them, or it can have adverse effects. When we do a position paper, we engage with people working in specific areas – including activists.
- It’s clear that FGLG India is not intending to stop, as you have a big agenda with big themes, that go well beyond September 2013. Within the big themes, it is less clear with respect to FRA (for...
improving livelihoods with post claims), what specifically can be done in the coming year as FGLG? What is the immediate target?

- There was an initial push to get land - 2 million hectares have been allocated, as individual rights. Now we are pushing for a way forward for community ownership. In the new Rules (for implementation of the Act, published September 2012), there is a specified procedure for allocating community rights: we feel that’s the way forward in many cases. Much forest land is under agricultural cultivation – this will be more forestry focused. The Government/implementing bodies have to think about post-claim strategies, but how to do so has not been fleshed out. FGLG plans to produce a briefing paper on what should be done after giving land, and this will be targeted at the district administration level, to provide a first step for after the allocation of rights. Also there are a lot of counter-FRA efforts to try to show it’s not having the desired impact and that land is being ‘given away’; the briefing paper will counter that perception. The post claim strategy came only in the September 2012 rules.

- Tripura has given a lot of land under FRA – one of the team members is doing some ‘handholding’ there.

- Is it too ambitious for the timeframe?

- This plan is very impressive and ambitious! Ideas also of ‘stocktaking’ for FGLG India eg. lessons learned.

- Are you planning to do any reflection and publication of your experiences and lessons learned?

- Is this a good subject for a film?

Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Synthesize experience of REDD+ initiatives on the ground (in production, conservation and community forest, and benefit sharing of REDD+)</td>
<td>January-September 2013</td>
<td>FGLG team, MOF, NGOs, RECOFTC, university</td>
<td>Focus group discussions, alumnae workshop, assessments/studies, training development module/toolkit, regular meetings, field visits, improvement of regulations.</td>
<td>Improving regulation framework, knowledge management, improving good value (data transparency, multi stakeholder processes, gender mainstreaming), strong networking, creating champions Eg assessment of benefits of REDD+, together with the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Story of change of FGLG alumnae ‘a green gold from East Nusa Tenggara’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing a simple toolkit for decision makers at the national and subnational level on REDD+.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plans for the period beyond September 2013

- Used as government programme (government budget).
• Link with other initiatives/ programmes (same platform) – source of funding.
• Mainstreaming of FGLG champions in international organisations.

Questions

• The toolkit will address which aspect of REDD+?
  ➢ There’s no common understanding of the REDD concept, so we need to develop that common understanding across sectors. This is the toolkit which Budhisi (Inspirit) developed, which will be improved particularly for use by decision makers. It will be used as a manual. The information it contains is not technical, but more general to show the scheme of REDD+, the current status of negotiation, etc.

• How will this build on existing toolkits?
  ➢ In improving it, the team will build on existing toolkits. The content is different for each target. Even now there’s a toolkit for decision makers but it’s not very applied. We need to persuade decision makers that REDD is part of their job, their responsibility.

• You’ll be synthesising REDD+ initiatives on the ground – there are 77 of them. How will you do this?
  ➢ We will do an assessment study of the initiatives – we’ll select those that are more advanced, for example those who have already got investors.

• What form will this assessment take? Who’s doing it? Is it very specific to inform changes to regulations?
  ➢ Yes it’s very specific: FGLG will review the study as well as ask others to review it. We’ll then develop policy recommendations. It will inform government of the challenges of implementation on the ground.

• Has any benefit sharing taken place?
  ➢ An FGLG member facilitated a discussion to establish the benefit sharing mechanism: it is difficult to convince the Ministry of Finance.

• The Vietnam team is also working on benefit sharing for REDD+. Hope you have access to share those documents.

Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Forest Forum</td>
<td>FGLG members</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Convene a FGLG national workshop for forest stakeholders</td>
<td>Revamping the national debate on forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock-take and document recommendations</td>
<td>FGLG members</td>
<td>April-June</td>
<td>An assessment of recommendations made in various studies and impacts</td>
<td>Input into/reshaping the forest policy and Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor forest Participate in REDD+ preparedness activities</td>
<td>FGLG members</td>
<td>March-Sept</td>
<td>Lead working group and convene meetings, write reports</td>
<td>REDD+ preparedness and strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability

- Mainstreaming FGLG work into member organisations’ strategies
- Fundraising – writing proposals, etc
- Programmes and other organisations to fund FGLG work activities.

Questions

- These activities are very impressive but perhaps too ambitious? They will take a lot of time and effort.
- What is the objective of establishing a national forest forum? Does the forum have a special programme on forestry development or does it just give policy recommendations?
- What is your position on REDD+ in Malawi? What is the potential of carbon trading in Malawi? How will REDD+ influence forest governance in Malawi?
- What about the engagement of the Government of Malawi regarding REDD activities, and the extent of engagement to REDD?
  - FGLG comprises members from Government, civil society, academia, and the private sector. A Government member is leading on the National Forest Forum. On REDD+ we have made policy recommendations; the Government has taken this further and are inviting FGLG to contribute.
- Given the devaluation in Malawi, is this an achievable programme? What is the stock-take and what product form will it take?
  - All activities will bring evidence to the national workshop: studies, desk review and assessments will bring recommendations and a report to be shared in the National Workshop. The institutional/financial/evaluation assessment is to be discussed in the National workshop. In terms of resources, all is in place.
- Regarding the question of who pays for REDD, can you critically consider its feasibility, how will it influence forest governance, the impact of carbon trading? Drawing conclusions from neighbouring countries, given their different contexts, REDD+ may not be adequate. Other experiences must be considered: what is the Malawi context?
  - The Government of Malawi is facilitating and FGLG is involved. The situation in other countries is being studied: for example a team has just returned from DRC and Zambia.
- Will the National Forest Forum lead to a reshaped forest policy and Act?
  - A draft has been produced: it is expected to be an agenda item in the National Workshop. The Land Registration Act has been revised, and review of the forest policy and Act was a key issue in the national workshop. All FGLG’s activities are contributing to the forest policy and Act.

Mozambique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>What/ impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote a consultation forum on forest</td>
<td>FGLG, DNTF (national forest service), Private sector</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Debates, preparatory meetings, research</td>
<td>Produce consensus and recommendations for forest governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undertake a research study of the illegal harvesting of timber in the Rovuma region [this will have an important economic component: how much revenue is the state losing due to illegal timber trade? And how much are the local communities losing?]

| CTV/FGLG | April-Sept 2013 | Field trips, interviews, observation, debate | Improve forest governance |
| WWF | | | |
| DNTF | | | |

Promotion of institutionalisation of paralegal national movement/association/network [paralegal is a reality in Mozambique – but the role is not recognised by the state. When a conflict happens, the paralegal is not acknowledged by government – yet they’re doing great work, and could do more if only they were institutionalised]

| CTV/FGLG | March-Dec 2013 | Capacity building (a course in each of the 10 provinces) | Institutionalisation of paralegal figure |
| WWF | | | Community well assisted |
| FAO | | | |
| CARE | | | |
| Paralegal associations – they are a few; need to support the establishment of others | | Creation of provincial associations | |
| National conference in Sept 2013 to share national and international experience on paralegal movement (including participants from India, South Africa, Namibia and Kenya). | | Conference to produce a declaration – a proposal to institutionalise paralegals. | |

Plans for the period beyond September 2013

- FGLG Mozambique continue their activities, drawing on other funds
- Incorporating FGLG actions in bilateral and regional agreements in southern Africa (Malawi and Tanzania).

The team will try to improve dialogue with the private sector and government this year. The role of forest company associations at provincial level are very weak, and are not represented in fora.

Questions

- Can the research address the question of why there is illegal logging trade between Mozambique and Tanzania, beyond studying the trend?
  - There are so many problems of governance, rule of law, etc. After this activity, let the Mozambique and Tanzania teams sit together and see how we can address this.
- This is a very strong agenda – but it will not achieve quick results! What specific impacts can you make sure of in 2013?
  - Remember that each event has communications associated with it – in the media etc.
- A comment from the India team: when trying to institutionalise paralegals, and reflecting Indian experience, it may involve minimum standards, accreditation etc. There are positive and negatives: for example cooperatives in India began informally, and then the state came in and ultimately destroyed the movement. Similarly now self-help groups have norms imposed on them and the lack of informality is destroying the original spirit.
This is just what we want to learn from: we want social justice and assistance to the community as the objective, with institutionalisation of paralegals being less important. What is important is that we are supporting the paralegals.

- The research may be ambitious given that it must finish in September – normally research takes a long time!
- We are using a lot of other sources alongside FGLG funds.

South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forestry enterprise development support – getting the programme more SMFE oriented. Consolidation of state and private sector support. [maybe with pamphlet for communities?]</td>
<td>Convenor and key team members pushing roll out and development of support programme with Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), DAFF, DED and SMEs</td>
<td>Task team Learning event on benefit sharing enterprises Media release Specific workshops and capacity work</td>
<td>Integrated support efforts for forestry SMEs – and this better recognised in policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land reform policy review</td>
<td>Convener and other land affairs representative and Department of Agriculture representative. SMFEs.</td>
<td>Sit on the review committee Submission of comments and view from FGLG working group. Quarterly committee meetings</td>
<td>Effective support service out of traditional bigger role players [SAPPI, MONDI etc] Opening the wider dialogue for ALL stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of non-timber products [advocate forestry but also provide alternatives]</td>
<td>FGLG Agriculture Dept members and some key members to sit on the think tank of products development. NGO, COGTA, furniture manufacturers and SMMEs [need to go beyond pulp and paper to furniture etc]</td>
<td>Use of steering committee to conduct workshop Steering committee to consolidate the list of product by region Identify some members to sit on further and timber processor committees</td>
<td>Minimise the potential competition between forestry and other traditional agriculture activities eg cash crops Establish a solid relationship with Dept of Agriculture to maximise efforts in timber sustainability. Increase of timber plantation for ailing manufacturing (furniture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hold several workshops on state owned forestry land | FGLG and Dept of Land Affairs and Rural |
Transfer

Coordinate community based committees on management of transferred plantations

Development

- FGLG/ Dept of Forestry
- Convenor to facilitate such workshop

Plans for the period beyond September 2013

- The drive for more and better SMFEs continues to be essential; international ideas and recognition of this is useful
- So we need to institutionalise ‘FGLG for SMFEs’ with South African resources, and participate in transnational FGLG with the help of IIED and others
- Preparation of funding sourcing document to support continuation of an ‘FGLG kind of structure’ – to be sent to DTI, Department of Economic Development; Department of Forestry, Charter council.

Questions

- This is too much for a short period of time – is it realistic?
  - There is other funding support, additional to FGLG.
- As in other countries, it’s important to do enough advocacy at this stage. Also how do you involve the private sector?
  - In FGLG we have senior managers from SAPPI, MONDI, etc., so whatever we do, they can take that information back to their HQ. The only people we’ve never had interaction with are furniture manufacturers [There are hardly any NGOs in South Africa, but lots of private sector actors, so the FGLG team is the most Private Sector focused team].
- Suggestion to consolidate all action points into forestry enterprise development support in 2013 – as a big push, and big products – and leave the rest for later. This plan contains too much, too many directions. The first area is critical and the others can feed into it, hence the suggestion for a big push on forestry enterprise development support.
  - A champion of this kind of programme has been Steven Ngubane: the team is hoping ITC will allow him to continue as convenor to the end of the programme.
- Many countries need to have products completed to help with donor reporting.
  - Both policymakers and policies change all the time – those dynamics really have an impact. But perhaps the country teams can write something to share the reporting.
- This links to attribution: not all these activities are FGLG. IIED can select – the project is like a base with options. Let’s see how through this project it has managed to have so many paths.
  - It’s a set of rivers flowing into one.

Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and dissemination of findings on illegal timber trade (Tanzania and Mozambique). Having</td>
<td>Revise/ finalize film documentary and policy forum/breakfast debate in May 2013: the film will be</td>
<td>FGLG partners</td>
<td>Influence action by the Government of Tanzania (with communities and other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shown the video, the team plans to make use of the recommendations given and go back to the field.

Documentation and dissemination of findings on illegal timber trade for East Africa and China.

Outcome monitoring and evaluation of MMC – governance issues in the country. Campaign, many NGOs working with communities from different expertise – how to communicate different information. Documentary on this.

Coordinating reflections and planning on REDD+ in Tanzania among pilot projects – many meetings previously, discuss what to do in the coming years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the concrete actions in coordinating and planning for REDD among field projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Possibly a conference with all stakeholders, then policy recommendations emanating from this to government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Regarding the film and testimony – can you ask communities to do the film themselves?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ If you speak to communities quietly and differently, you get more out of it. This gives you different stories from the same NGOs. It depends on the technology available, but it is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Regarding improved coordination between REDD+ partners – there are different NGOs’ experiences in Tanzania, and for their voices to be heard, they need to be working close together. Some have more knowledge for assessing carbon stocks (for example), so working together to bridge these gaps, capacity differs from NGOs to another, identify strengths and weaknesses, so that experience and knowledge is shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Are you planning to do a reflection/document what has been learnt over the past years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ After this meeting, FGLG members can meet and reflect and we can write a report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ You need to plan for a specific impact from coordinating REDD pilots on Forest Governance. At present these are not coordinated. How can we improve learning between implementation and demonstration to higher policy making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ FGLG has put a component on communication of climate change and REDD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Does MMC not have its own M&amp;E process? Why not draw on this process, plus the Forest Hearing, plus some more work to make a “state of forest governance in Tanzania” report? What about the future engagement of FGLG in MMC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Suggestion to increase the participatory nature of the testimonials, so as to capture the ‘real’ story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ How will you ensure maximum (positive) impact of the documentary?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Through mainstream media and a conference on REDD progress
- You may want to use multiple channels/tools for 1 and 3.
- FGLG as leverage/ TNRF as platform to reflect on MMC.
- TNRF as platform for communication

Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When*</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building for members and partners</td>
<td>Jan-Sept 2013</td>
<td>RECOFTC VN, HUAF, Dak Lak, Bak Kan.</td>
<td>Training/ awareness raising/ workshops/ study tour</td>
<td>Capacity of relevant stakeholders built/ improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audience: team members, partners, CSOs, Government officials, communities, private sector entities (if possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGt capacity building for communities from Oct 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGt capacity building for communities from Oct 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights to forests</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGt capacity building for communities from Oct 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and REDD+</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGt capacity building for communities from Oct 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEGt</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGt capacity building for communities from Oct 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support ongoing processes on CFM, FLEGt, REDD+, forest government monitoring</td>
<td>Till Sept 13, possibly beyond</td>
<td>FLEGt members’ contribution. Audience: VN Forest, CSOs, FAO/WB, UNREDD programme</td>
<td>Meetings Capacity building as above Guidance documents</td>
<td>Policy formulation. Guidance available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection, evaluation and publication</td>
<td>Till Sept 13</td>
<td>FLEGt with independent consultant(s)</td>
<td>Evaluation Team reflection Publications Dissemination</td>
<td>Publications available – type of publication will vary according to specific audience eg planning a contribution to Agriculture and Rural Development magazine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audience: all who are interested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plans for the period beyond September 2013
- Capacity building on FLEGt for civil society organisations and the private sector
- Support ongoing processes of CFM, FLEGt, REDD+, forest governance monitoring
- Development of natural resource governance curriculum for Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry.

*Some of the timing will depend on the availability of the target audience.

Questions
- We need to make the policy framework the big effort this year – and gear the publications and capacity work to this too.
  - Yes this is possible, but most of the activity inputting into the community forestry policy will be after September, in line with the Government of Vietnam community forestry pilot project which ends in December 2013.
- Are you planning any advocacy activities?
Yes in terms of feeding into policy formulation and publications. All this can be called policy advocacy.

- Did you collect some baseline information for the evaluation earlier?
  - In September 2006 we did an assessment of community forestry management in Vietnam and produced a report in 2009, so that could serve as a baseline. We also have access to RECOFTC studies on community forest management so we could use those as a baseline too.

- Is there some overlapping of effort in Vietnam?
  - Yes in terms of FLEGT and REDD, but in community forestry we are working to try to coordinate issues. At the moment we have VN Forest which coordinates the FLEGT process, but which lacks contact with civil society, which is something we are planning to work on. Regarding REDD: at the moment the national REDD office does not have the resources to do a lot of coordination.

- Suggestion to publish in Vietnamese and international journals. But also, to what extent are journal articles read by non-academics?

- How will you identify the audience? I.e. they might [not?] know the work exists, and therefore be unable to have any interest.

- Capacity building is a big activity – I prefer capacity building as a programme rather than ‘the activity’. Is it possible to achieve capacity building in the 6 month duration?

- Regarding the Government of Vietnam efforts on CFM – how do you collaborate up to resource base?

- Regarding policy formulation and the engagement of FGLG: is guidance prepared by government or FGLG?

- Q10: To what extent does Government use FGLG publications?
4. China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform

Presentation of the draft workplan of the China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform (China-Africa FGLP) was made by Lila Buckley of IIED, drawing on discussions during the inception event that took place in Beijing, immediately prior to the FGLG Learning Event in Tengchong.

The preliminary objective of the Learning Platform is to ‘Strengthen understanding, partnership and joint action on forest governance between China and Africa’, with a focus on information sharing to fill gaps and identify priority issues; bringing knowledge from the field; and fostering stronger, deeper links among more diverse stakeholders.

Those involved in the Platform will likely include:

- IIED
- FGLG country teams
- CAF, SFA, GEI, IUCN, WWF, Forest Trends, TFT, TNC, EFI
- Other researchers, NGOs, government, investors/banks and private sector stakeholders in China and Africa participating in research, joint action and policy engagement

Within the overall objective, there are several focus themes which the Platform is likely to work on:

- Models for sustainable forest management
- Emerging standards and principles
- Timber trade and investments
- Non-forest sector investments impacting forest governance.

Discussions so far have identified some the following potential activities for 2013:

- Share information coming out of this first Platform event in China
- Joint research on various topics, once research questions have been agreed
- Investigative reporting trips by five Chinese journalists to Africa
- Sharing of Chinese Guidelines by FGLG country teams with African stakeholders. The idea is to use the Guidelines as a tool for constructive engagement between civil society and government, to stimulate regulations and other incentives to improve behaviour
- Convene a second China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform event in Africa in 2013/14. The event could possibly focus on:
  - Impact and details of Chinese investments in and trade with the forest sector in specific countries, with comparative export trade data
  - China’s forest governance experience (eg sustainable forest community development; community fire prevention model, etc.)
  - Existing and emerging standards (in Africa, China and globally) affecting timber commodity production and trade
  - Experience of demonstration projects on the Guidelines (eg WWF-CAF projects)

As regards the potential joint research, this could address the following possible research questions:
• Joint case studies of Chinese forest sector activities in specific countries (eg Cameroon)
• Chinese guidelines: how are they being applied in different ways in different African countries?
• Investigative reporting by Chinese journalists on Chinese forest sector activities in specific African countries
• Timber trade governance: joint studies exploring discrepancies in African export and China import data (eg Mozambique)
• Chinese domestic market: market regulations, consumer priorities, and potential to support and encourage overseas Chinese companies to apply SFM
• Legislative framework: joint research on existing and emerging standards and principles in Africa and China affecting Chinese forest enterprises activities in African countries.
• Forestry management models: comparative research in China and African countries (this could include an update of IIED’s paper on Chinese small and medium forest enterprises)
• Broader sector analysis: how Chinese investments in other sectors in Africa affect forest sector
• Stakeholder analysis: how Chinese investments in other sectors in Africa affect forest sector

All this research would be designed to lead into policy recommendations and joint actions.

The presentation on the draft China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform workplan was complemented by remarks from Dr Chen of the Chinese Academy of Forestry and Dr Fu Jianquan of the State Forest Administration.

Dr Chen noted that in his view, “the workplan is complete and conforms to what we want”. The possible research questions and the case studies in specific African countries are good. Regarding the guidelines: much work has been done on these already and CAF have tried to promote them. CAF is concerned and interested in the impact that Chinese investment has – and the questionnaire will provide feedback on what is thought about Chinese investment. There is much trade between China and other countries and it’s time for China to take action.

Dr Chen continued by stating their concern about trade between China and Africa, recognising the value of the potential legislative framework that this event proposes. He also welcomed the plan to involve diverse stakeholders and concluded “We are very interested in the China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform”.

Dr Fu Jianquan made the following points:
• The Forest Governance Learning Platform (FGLP) is a good platform to exchange experiences, questions, problems about forest governance. I feel very interested in it because we can exchange what we feel about forest governance and exchange about the problems we’re facing now in China
• Scholars and experts from both sides have given advice from different perspectives and based on different realities, including recommendations on how we carry out the next stage of the work. We hold open and supportive attitude towards the platform, as a means of widening communication and exchange.
• There is already good, constructive cooperation with NGOs including TNC, EFI, GEI, Forest Trends, and IUCN. FGLP provides another platform for us to have more exchanges and further promote cooperation.
• There is a lot to do to improve partnerships with CAF and FGLG. More detailed discussion is needed as to how we do this. Concerning the content: it’s a good proposal to strengthen and improve
connections/exchange, between diverse stakeholders in addition to inter-governmental interaction. One example is that Dr Fu will hold a meeting with a Ugandan minister the following week.

- Joint case studies: Dr Fu participated in international symposium in Cameroon, and there are lots of opportunities to carry out joint case studies, for example with Mozambique and Ghana. We have resources for the next cooperation.

- The Platform plan to support five journalists for investigative reporting is a very good suggestion. Perhaps we could integrate resources from different sources (as journalists from different backgrounds will have different views), and also invite the partners/forestry experts to participate in this reporting. These experts can contribute to better understanding of the value chain, and they can answer questions posed by the journalists in a scientific way.

- The Chinese guidelines are actively being introduced and promoted at international conferences and symposia. Firstly it was only in English but because of the high attention paid by the leaders of our country, we are translating them into Spanish, Russian, Portuguese and French.

- Besides the translation of the guidelines, we are also carrying out pilot projects in Gabon, Russia, Cameroon, PNG, Indonesia and Guyana. These pilot projects enable feedback from Chinese enterprises: what is good and what should be improved?

- How can we share models for forest governance? We have political strength, and accumulated experience of forest plantation management, diversification control, wildlife conservation, forest fire control – and we have carried out cooperation with South Africa and Kenya where there are abundant wildlife resources. What collaboration can we do under FGLP? Both sides need to discuss further to determine priorities.

- Finally, it would be better for CAF to have a fixed team to communicate with FGLG. In doing so, CAF can know the activities better and understand what the platform can do, as well as how we can cooperate with FGLG.

**Questions and comments**

James: As you say, there’s a good basis here for taking this dialogue forward and for investigating the idea of the platform, but we need to do a lot more talking to identify the particular issues and ways in which we can pursue them. At this stage it may be useful to get some further reflections on the possibilities of the issues to focus on, and how they may be worked on, as well as on some practical needs we now have. For example, where should we meet next, and what should we talk about when we do next meet?

Robert: I really appreciate what has been presented. I feel that the ideas will evolve as we have another meeting. As regards where – if Tanzania and Cameroon say no, we in Malawi can host!

Msa: I believe that the information presented really reflected the positivity from the Chinese delegation which is a good way forward. But I believe it would work even better after the documentation that they want to circulate to African countries… so that by the time we meet, the questionnaire has been sent back and consolidated, and available. Re: venue, I would be delighted to suggest the Congo Basin should be the best area given the huge interest of Chinese companies there.

Antoine: I think the Congo basin will be a good venue and I believe that this meeting should have a certain profile and we want IIED to take the lead in terms of convening. Secondly the guide is absolutely important. In Central Africa, people don’t have the perception that there are very good things in terms of forest management going on in China. In practice, the company we saw yesterday was impressive – this is what the private sector can do in Africa – at least they can show that in China there are good practices in terms of minimising losses. So Chinese companies could exchange with local Cameroononian companies.
James: The forms for the survey are available (being circulated) – CAF are underway with their own research on links between China and Africa investments. The immediate next step is to develop a draft report from the meeting in Beijing and share it with you, then we can summarise our agreed next steps in Chinese, English, French and Portuguese, and use that as a basis for our next discussions.

Dr Zhang: It is very useful to get this information but it is only a first stage. This event is a very good opportunity because there are inputs from more than ten countries. Some of you are from government, some independent – it’s good for us to get a general idea (through the survey) about what you think about Chinese investment and trade. For the next stage, we’ll have more specific studies, and will present the outcome of this study to the SFA. Actually this is the first attempt to do such a study. You can provide us with good information, and I hope you can keep in contact with us and continue to share information and collaborate.

Tan: Regarding the survey: I’m not sure whether I’m able to answer these questions. Many are at the national level and we need access to statistics to provide the answers. If you are really interested in the answers, please give us some time.

Dr Zhang: Yes it must be difficult to provide the data now. If you get the information later, please send it to us.

James: We also have some opinion survey work that has informed the two background papers, and we will deepen that in coming months. Perhaps we could put that together with the survey results.
5. Field Trip

The field trip took participants to see a community forestry initiative at Jingkou Community in Houqiao township, and to a wood processing factory.

Once a key target of the poverty alleviation programme in China, Jingkou has made great progress in improving its environment and developing its forestry resources. Jingkou has recently received several awards, such as being one of the Top One Hundred Villages of Afforestation. More than 95 per cent of Jingkou's 88km² is under forest, which includes a large number of rare and valuable tree species. The two key economic tree species are Camellia (which covers 10,000ha) and walnut (467ha). These two species produce an annual output of 14.5 million yuan (more than US$ 2.3 million), and by 2012, farmers' per capita net income from forest management was 3,000 yuan (about US$ 490).

Collective forest tenure reform started in 1998, since when the planted forest area grew to 84 per cent of the total forest area. The village committee uses some of the income from the forest to provide security patrols, firefighting measures, etc, and also for investment in infrastructure (roads, drinking water, primary schools, a community clinic and much else). Furthermore, the village has invested in a new community welfare and pension system, which provides a pension to retired people.

Following demarcation and registration of forest land in 2006, farmers were issued with Forest Property Certificates covering about 5,533ha of forest land, with a further 2,867ha of forest land being put under collective management. Forest land can be used as a guarantee for loans, and such loans further improved investment in the forest sector.
Reflections on the field trip

Baruani Mshale and Sushil Saigal gave some reflections on the field trip, with contributions from other participants:

**Jingkou community forest**

- We learnt that communities are allowed to keep 100% of the revenue
- We were told that forestry is the highest source of household income, at more than 40% of the total.
- The income is also used for village development, including provision of pensions to elderly people.
- We were unsure how harvesting quotas are decided, but there appears to be some system of sustainable harvesting.
- They don’t have to sell in a particular year but can wait till a future year when prices are better. It’s very important to be able to use the market like this
- Forestry management competes with other land uses such as crop farming: these communities tend to have crops in the valleys and trees on hillsides, so the physical features separates the two. Comparing this to Africa, the situation is different as there tends to be direct competition over land use.
- These are more planted forests here, compared to Africa where there are more natural forests (though there are small scale individual plantations in some African countries too).
- We sensed that we didn’t hear the farmers’ voices very much (partly due to the seating arrangement: they were seated at the back, away from the local officials). It would have been interesting to hear communities’ perceptions of these forest tenure reforms, and we could have drawn more lessons there.
- The dynamics of gender and generation were interesting. We saw children and older people but very few in the 25-45 age bracket. This is perhaps because they’re moving into towns? So what does this mean for the future of community forestry?
- There is an issue of ageing of those in the community who are involved in forestry. This is similar to South Africa, where the youth are not interested. This has led to import of skills from neighbouring countries, but it’s unreliable. Health is also a major factor in difficult terrain – what are Chinese plans to address this?
- There were no women present in the community group, and none involved in the discussion
- We learnt about the importance of tenure: the whole scheme revolved around changing tenure relations, as it was initially a collective, then given to households on a 70 year lease. This change seemed to be the most critical part. There are parallels to Joint Forest Management (JFM) in India.
- The community forest covered 8,400 ha and was used by 500 households. This is quite a favourable area compared to JFM, where each patch is 2-300ha.
- We saw that, with a few years of investment (say 15-20 years), you can bring a degraded landscape back to forest.
- The potential for NTFP is often more important than that for timber. Eg in this area, camellia and walnuts.
- We were impressed by level of detail the community had: community members gave detailed responses, and were very knowledgeable both about present and future plans. These very clear, precise, consistent figures thus formed a very robust data set – this is a big contrast with India!
- We saw a lot of certificates in the village hall, symbolising the community’s pride: this is important in motivation
- The villagers said the management of forest is a big challenge for them. What is the role of the national forest service? There are no fire-breaks, and the condition of the forest floor indicated that there’s not much assistance from the forest service.
We were impressed that the villagers can get loans on basis of forest tenure certificates. This is difficult in Cameroon.

Wood processing factory

- The wood processing factory is one of five plants owned by the same company. They focus on processing low quality wood with an aim to minimise waste: this is important as it reduces the pressure on high quality wood. If we compare that to the African perspective, the use of low quality wood use depends on the context. In natural forest, low quality wood is left in the forest where it does have value as it decomposes and releases nutrients. It’s also a good source for furniture, building, and energy. So it is not necessarily ‘low quality’.
- We were told the wood is sourced from community managed forest (one third), and from large scale commercial plantations (two thirds). There was a huge volume of timber, but the catchment area from which it was sourced was not clear.
- The concept of greening the industrial facility was not covered during our tour.
- Chinese investors in Africa have been criticised for not observing safety – so we tried to look at that too. What about water and energy consumption? Is the wood sustainably managed? Is there value addition? What about health and labour standards? We were surprised to see manual operation of large amounts of wood – this is dangerous and inefficient.
- We suggest that if the visit had been organised according to the chain of activities, it would have been easier to follow.
- Regarding the link between the processing enterprise and the suppliers, it was not clear whether a partnership can be developed on a long term basis so that the suppliers have a stake in the sustainable management of the resource
- The plant was very automated, using machinery imported from Sweden – it is not using very high labour.
- Value chain analysis – at what stage is value added and who captures it?
- It was not clear how the timber is sorted.

We also visited a ‘volcano park’ in which there are a number of resident communities. From a forest governance perspective it was interesting: there is an arrangement with those who own private forests, whereby they are paid CNY50-100 per year, like an environmental service payment.

The group then went on a popular river walk near the park and observed a lot of NTFP produce being sold – crickets, mushrooms, birds etc – but we were unsure whether the extraction is monitored in any way. The stall holders we passed on the walk are part of a company: the company pays the local people for the right to set up stalls for tourists, at a rate of CNY 2-3,000 per year.
6. Reflections on FGLG – the past year and time ahead

Given that the learning event marked the final year of continuous funding for the international FGLG alliance, several participants were invited to give their reflections on FGLG.

Robert Kafakoma (Malawi): has attended many FGLG events and activities. At the start, it wasn’t clear what FGLG was about. As the teams came together, we shared experiences, documented, learnt, talked to communities and companies, and discussed at length. Looking back, in some cases we’ve moved mountains. With regard to Malawi: since 2003, many of the group have become Ministers, permanent secretaries, started their own businesses, etc – and they still retain links with the FGLG network. So it’s easy for the group to press a button to make things move. But unfortunately it has weakened the institution responsible for forestry. Many countries are still struggling – they haven’t really built a network within. There are still a lot of lessons and experiences to share.

As we go forward, we still have to do a deep analysis of what we’ve done together and the impacts made in forestry governance at national, regional and global levels. We still need to develop documentation with evidence of what’s been achieved. In Malawi, there’s a strong network – FGLG is linked to climate change, CBNRM, water resources management etc. In other countries, there’s still much work to be done. We need to strengthen the inter-country networks; we should have more bilateral meetings.

A new ‘front’ in FGLG work is the China-Africa theme. The perception is that there are a lot of negatives attached to Chinese investment, so we need to do a lot of communication work. Last October there was an African Development Forum, at which papers presented were about Chinese investment, but with the participation of only one Chinese representative, from the Chinese embassy in Ethiopia. If we compare productivity in China and Africa, that of China is very impressive. As FGLG we have a good platform to document and bring out the information – we need to know what China is doing, and vice versa. FGLG provides that platform. We need to continue with the learning events – that’s where we learn. I know more because of FGLG. Let us continue organising these learning events.

Nguyen Quang Tan (Vietnam): I’ve been involved with FGLG for seven years. The first email came from IIED in December 2005, inviting me to participate in a scoping visit to identify objectives. The budget was limited. In Vietnam, we decided to focus on learning about poverty alleviation through community forestry. We started with the intention to learn as we went along. The first learning event I attended was in Uganda, then India, then Malawi. It was eye-opening to discuss charcoal issues with African villagers: we had some very open discussions. It’s a little different in China and Vietnam concerning exchange of information. Then we had learning events in Bali, Mozambique, Vietnam – and now Tengchong.

A member of the Vietnam FGLG team said ‘FGLG has very little money but has been very cost effective and has brought more impact than projects of $1 million’.

Four key things about FGLG:

- Effectiveness and efficiency – analyses, workshops, study tours, dialogues to share learning – for Vietnam it was one of the first times policy makers and academics got together with villagers to discuss. It’s a good chance for exposure to what’s happening in the field
• Capacity building – when Tan started, he had just done his PhD so his forest governance knowledge was from books. FGLG has given him the chance to see what governance is really like in the field. It has helped Tan to develop his own capacity as well as that of other team members and partners
• Networking – one of the highlights of FGLG has been the opportunity it provides to the Vietnam team to network with national, provincial, district and community level – as well as international level.
• Publication – all teams have tried to document our learning in different formats, whether print, video etc. It’s very important to keep and spread the knowledge and learning.

The learning experience will continue in the coming years, even if the funding is coming to an end. We will expand to more analysis, and more areas of interest. In Vietnam we’re trying to get further funding to continue the work beyond the current phase. I believe that even if there’s no money, we should continue our learning and try to meet every year.

Msawenkosi Madlala (South Africa): Even though it’s my first time at a learning event, the role of FGLG coordinating their relationships between countries is coming out strongly. Intra-African dialogue should increase – as Robert mentioned – similarly in Asia. The value of this kind of discussion goes beyond what we’re seeing right now. I talk as someone who works on research and timber trade every day: what you’ve shared has really opened my mind.

Antoine Eyabe (Cameroon): I concur: FGLG as a multi stakeholder platform in Cameroon was not there before. One of our members has just been appointed as a key adviser in the Ministry of Forestry. However it is also important to highlight some of our weaknesses. For example we don’t communicate enough. If IIED didn’t coordinate an event, we might not communicate so much. It’s important to share similar issues across countries.

Baruani Mshale (Tanzania): If FGLG is coming to an end, what’s the incentive for everyone to continue? When IIED is convening, it provides motivation for you to do something. Encouraging critical reflection from each country is positive, but in any network there are lots of dynamics that affect how they work. It’s critical to look at those challenges. For example, all organisations that you represent have unique identities, and you use those to get funding. Sometimes those identities could be lost when you come together as a group. It’s a question of attribution – to what extent are outcomes attributable to FGLG? I sense it’s unclear. How do you acknowledge other organisations without losing the role of FGLG? We need to discuss these dynamics openly to find solutions.

James Mayers (IIED): the longevity of FGLG gives us potential to be a bit more direct. I like the point about individual identities of FGLG teams – USPs – what does each have? Teams are much clearer on what is the key thing they do.

Challenges for us all this year
• Impact. Getting key products done and making optimum impact this year
• Evaluation. Assessing impact over last 4 years and last 10 years, and telling stories of change
• Sustainability. FGLG impact further developed through other funds and initiatives, and through FGLG and country teams, beyond this year
• China-Africa forest governance learning platform. Taking the next steps
7. Impact of FGLG over the last four years

Learning event participants were asked to do a quick self-assessment of the extent to which FGLG has reached its intended four outputs.

Evaluation of learning event

Learning event participants made a quick assessment of the quality of four features of the learning event.
Annex 1: Agenda

Programme: FGLG Learning Event
March 7th to 11th 2013, Tengchong Airport Sightseeing Hotel, Baofeng Rd, Tengchong

Day 1: March 7th 2013: Arrival in Tengchong and brief opening session of learning event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2000-2100 | Welcome session – Mr James Mayers, IIED, Mr Ren Peng, Global Environmental Institute and Dr Jianquan Li, Chinese Academy of Forestry  
Welcoming remarks  
Self-introductions  
Overview and discussion of the programme for the learning event  
Introduction and update on the Forest Governance Learning Group |

Day 2: March 8th 2013 – Reviewing FGLG progress-workshop day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900-1200</td>
<td>Sharing achievements and lessons learnt amongst country teams – in two main groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1400</td>
<td>Synthesis of lessons learnt amongst country teams – plenary discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1630</td>
<td>Thematic discussions and news from country teams and partners – in plenary with some possibly in smaller groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630-1700</td>
<td>Highlighting ideas with implications for plans ahead – in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 3: March 9th 2013 – Field trip day

Visit communities with forest-based livelihood to understand Chinese approaches to sustainable forest governance and forest-based livelihoods, as well as ‘alternative’ livelihood projects.

Visit sites where logs are processed or forest products are manufactured to understand how forest product processing industry help to improve local people’s livelihood and increase their income.

Day 4: March 10th 2014 – Planning FGLG work ahead-workshop day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900-0930</td>
<td>Sharing experience of field programme – in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1000</td>
<td>Re-capping of ideas from previous days – in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1200</td>
<td>FGLG planning for 2013 – in paired country team groups, then in thematic groups for cross-cutting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1300</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300-1600</td>
<td>Presenting plans and exploring key ideas - in plenary then possibly in smaller groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1700</td>
<td>Summarising next steps and evaluating the event – in plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 5: March 11th 2013 Departure day
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The Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) is an informal alliance of in-country teams and international partners, currently active in seven African and three Asian countries, facilitated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). It aims to connect those marginalised from forest governance to those controlling it, and to help both do things better.

Periodically, FGLG teams get together at an international learning event. In March 2013, the ninth such learning event was held in Tengchong in China. The objective was to share experiences and to peer review the work of the teams, particularly focusing on the outcomes and impacts of activities undertaken in the last five years. This report summarises the results.