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The FLEG(T) idea

Ten years – Lessons learnt

Data and information presented here have been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union, through a project titled ‘PRO-Formal: Policy and regulatory options to recognise and better integrate the domestic timber sector in tropical countries in the formal economy’; CIFOR; and the CGIAR Research Program on Forests, Trees and Agroforestry (FTA). The usual caveats apply.
The FLEG(T) idea
Forest Law Enforcement, Governance, and (Trade)
Where is FLEG(T) coming from?

Facing Reality
How to halt the import of illegal timber in the EU
## The pre-FLEG(T) actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mid-1990s</td>
<td>Inter-governmental Panel and Forum on Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>G8 summit agrees to an Action Plan on Forests which includes a commitment to eliminate illegal logging (Colchester, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 - 2000</td>
<td>G8 summits in Birmingham and Okinawa: first true public and official statements on illegal logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2001</td>
<td>Bali Ministerial Meeting: a Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) initiative in Asia is launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Indonesia signs joint statements or memoranda of understanding with the U.K, Norway, Japan, Republic of Korea, and China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>The President’s Initiative Against Illegal Logging is launched, committing the U.S. to assist countries in the Congo and Amazon Basins, Central America and South-East Asia to combat illegal logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>Yaoundé, Cameroon: 39 countries committed to a Ministerial Declaration and Actions targeted at combating illegal logging, associated illegal trade, and corruption in the forest sector at the Africa Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (AFLEG) conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>A EU’s Action Plan is officially released to both increase support for governance and enforcement in wood-producing countries, and mechanisms for voluntary actions to control trade in illegal wood products (Colchester, 2004; AF&amp;PA, 2004). Trading activities are added to the EU’s FLEG, which becomes FLEGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where do we stand?

Implementing:
Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Liberia, Republic of the Congo

Negotiating:
Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Guyana, Honduras, Laos, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam

Informing:
Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Peru, Philippines, Cambodia, Myanmar/Burma, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Sierra Leone

European Union

www.euflegt.efi.int/vpa-countries
Where is FLEG(T) going?
A sense of direction

- Illegal ≠ Illegitimate ≠ Non Sustainable
- Legal ≠ Legitimate ≠ Sustainable
What to do with this?
...and this?
...and this?
...and...and...

Chainsaw milling: supplier to local markets

European Tropical Forest Research Network

Center for International Forestry Research

CGIAR
Congo basin (++)

Formal 31%

Informal 69%
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**Why can’t they have a permit?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Available permits</th>
<th>Current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Timber exploitation permit</td>
<td>Suspended 1999-2006; Volumes not adapted; Prohibitively expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Discretionary permit</td>
<td>Suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Special permit</td>
<td>Suspended in parts of the country; Not attributed in others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Artisanal Exploitation Permit</td>
<td>Suspended in parts of the country; Delivered for wrong objectives; Incomplete regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Artisanal Exploitation Permit</td>
<td>No implementing regulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Simple, cheap, decentralised (and seek convergence between legal and legitimate), but based on knowledge of the resource.
‘Invite’ (not impose) formalisation

- Things a government could do
  - Check whether ‘customary’ ownership is possible (positive impacts on rural livelihoods → timber prices, check ecological impacts)
  - Promote ‘legal’ demand through public procurement policies (better prices, incentives to improve quality, get registered, pay taxes)
  - Support with control, provision of transparent data and information
  - Facilitate micro-credit (decrease risk of overdependence on debts)
  - Support with extension services, training...

- Avoid criminalisation and avoid (re)inventing the market
Governance

- ‘The biggest challenge is to overcome the inability of governments to stimulate legal trade…’

[Costs to chainsaw millers]
‘Invite’ State official on board

- Test ‘decentralisation’ in practice and give more and more responsibilities to field staff (auctions with engagement of State officials; incentives and ‘ premiums’ based on quantitative results, e.g. number of permits delivered and closed with success; annual independent audits)

- Effective sanctions
Land use dynamics
Nothing interesting to read on your flight back home?

And DRC coming...http://www.cifor.org/pro-formal
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