



The Antalya Workshop – from Declaration to Action

Implementing the St. Petersburg Declaration
on
Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) in
Europe and North Asia (ENA)

May 16-18, 2006
Antalya, Turkey

Draft Workshop Proceedings

Editor's note: These proceedings were prepared on the basis of presentations delivered and discussions held at the workshop. The proceedings are not intended to be comprehensive, however, workshop participants are invited to send comments suggesting factual amendments or inclusion of materials omitted to ena-fleg@worldbank.org

Information Boxes

Box 1: An Overview of the St. Petersburg Declaration..... 4

Box 2: Action to Implement the St. Petersburg Declaration 5

Box 3: Examples of national FLEG Processes 11

Box 4: Types of illegal logging and other forest crimes in the ENA Region, their
drivers and potential responses 15

Box 5: Matrix for defining scope..... 17

Box 6: Civil Society Draft on Meaningful Public Participation in the ENA-FLEG
Process 27

Background and Workshop Overview

Illegal activities in the forest sector are widespread in the Europe and North Asia (ENA) region. Available country estimates on the proportion of illegal timber supply range from a few percent to amounts exceeding the officially recorded harvesting volume. Illegal harvesting may play a significant role both in commercial timber supply as well as subsistence fuelwood consumption.

Growing concern among stakeholders in the ENA countries over the negative impacts of illicit harvesting activities has catalyzed a regional process to address the issue. In November 2005, the Ministerial Conference on FLEG in the ENA Region, held in St. Petersburg, brought together more than 300 stakeholders from the region and resulted in the St. Petersburg Declaration, an expression of commitment to combat illegal activities in the forest sector, was accepted by acclamation by 44 governments.

Building on this progress, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Turkey, in collaboration with the World Bank, organized a workshop in Antalya, Turkey from May 16 to 18, 2006, to offer interested stakeholders an opportunity to learn from past experiences in combating illegal activities in the forest sector and to provide practical guidance on formulating national action plans with clearly defined targets and means for monitoring progress of implementation as called for in the St. Petersburg Declaration. The workshop brought together more than 110 people from 30 countries, representing government, civil society and the private sector.

The principal objectives of the workshop were to:

- (i) Learn from experiences gained so far in the ENA region and elsewhere in combating illegal activities in the forest sector;
- (ii) Share experiences and improve skills in formulating Action Plans to combat illegal activities in the forest sector;
- (iii) Provide a forum for discussions between country representatives and funding agencies

Many of the governments and stakeholders involved in the regional process had indicated that they are unfamiliar with the methodologies and approaches applied in such processes, and that they would appreciate having access to more developed technical aids. In response to this need and in preparation for the Antalya Workshop, “Guidelines for Formulating and Implementing National Action Plans to Combat Illegal Logging and other Forest Crime” were developed by SAVCOR-INDUFOR in collaboration with the World Bank ENA FLEG Secretariat. The Guidelines have three focal areas (i) conducting the formulation process, (ii) designing contents for the Action Plan, and (iii) establishing arrangements to implement the Action Plan. The Guidelines were circulated to Workshop participants in advance of the meeting and informed working group discussions at the workshop. The guidelines are available at:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTARD/EXTFORESTS/0,,contentMDK:20923018~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:985785,00.html>

Over the course of the workshop, participants provided feedback on the draft Guidelines that gave valuable directions for their future development. This feedback will be incorporated into a revised draft of the guidelines. In particular, the participants noted the importance of evaluating the adequacy of relevant legislation in the early stages of the assessment. Also, the framework for analysis should be sufficiently flexible and broad so that all pertinent linkages to other sectors can be covered. Comments, additions and improvements to the guidelines are welcome, and should be addressed to the World Bank ENA FLEG Secretariat to ena-fleg@worldbank.org

Organization of Work

The Workshop was organized according to three sessions on the following themes: lessons learned (day 1), formulation of action plans (day 2) and collaboration (day 3). Session 1 on lessons learned took place in a plenary setting and was comprised of four panels on: promoting legality through appropriate institutions, laws and regulations; monitoring forest resources and their use, and improving accessibility of information to the public; engaging stakeholders through open and participatory processes to promote transparency, reduce corruption, facilitate equity and minimize undue privileged influence; and ensuring that demand-side measures support action by the producer countries and promote trade in legally harvested timber.

Session 2 on the formulation of action plans took place in both working group and plenary sessions. The working groups provided an opportunity for participants test and provide feedback on the Guidelines for Formulating and Implementing National Action Plans as well as the opportunity to work with others from countries with similar conditions. The working groups met in two sessions, the first focused on the identification of the scope and key actions for national action plans, and the second on identification of key elements of country processes. Session 3 on collaboration comprised a working groups session on resource mobilization followed by a panel presentation and plenary discussion on technical and financial assistance form bilateral and international organizations.

Opening Session

Osman Kavehçi, General Director of the Turkish General Directorate of Forestry, welcomed participants to Turkey and underlined the importance of the workshop. Mr. Gerhard Dieterle, Forests Advisor, World Bank, and Co-chair of the ENA-FLEG International Steering Committee, recalled that just six months ago ministers and high-level governmental officials, and civil society and private sector representatives convened in St. Petersburg and committed to address illegal logging and related crime with the adoption of the St. Petersburg Declaration. He recalled key elements of the Declaration, including each country's responsibility for curbing illegal logging, trade and related crime, and agreement that forest law and governance issues need to be addressed at local, national, transboundary, regional and international levels and that producers, traders and consumers share equal responsibilities. He underscored the urgent need by countries to undertake collective actions for which the ENA-FLEG process offers opportunities for significant synergies.

Nuri Uslu, Deputy Undersecretary, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, delivered a welcoming address on behalf of Osman Pepe, Minister of Environment and Forestry of Turkey and opened the workshop. He emphasized the importance of international partnership to address threats to the environment and forests in particular, and underscored the importance of the ENA FLEG process. He highlighted several international forest-related processes and conventions that Turkey is engaged in, including the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF). He remarked on how the diversification of energy sources to coal and natural gas has improved the state of forests in Turkey.

Speaking on behalf of Andrew Vorkink, the World Bank Country Director of Turkey, Peter Dewees said the World Bank is intent on tackling governance problems in any sector where there are expectations for service delivery, from forestry to education to infrastructure development. He said good governance goes hand-in-hand with effective law enforcement and indicated that the World Bank stands ready to assist all regional partners in coming up with realistic and practical measures for ensuring sustainable forest management and good forest sector governance.

Overview of FLEG process in the ENA Region

Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank, presented an overview of the FLEG process in the ENA Region to date. He explained that ministerial forest law enforcement and governance initiatives create the political "space" at national and regional levels for governments to address the complex and politically sensitive issues related to illegal logging in partnership with major stakeholders from civil society and the private sector. Co-hosted by both "producer" and "consumer" governments and the World Bank, these processes aim to mobilize international commitment from producer, consumer and donor governments – in collaboration with other stakeholders -- to increase efforts to combat illegal logging as well as the associated trade and corruption in the forest sector. Since

September 2001, Ministerial processes have taken place in East Asia (2001), Africa (2003) and Europe and North Asia (2005).

The ENA FLEG process was initiated in May 2004, when the Russian Federation announced its support for such a process and intention to host a FLEG Ministerial in 2005. An International Steering Committee (ISC) was established in February 2005 to guide the ENA FLEG process, and in June 2005 a Preparatory Conference was held in Moscow to begin discussions on FLEG issues in the region and to initiate drafting of a declaration for consideration at the Ministerial Conference. The Ministerial Conference took place in St. Petersburg in November 2005, yielding the St. Petersburg Declaration, an expression of commitment by 44 countries to take action to address illegal logging and associated forest crimes. See Box 1 for an overview of the St. Petersburg Declaration.

Box 1: An Overview of the St. Petersburg Declaration

The St. Petersburg Declaration, adopted by 44 countries at the November 2005 St. Petersburg Ministerial Conference on FLEG in ENA, charts a course for action at the national and international levels and addresses the possible need for reform of forest sector legislation and policies to ensure that forests are managed in a sustainable manner, responsible legal forest industry is encouraged, and the rural poor are not criminalized for using forest resources. The Declaration differentiates between poverty driven and commercial illegal logging and addresses both in a balanced way. It underlines that combating illegal logging is a shared responsibility of both timber and timber product exporting and importing countries, requires high-level political commitment and collaboration across sectors and should engage governments, civil society and the private sector.

Delegates in St. Petersburg also identified a set of possible actions that government, NGOs and the private sector might take to meet the commitments made in the Declaration. At the international level, the participating countries commit to strengthening national capacities in the affected countries, systematic monitoring, assessment and reporting of progress on FLEG, promoting partnerships between the private sector and civil society, and the facilitation of information sharing and transfer of technology. The suggested measures at the national level range from law enforcement and combating corruption in the forest sector to engagement of stakeholders in the formulation of forest policies and legislation. Broader measures to address the underlying causes of illegal logging, such as rural poverty, are also included.

The Declaration also calls for the participating governments, as well as civil society and the private sector, to meet within three years to exchange experiences on implementation, and for a second Ministerial Conference within five years to assess progress made in FLEG.

Stakeholder engagement – including national and international NGOs and private sector entities – was central to the process leading up the Ministerial and will remain so in the follow up to the Conference and the implementation of the St. Petersburg Declaration.

Action to Implement the Declaration

Ahmet Ulukanligil, Deputy Director General, General Directorate of Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Turkey, presented a summary of Turkey's action to date to fill the commitments of the St. Petersburg Declaration. As a first step, the Declaration was translated into Turkish and sent to all related governmental and non-governmental bodies. All relevant government agencies as well as central and local departments of the Forest Administration were invited to evaluate the Declaration and to initiate actions within their competency. Hosting the workshop also marked a clear step toward implementation. As exemplified in Box 2, a number of other countries have also taken action on the ground to implement the Declaration since November.

Box 2: Action to Implement the St. Petersburg Declaration

Dialogue between **Russia-China** is developing, and a top-level Russia forestry delegation visited China and had FLEG follow-up as one of the items on the agenda.

The **Transparent Timber Flows in the Baltic Sea Region Workshop** is scheduled to take place in Riga, Latvia, from June 8-9, 2006.

In **Georgia**, the government is organizing broad stakeholder consultations with private sector and civil society on the concept of their new National Forest Policy and Strategy (NFPS), in which FLEG issues are centrally placed.

The **Third Central-Asian Forest Investment Forum** took place in Almaty, Kazakhstan, in February 2006. The development of national FLEG action plans was one of the Forum's clearly stated objectives.

Russia's National Action Plan (NAP) to prevent illegal logging and associated trade has been developed in partnership with civil society, NGOs and private sector.

Japan's green procurement policy (GPP) for forest goods and services come into effect in April 2006, requiring that all government procured timber be legal according to forest laws in producing countries and sourced from forests under sustainable management.

The **European Council of Ministers** is currently processing a resolution which endorses the Ministerial Declaration and thereby commits all 25 Member States to the Declaration.

Session I: Lessons Learned

Ahmet Ulukanligil, Deputy Director General, General Directorate of Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Turkey, and Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank, acted as co-chairs throughout the first day of the Workshop.

Panel 1: Promoting Legality through Appropriate Institutions, Laws and Regulations

Andrey Kushlin, Senior Forestry Specialist and Alternate ENA-FLEG Focal Point, World Bank, introduced and moderated this panel session.

Russia's National Action Plan for Preventing Illegal Logging and Associated

Elena Churilova, Federal Forestry Agency, Russian Federation, delivered a presentation on Russia's National Action Plan (NAP) to prevent illegal logging and associated trade. Illegal logging in Russia amounts to 10-15%, with the problem stemming from underlying socioeconomic, legal and sectoral causes. Approved by President Vladimir Putin, the NAP was developed in partnership with civil society, NGOs and private sector. A chain-of-custody assessment was used to identify which authorities to involve in developing the NAP. The process for developing the NAP started with the identification of five "building blocks" or core elements for the NAP: improving legislation, improving the state governance system, improving forest management, developing socio-economic mechanisms, and enhancing international cooperation.

For example, the block on improving forest management encompasses the establishment of mechanisms for interagency cooperation and coordination between government bodies and the establishment of a single interagency information system for recording use of and trade in forest resources and products, price and tax monitoring, and illegal activities. The institutional support to the NAP consists of assigning responsibility for implementation to a federal authority and the establishment of a NAP Supervisory Council. Regional plans as well as criteria and indicators for monitoring the NAP's performance are also being developed. Goals set in the NAP include: applying remote sensing to 100% of commercially exploited areas; increasing payments to the budget by up to RUR 2 Billion/year, and enhancing the international credibility of the Russian Federation in the area of forest management and governance.

Development of Forest Policy, Legislation and Institutional System in Latvia

Arvids Ozols (Latvia) shared lessons learned from Latvia's forest sector reform process. In general, the preconditions for good forest governance include: society's understanding on the role of forests and forest sector in sustainable development; sound forest legislation; institutional capacity; and cooperation between different institutions and stakeholders. Latvia's reform process started with land reform in the early 1990s to clarify ownership, and culminated with the adoption of a new forest policy in 1998 that established a balanced approach to management of forest economic, ecological and social

values. The policy separated productive and supervisory functions through the establishment of the State Forest Service (supervision and advisory services, law enforcement) and the Company for State Forest Management (management of state-owned forests). The new model is a success, as demonstrated by a four-fold increase in forest revenues since 2000.

Key lessons from Latvia are that: illegal logging is part of a larger problem faced by transitional economies, specifically, issues of rule of law, governance efficiency and corruption; illegal logging can be best stopped using a combination of existing tools and the development of new constructive policies involving state institutions beyond traditional forest administration, given that several of the underlying causes are outside the forest sector; and effective NGO partnerships with private sector, forest industry and banking and private forest owners can foster alliances necessary to combat forest crime.

Simplification and Improving Transparency of the Rural Communities' Rights of Access to Forest Resources in Albania

Nehat Çollaku, Director, Albanian Ministry of Environment, Forests and Water Administration, presented on the illegal logging situation in Albania. Illegal logging in Albania is driven by poverty in rural areas as well as commercial interests and broader problems with the legal framework and land tenure. Low transparency in forest administration, underdeveloped information systems and inadequate legal supply further exacerbate the problem. In 2000, officially recorded illegal logging was about 25% of legal supply. However, actual illegal logging probably exceeds legal harvest by a factor of ten. The main consumers of industrial round wood are the wood material processing industries and construction industries. The largest consumer group of firewood is households, but public institutions, charcoal and lime producers also consume significant volumes of firewood.

The Albanian Forestry Project and Albania Private Forestry Development Program have decentralized forest management in 138 local government units (communes), transferring pastoral land and forests use rights to rural communities. The preliminary results of forest transfer to local communities are encouraging, for their positive environmental impacts and for the socioeconomic benefits. The inter-ministerial Task Force established in 2000 to coordinate action to address illegal logging has yielded results, and the volume of illegal logging wood decreased by 14% last year.

Good political will across the sectors concerned with national forest resources, involvement of civil society, strong penalties for illegal behavior and effective rewards for responsible behavior, interventions to alleviate rural poverty, and reduced taxes on alternative heating sources were identified as keys to success. The clarification of roles, responsibilities and authorities among different government levels, private sector and civil society as well as coherence between laws were also deemed essential.

Strengthening Capacity for Criminal Prosecution and Anti-Money Laundering Measures

Theodore Greenberg, Senior Specialist, Financial Integrity Unit, World Bank, discussed how anti-money laundering laws can be applied to investigate and prosecute illegal logging. Money laundering is the process of disguising the proceeds of crime in an effort to conceal their illicit origins and legitimize their future use. For example, money can be laundered by placing proceeds in bank accounts abroad, or by purchasing goods that are later sold to receive ‘legal’ cash. Money laundering is a separate offense in addition to illegal logging that can carry jail sentences, allow for seizure and confiscation of proceeds of crime.

Money laundering analysis can assist investigations by, for example: identifying false statements on bank loans, letters of credit, customs and shipping documents; establishing patterns of cash deposits/withdrawals involving banks and other financial institutions; following wire transfers to foreign jurisdictions where assets are hidden and/or used to promote forest crime; identifying sources for cash used for loggers, food, chainsaws, trucks, heavy equipment, tugboats or ships; and enhancing financial sector scrutiny of politically exposed persons.

Greenberg suggested that the establishment of interagency logging strike forces could provide an effective means to build interagency, interdisciplinary and international cooperation and to target important cases. Additional recommendations included to: develop “Red Flags” to help detect suspicious financial transactions; review of money laundering laws to identify provisions useful to the prosecution of forest crime cases; identify best practices for as well as impediments to investigation and prosecution of timber crime cases; create fast track procedure for certain forfeitures; and consider establishment of a Forest Crime Forfeiture program.

Panel 2: Monitoring Forest Resources and Their Use, and Improving Accessibility of Information to the Public

Lars Laestadius, Senior Associate, World Resources Institute, moderated this panel and delivered an overview presentation on the topic. Transparency and monitoring are closely related concepts: transparency means consistent sharing of information; and monitoring means systematic collection of information. Both are processes which should be mainstreamed into production and governance systems. The technology for transparency and monitoring is rapidly becoming cheaper, more effective, easier to use and more widely applied, increasing the possibilities of mainstreaming transparency and monitoring in national plans of action.

Joint Government-Civil Society Monitoring of Forest Utilization at the Sub-national Level

Denis Smirnov presented lessons learned from a joint WWF and Russian Ministry of Natural Resources project to monitor forest use in the Jewish Autonomous Region -

Evreiskaya Autonomous Oblast (EAO) – in the Russian Far East. 80% of roundwood harvested in the EAO is exported to China, with Chinese timber companies carrying out most of the logging. Initiated in January 2003, the project is comprised of:

- analysis and maintenance of data bases on timber companies, forest lease holders, main areas with illegal logging, and offenders of forest legislation;
- regular planned audits (24 times a year); and
- unscheduled raids based on information received and results of analytical work.

After three years, illegal logging in EAO has dropped and is under control. By comparison, in two other regions of Russian Far East - Primorskii and Khabarovskii kray, illegal logging remains an urgent problem. Unscheduled raids, timely prevention of consolidation of illegal loggers with organized crime, disqualification of offenders from holding forest leases, and improved understanding between Chinese timber companies and Russian control agencies were identified as contributors to the project's success. In response to a query as to whether this experience will be scaled-up, Smirnov said the situation varies from province to province, requiring responses tailored to each situation.

IT-Based Systems for Authorization and Monitoring of Forest Practices and Follow-Up with Landowners

Patrik Olsson, Swedish Forest Agency GIS-Specialist, explained how GIS technology is used in Sweden to review, authorize and monitor fellings. Notification of planned fellings on sites larger than a half hectare must be delivered to the Swedish Forest Agency at least six weeks prior, along with information about the about plans for forest regeneration. The information is recorded in the GIS and analyzed to make sure that no area with high environmental value will be effected. Important information about the shape, scale and date of fellings is gathered by comparing satellite images with Enforma, a software program that detects forest cover change. Implementation of regeneration plans is also monitored and enforced through this system.

In responding to questions, Olsson commented that, while a formal cost benefit assessment has not been completed, the benefits far outweigh the costs and Enforma is not expensive and easy to use. Regarding whether forest owners in Sweden were consulted before Enforma was designed, Olsson explained that they had not been consulted but that they are in general pleased with the system and that they benefit from the information collected which is made publicly available at no cost.

Panel 3: Engaging Stakeholders through Open and Participatory Processes to Promote Transparency, Reduce Corruption, Facilitate Equity and Minimize Undue Privileged Influence

Carole Saint-Laurent, Senior Forest Policy Advisor, IUCN, introduced and moderated this panel.

Stakeholder engagement: Lessons Learned from Fisheries Management in the Baltic Sea Region

Karin Wessman, Forest Project Coordinator, WWF International, highlighted some lessons on stakeholder processes from the fisheries sector – specifically the *Baltic Sea Regional Advisory Council* and *Kosterfjorden Regional Advisory Council* - that could inform similar processes in the forest sector. Stakeholder dialogues have helped decision-makers by providing access to local knowledge and high quality advice, building stakeholder ownership of problems and solutions, and providing a mechanism to flag stakeholder concerns. Such processes have been particularly useful in finding solutions to conflicts around protection, management and local development.

Keys to successful stakeholder processes identified include patience, clarity of decision-making process and role of stakeholder involvement, realistic expectations (i.e. overarching problems such as corruption cannot be solved within one sector alone), adequate resources for stakeholders to participate, agreement on a joint goal (e.g. “We want to eat fish from the Baltic Sea in 50 years time”) and capacity-building. The stakeholder process should be responsible for reaching a joint understanding but common opinions are not needed. A long-term committed and respected facilitator(s) is essential, and people often need to be hand-picked to the processes as personal qualities (integrity, solution oriented, respect, etc.) are very important. To maintain credibility, decision-makers should be prepared to follow the advice from stakeholder dialogues.

During the discussion, the question of expanding protected areas in Turkey as part of FLEG was raised, and Wessman agreed on the importance of protected areas but cautioned that the needs of populations living near such areas must be considered. With regard to how to deal with a biased or misinformed press, trainings for journalists to encourage accurate reporting and interest in the topic were suggested as one solution.

Turning Declarations into Action through Tripartite Dialogue in FLEG Regions

Victor Teplyakov, IUCN, discussed how a FLEG national action plan might develop and lessons learned from IUCN’s role in multistakeholder FLEG discussions in more than 15 countries (see Box 3 on examples of national processes).

Box 3: Examples of national FLEG Processes

- **China:** Current focus of State Forestry Administration on tenure reform provides opportunity/process to address not only illegal logging and trade but also root causes and promote good governance generally.
- **Brazil:** A national working group on FLEG is being formed by sensitizing important government institutions and political opinion leaders about the issues, using NGO forums and social movements to reach key civil society actors. The private sector will be brought in when the currency situation is improved.
- **Tanzania:** FLEG inserted into nfp review process by the IUCN National FLEG Coordinator, resulting in Forestry Department taking responsibility for FLEG.
- **Central America:** A minister in Costa Rica acting alone initiated what later became a six-country action plan and funding proposal involving six directors of national forestry agencies, a network of rural organizations and IUCN.
- **Vietnam:** The IUCN National FLEG Coordinator and government International Cooperation Department are collaborating to build process to be 'adopted' by Forestry and Rural Development Department
- **Central Africa:** IUCN initiated process in four countries that attracted civil society, private sector and parliamentarians. Subsequent World Bank involvement helped to bring in high level government officials for the ministerial process.

There is no 'magic formula' for developing a national action plan - it can be initiated by the Government or any credible organization and should involve actors with political influence, implementers and opinion leaders. Governments should be engaged at sufficiently high level, with parliamentarians included to ensure that reforms are adopted. Opinion polls and radio broadcasts in local languages are good ways to engage the public and media.

Sustained international involvement in developing and implementing NAPs is essential to reassure countries that the international community and (multilateral and bilateral) donors are still engaged after the Ministerial Conference. International community involvement on a continuing basis also helps secure the participation of key government officials and the private sector interested in their international image.

A number of lessons have been learned from experience processes to date:

- Action should be taken as soon as possible and not put on hold until after the national planning processes is completed;
- A tripartite approach (comprised of government, private sector and civil society) should be encouraged and strengthened at all levels to facilitate appropriation of the FLEG process by stakeholders;
- NAP processes need ongoing capacity building, awareness raising, communications and networking; and
- Synergies should be maximized, and gaps and overlap minimized between the bilateral and international organizations that are interested in FLEG issues in each region.

In the following discussion, one participant asked what should be the baseline for a multi-stakeholder process. In response it was agreed that civil society participants would draft initial criteria for such a baseline. The criteria were presented on the final day of the Workshop (see Box 6).

Panel 4: Ensuring that Demand-Side Measures Support Action by the Producer Countries and Promote Trade in Legally Harvested Timber

John Hudson, Senior Forestry Advisor, United Kingdom Department for International Development, introduced and moderated this session.

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) Sustainable Wood Procurement Requirements for Borrowers

Mikko Venermo, Principal Environmental Advisor, Environment Department, EBRD, informed participants on EBRD's policies for sustainable wood procurement. The EBRD promotes sustainable forest management through its investments in forest products industry. As part of the environmental due diligence, each forest industry operation is required to carry out a review of forest resource use. This and other requirements acknowledge illegal logging persists as a problem in the ENA-FLEG region and that it is a critical issue affecting the perceived investment climate for forest industry investments.

EBRD requires its Clients to adhere to rigorous corporate wood procurement policies and procedures, ensuring that the wood supplied for their operations is of legal origin and comply with principles of sustainable forest management. Companies that do not have their own system in place are required to adopt and implement a step-wise wood procurement plan. With these requirements, the EBRD is promoting demand-side measures that support the objectives of the St. Petersburg Declaration. The EBRD also encourages its clients to engage into dialogue with Governments to support the development of state controlled legal, enforcement and governance systems towards sustainable forest management and to promote certification of state-owned forests.

Verification of Wood Origin – the Case of Stora Enso in Russia

Helena Jantunen, Sustainability Manager, STORA ENSO - Wood Supply Russia, overviewed Stora Enso's experience with wood origin verification in Russia. For almost ten years, Stora Enso has used and continuously developed a system for tracing wood origin, which currently covers all of its wood procurement. Stora Enso's strategies to ensure origin of wood include analysing the risks related to legality and sustainability issues, focusing on long-term partnerships and investments, increasing Stora Enso's own logging operations, keeping the supply chains as short as possible, having active stakeholder dialogue and development projects, using wood origin tracing systems, and promoting forest certification.

The total consumption of wood in Stora Enso's mills in 2005 amounted to 47 million m³ (solid under bark), and of that the volume from Russia was about 7 mln m³. To improve control and to enhance tracing of origin of wood procured in Russia, Stora Enso has:

- achieved an FSC Controlled Wood verification in November 2005 covering all ten regions where the group is buying wood in Russia and its supply to Stora Enso mills including outside of the Russian Federation;
- initiated an FSC forest certification of own subsidiary forest lease territories in Russia totaling about 1,000,000 hectares;
- updated a supplier ranking scheme based on results of supplier and site audit results; and
- included, for the first time, key data on also Russian wood procurement in a joint European level Wood Supply EMAS report, which is due to come out in summer 2006.

During the discussion, in response to an inquiry about financial savings from reducing the number of middle men in the supply chain, Jantunen indicated this is difficult to calculate due to changes in other factors of production, such as the cost of transportation. With regard to changing prices for wood from Russia, Jantunen indicated that prices for roundwood logs have increased, and will like increase more as a result of an export duty on roundwood scheduled to begin in July 2006.

Demand Side Measures to Tackle Illegal Logging: Using the Market Mechanism

Andy Roby, Head of Environment and Corporate Social Responsibility, UK Timber Trade Federation, addressed how the UK's legal and sustainable timber procurement policy, adopted in 2002, has influenced UK suppliers. The UK imports 70% of its timber needs and the UK Timber Trade Federation (TTF) represents the majority of agents and importers responsible for this trade. ENA-FLEG countries are a significant source of supply direct to the UK, particularly from the Baltics and Russia, but also indirectly through Scandinavia.

Softwood producers for the UK market have responded to the 2000 Timber Procurement Policy by getting their forests certified, and last year the TTF estimates that 60% of our softwood timber imports were certified. The hardwood response has been weaker at 29%, mainly because of difficulties establishing certification systems in certain supplier countries. TTF market research found that inadequate supplies of certified hardwood has resulted in premiums of between 2 and 30% being paid by traders for verified legal and certified sustainable hardwood, depending on the product and source country. While the main driver for this market change is the UK timber procurement policy, other factors are corporate customer purchasing policies, building regulations, and the need for the timber industry to demonstrate its environmental credentials.

Roby suggested that ENA-FLEG participants should consider what market-based measures they can put in place in their own countries, notably establishing government timber purchasing policies and tightening building regulations to require legal and sustainable timber. Based on the UK experience, traders are in favor of clear, practical legislation that will eliminate illegal timber from supply chains and stops unscrupulous

suppliers from undercutting markets with cheap illegal timber and ruining the reputation of timber in the market.

Summary of Key Points from Session I

At the close of the first session, Gerhard Dieterle, summarized common points and themes that had emerged throughout the discussions:

- There is no set recipe for a national action plan, and a national action plan process does not need to be “perfect” from the start.
- Meaningful stakeholder engagement is essential and an ongoing process that takes patience and time.
- Illegal logging is not a problem only for the forest sector – other sectors must also be engaged.
- The importance of transparent information and monitoring to improve accountability is clear. New technology can reduce the cost and increase the functionality of monitoring while increasing precision and response capacity.
- The responsibility for addressing illegal logging is shared by producer and consumer countries alike, and requires international cooperation.
- An enabling legal, institutional environment is a key factor in addressing FLEG issues. Secure land tenure and land use rights are a necessary basic requirement for economic actors.
- Procurement policies for sustainable wood can help drive the demand for legally sourced wood and wood products.
- Pro-activity of the private sector is a key tool to stimulate pro-activity at national and international levels.

Session II: Formulation of Action Plans

Delores Belorechka, Department of International Cooperation, National Forestry Board at the Ministry of Agriculture of Bulgaria, and Andrey Kushlin, Senior Forestry Specialist and Alternate ENA-FLEG Focal Point, World Bank, co-chaired the second day of the workshop, which was comprised of plenary sessions and smaller working group sessions.

An Introduction to the Formulation of National Action Plans to Combat Illegal Logging and other Forest Crime

Tapani Oksanen, FLEG Task Team Leader, World Bank, presented on how to develop effective national action plans. To design an effective action plan, the basic requirements are an understanding of the magnitude and impacts of different types of illegal logging and other forest crime, an analysis of the drivers (or underlying causes) of these crimes (see Box 4 for examples of crimes and drivers), and agreement on the most effective measures to (i) prevent, (ii) detect and (iii) suppress these crimes. The scope of the action plan will vary depending on the economic, social and environmental costs of these different forest crimes. Responses can be based on: improving legal supply, institutional reforms, economic incentives, information and transparency, and effective responses are based on consensus and be cost-effective.

Box 4: Types of illegal logging and other forest crimes in the ENA Region, their drivers and potential responses

▪Illegal logging for securing subsistence

–Drivers: poverty, lack of alternative sources of energy...

–Potential responses: improving legal access, alternative income opportunities, alternative source of energy...

▪Small-scale illegal logging to enhance livelihoods

–Drivers: poverty, complex legal procedures, land-tenure disputes, failures of law-enforcement...

–Potential responses: alternative income opportunities, reduced bureaucracy, clarification of land tenure arrangements, interagency cooperation...

▪Large-scale illegal logging

–Drivers: failures of forest and law enforcement institutions, overcapacity of industry, lack of monitoring and transparency, export demand, high cost of legal timber...

–Potential responses: institutional reorganization, phased reduction of industrial capacity, increased timber supply, improved monitoring, data management and accessibility, promotion of responsible business practices

▪Conflict timber

–Drivers: absence of institutions and general lawlessness

–Potential responses: conflict resolution, international collaboration in sanctioning conflict timber

▪Irregularities in timber sales and award of concessions

–Drivers: low risk of sanctions, poor staff motivation, poorly organized financial control systems, inefficient legal procedures...

Potential responses: improved transparency of processes, competitive bidding, independent financial audits, greater prosecution of criminal cases and stiffer penalties

(Continued next page)

(Box 4 Continued)

▪**Evasion of taxes, royalties and other fees**

–Drivers: unreasonably high taxes and fees, poorly organized and corrupt financial audit systems, inadequate private accounting systems, inefficient legal procedures

–Potential responses: adjustment of taxes and fees, effective sanctions on companies guilty of evasion of taxes and fees, independent financial audits, sound accounting practices, strengthened prosecution of criminal cases and stiffer penalties ...

▪**Circumvention of labor laws**

–Drivers: indifferent attitude in companies towards labor laws, poorly organized and corrupt oversight, inefficient legal procedures...

–Potential responses: effective sanctions on companies found guilty of violations, strengthened prosecution of criminal cases and stiffer penalties

▪**Unauthorized wood processing**

–Drivers: strong domestic and export demand, excessive bureaucracy for legal operation, poor and corrupt oversight, inefficient legal procedures

–Potential responses: increased legal timber supply, simplified licensing procedures, strengthened prosecution of criminal cases and stiffer penalties

Introduction to Working Groups on the Guidelines for Formulating and Implementing National Action Plans

Esa Puustjärvi, Savcor Indufor, delivered an overview of the purpose and approach of the working groups. Based on the Draft Guidelines for Formulating and Implementing the National Action Plans to Combat Illegal Logging and other Forest Crimes, the working groups met in three sessions focused on the following: 1) the scope and key activities for Action Plans, 2) key elements of country processes, and 3) needs and opportunities for external assistance. Working groups were given the option of using matrixes to facilitate this work and initiate dialogue (see Box 5 for an example). The working groups provided an opportunity for participants to familiarize themselves with the methodology proposed in the draft Guidelines, to initiate discussions with other participants from the same country that could be continued at the country level, and to provide feedback on the methodology that would be incorporated into the revised Guidelines.

The groups were divided according to the following:

Group 1: Large-scale timber producers and exporters with predominantly state ownership of forests & their key trading and development partners (Carole Saint-Laurent, IUCN, and Andrey Kushlin, World Bank, as facilitators);

Group 2: Timber producers with mostly domestic/household consumption and predominantly state owned forests & their key trading and development partners (Victor Tepliakov, IUCN, and Tapani Oksanen, World Bank, as facilitators); and

Group 3: Timber producers with significant non-state ownership of forests & their key trading and development partners (Elena Kulikova, WWF Russia, and Peter Dewees, World Bank, co-facilitated this group).

Box 5: Matrix for defining scope

<i>Type of illegal activity to be addressed</i>	<i>Gvt</i>	<i>Private sector</i>	<i>Civil society</i>
Illegal removal of trees			
Timber data manipulation			
Irregular timber sales, award of concessions & service contracting			
Evasion of taxes, royalties and other fees by enterprises			
Evasion of taxes, royalties and other fees by community or private forest owners			
Violation of labour laws			
Unauthorized wood processing			
Other			

Working Group Results: Definition of Scope and Key Activities for Action Plans

The Working Groups reported outcomes from their discussions to Plenary, indicating the top three priorities related to defining the scope. Group 1 identified illegal removal of trees, timber data manipulation, and evasion of taxes, royalties and other fees by enterprises as priorities. The group also expressed concerns about how tallying and averaging opinions in the matrix lead to divergent opinions canceling each other out. Group 2 identified illegal removal of trees, violation of labour laws, and unauthorized wood processing as priorities in defining the scope. Group 3's priorities were as follows: timber data manipulation and violation of labor laws; illegal removal of trees; and evasion of taxes, royalties and other fees by enterprises.

The groups also reported on the exercise of considering and prioritizing key activities under the topics of prevention, detection and suppression. Group 1 noted that actions need to be sequential and coordinated. For example, a stronger legal system is no good without effective prosecution. It identified the following for priority action: elimination of shortcomings in the legal framework, introduction of demand side measures, enhancement of legal oversight, monitoring of use and trade, improvement of management structures and systems in public forest administration, and strengthening of international cooperation.

Group 2 identified the top three priorities actions for prevention as: improving management structure, alleviating poverty, and reducing domestic demand for timber, with stakeholder engagement, international cooperation, adjustments to the legal framework, and transfer of property rights as additional priorities. Priorities for detection were improved monitoring of forest use and timber trade and enhanced effectiveness of legal oversight. For suppression, the priority was increased effectiveness of the judiciary

Group 3 considered priorities from the perspective of consumer vs. producer countries and also ranked priorities based on urgency for action. Overall priorities were enhancing stakeholder dialogue, supporting development of responsible business practices in the forest sector, introducing demand-side measures locally and/or in importing countries to reduce demand for illegal timber, and reducing costs of legal timber harvesting and trade. Issues important to both producer and importer countries were the effectiveness of monitoring systems, data accuracy and unfair competition among companies. Medium priority activities for the group included improving management structures and systems in public forest administration/enterprises, eliminating key shortcomings in legal frameworks, strengthening international collaboration, increasing the effectiveness of the judiciary, strengthening collaboration with police force, increasing long-term supply of timber, and alleviating rural poverty. Nfeps were identified as an instrument for enhancing stakeholder dialogue and as the best place to incorporate FLEG action at the national level.

Identification of Key Elements of Country Processes

In their second session, Working Groups discussed five questions related to the development of national action plans as a means to identify “building blocks” to provide the foundation or starting point for creating such plans. Discussion results were reported back in Plenary and are summarized below along with the questions:

Question 1: What are the first steps you need to take to get started in your country?

Group 1

- Identify stakeholders
- Identify a champion (or a basket of them)
- Identify someone who is responsible for making it happen
- Map out the country’s vulnerability and resources available and needed
- Identify objectives, timeframe, independent assessment, measurement
- Establish independent baseline data
- Awareness-raising (by government and NGOs) about the St. Petersburg Declaration
- Establish a national working group with the most important government agencies
- Request from Antalya workshop to all ENA FLEG governments to as what are you doing and who has lead responsibility

Group 2

- Issue a government decree
- Establish a special interagency taskforce or committee to coordinate FLEG activities and develop the NAP
- Identify the leading agency to take responsibility for FLEG Hold roundtable discussion with key players from different ministries
- Hold stakeholder consultation to inform stakeholders about ENA FLEG
- Assess/study prior work on FLEG
- Map/identify who will be involved in the national level process

Group 3

- Use existing frameworks (National Forest Strategy, National Forest Policy, National Forest Programs) or update them (long-term oriented)
- Establish multi-stakeholder dialogue, establish transparent process (participatory approach, cooperation, degree of commitment and obligations)
- Collect realistic data on illegal logging's impact
- Start an awareness-raising campaign
- Improve current legislation and formulate new forest code (and provide adequate law enforcement)
- Build capacity to address FLEG issues

Question 2: Who could or should champion this process in your country?

Group 1

- A political person who needs to be seen to have achieved something
- One ministry could take the lead and then assign responsibility
- NGO and private sector leaders combined with a government resolution

Group 2

- Ministry responsible for forests or environment.
- Forest department.
- The Prime Minister/ Head of State* should make support clear – perhaps with a decree.

**Political level of champion can vary depending on national circumstances (seriousness of the issue and political structure).*

Group 3

- Government
- Relevant Ministries (Forest Departments, Services, Agencies)
- Forest Owners
- Forest Sector
- FAO Experts

Question 3: Who are your most important partners inside and outside the forest sector in your country?

Group 1

Industry, private forest owners, quasi governmental agencies, customs, NGOs, local government, regional authorities, journalists for transparency, international processes, and bilateral MOU partners.

Group 2

Outside the forest sector: Ministries/Agencies of: Finance, Economics and Development, Trade, Interior, Justice/Prosecutor, Foreign Affairs, Environment,

Water, Transport, Agriculture, Infrastructure, Social Protection, Labor, Energy, etc. Parliament and cabinet of ministers. Parliamentary commissions. Local authorities and administration. Bilateral and multilateral donor agencies. Research institutes. ENA FLEG countries. Print and broadcast media. Focal points for environmental conventions. Meteorological standard committees.

Inside the forest sector: Ministry of Forestry/Forest Administration, Ministry of Environment, Forest Departments, University Forestry Faculty, Research Institutions, NGOs, Forest management and planning enterprises, private sector, Forest villages and cooperative institutions

Group 3

Private Sector (private forest owners associations, industry associations); Governmental Institutions (Ministries of Finance, Interior, Agriculture and Food, Justice, Environment); the scientific community; politicians; trade Unions; cross-boundary partners; and interested groups.

Question 4: What are the major constraints to starting the process in your country?

Group 1

- Process too bureaucratic
- Unclear allocation of official lead responsibility
- Lack of support of lead agency by other ministries
- Defensive attitudes of vested interests inside and outside governments – need persistence and communications to navigate through this
- Idea that all solutions have to be identified before getting started
- Not using the right “language” to persuade key audiences

Group 2

- Financial Resources
- Departmental/Ministerial interests and weak/low support from local authorities
- Insufficient interest from institutions outside the forest sector
- Opposition groups in the private sector
- Unexpected external impacts – i.e. increases in energy price

Group 3

- Lack of capacity (incl. institutional capacity)
- Lack of funds, budget resources for state institutions (example – for monitoring systems)
- Economic and social problems (many benefit from illegal logging)
- Reluctance of related institutions and sectors
- Lack of openness in decision making process (professionally based decisions)
- Difficulties related to transitional processes

Question 5: What are the main opportunities for sub-regional collaboration (regarding activities or processes)?

Group 1

- EU FLEGT
- Ministerial Conference for the Protection of Forests in Europe
- Russia-China Collaboration
- Russia-Finland Collaboration
- Need sense that there is a continuing process to maintain momentum and learn from each other (e.g. good to have Antalya a few months after St. P.)
- Japan-Russian Far East (already bearing fruit)
- Cooperation, e.g. on monitoring/gathering info
- Linkages
- Other FLEG processes
- The Forest Dialogue
- International processes
- Existing stakeholder networks and processes should be integrated
- G8 – FLEG needs higher level of support

Group 2

- Intergovernmental taskforce under existing commissions
- Customs collaboration to standardize information formats
- Verification of exports/imports
- Information sharing on successful experiences, for example through study tours
- Capacity building/training

Group 3

- Multilateral regional cooperation (e.g. cooperation within Balkan Region)
- UNFF and MCPFE (Roundtable), FAO\ EFC
- Central Europe initiative – joint trading association
- Awareness building on the process itself
- Timber Trade cooperation
- Share experience both positive and negative
- Negotiations with donors

Session III: Collaboration

Resource Mobilization

The third working group session focused on resources available to develop and implement national action plans, with discussion focused on three questions as summarized below.

Question 1: What existing government resources could be reallocated or used more effectively to support NAPs?

Group 1

- Some of the costs should be borne by the private sector. This knowledge/technology can be shared
- MDG funds
- Capture of lost revenues
- Sale of confiscated wood
- Reallocation of money directed to forest restoration
- Incentives for organizational financial efficiency still lacking in some countries
- Put budget allocation in the context of national policies and legislation

Group 2

- Some national budget could be reallocated. However funds are already committed to certain activities making reallocation difficult.
- First need to draft an estimated budget. Then the government can allocate finances for the activities. Private sector or NGO financing could provide additional support as needed.
- Government funds are not available. International organizations or private companies should finance projects.
- Finance minister will not fund NAP development. Grants from international agencies for developing the NAP are needed.

Group 3

- National Forest Programs
- Forest funds
- Environment funds
- Reallocate budget resources – this is a challenge given other demands
- Additional tax money from forest industry and/or owners
- Access to funds depends on the activity: forests, customs, interior

Question 2: What existing development programmes could be used more effectively to support NAPs?

Group 1

- World Bank – PROFOR
- FAO National Forest Program Facility
- Use of regional development funds
- European neighborhood Programme (from 2007, potentially available to 6 ENA countries)

The group noted that the ENA region is less of priority for development agencies than poor developing countries as the skills base in the region is high and less development money needed than in poor countries

Group 2

- NAPs can be developed and integrated into existing plans such as nfps
- Government decree to implement as well as long-term action plan amongst ministries aimed at combating illegal logging.
- Parliaments often allocate funding on a one-year cycle. An estimate of the cost of implementation should be made and a “champion” on the budget committee should be identified to help secure resources. Inviting ministries to participate in a FLEG NAP coordinating committee to get “in-kind” contributions of personnel and training.
- Nfps can provide a good framework/umbrella for all forest-related action plans to have one budget.

Group 3

- Integrate NAPs into existing Programs
- National rural development plans
- Clearinghouse mechanisms for technical approaches
- Promote collaboration between many institutions including, using existing regional programs
- Human resource reallocation

Question 3: How can additional donor support for NAPs in the ENA region be attracted?

Group 1

- In some cases, an audit of the public sector needed before civil society would have confidence, and donor support attracted
- In general, third party audits improve governance and confidence and should receive donor support as this in turn could improve the prospects for further funding
- Payments for environmental services could provide additional sources of money.
- EU + G8 should have a fund for FLEG to which countries could apply
- Possibility of China linking its very large domestic forestry programme to illegal logging problems in other countries

Group 2

- Best way to obtain financing from the World Bank is through the country office – minister should develop a relationship.
- From the donor perspective, involvement of more than one donor can be very good for politically sensitive issues such as FLEG – one donor can help to encourage additional donors to partner on the activities.
- Before approaching donor, need to contact the national planning ministry to ensure support for the idea.
- Programs that address conservation of biodiversity, combating desertification, and poverty reduction should be involved in partnership to stop illegal logging.
- FAO NFP Facility is a potential funding source, in particular, possibly for NGOs. NFP Facility should address NAP on illegal logging as a sub-component of nfps.
- GEF projects should address illegal logging given the adverse impact on biodiversity.
- Need, programme, objectives, budget to attract support

Group 3

- Co-financing need to give credibility
- NAP objectives need to be clear
- Private sector needs to be included
- Rise G-8 attention - short and sharp messages
- Investment resources are available but needs to be mobilized
- Stronger linkage to SFM
- UNFF\ ENA-FLEG needs to mobilize support
- Partnerships but not just about money, information is important
- NGO\ Private sector
- Need for well defined NAP
- Better focus on benefits to improve image
- Need to make clear linkages withy benefits

Outlook for financing and technical support from international partners

FAO: Eva Müller, FAO Forestry Department, informed participants of potential means available from FAO to support implementation of the ENA-FLEG indicative plan of action, specifically the Technical Cooperation Program (TCP), the NFP Facility and the Norway Partnership Program. TCP projects are designed to play a catalytic role for national development initiatives by providing short-term experts and consultants, training, equipment and supplies for a two-year period. Funding for such projects is up to US\$400,000, and US\$200,000 on average. More information on this project is available at: www.fao.org/tc/tcp

The NFP Facility is a partnership of developing countries, funding partners and FAO that facilitates the implementation of national forest programmes (nfps). The Facility provides grants workshops, training, policy analysis, information sharing initiatives and country support procedures. The Facility enters into partnerships with individual countries for a three-year period with a financial commitment of US\$300,000. The next call for

proposals for new partnerships will take place June – July 2006. Further information is available at: www.nfp-facility.org. The Norway Partnership Programme promotes best practices for improving forest law compliance and could be used for national workshops.

European Commission: John Bazil, International Forest Policy Officer, Environment Directorate General of the European Commission, informed participants about funding opportunities from the EC. The next funding cycle for the forestry budget line is for the period 2007-2013. Regional and national level strategies are developed for programming funds over the course of the cycle, and, for example, ENA FLEG is in the strategies for Central Asia and the Russian Federation. However, given that the funds are available only in 2007, activities would likely start on the ground only in late 2007. The EC's environment budget line is still under negotiation, but likely to reflect FLEG, with funding allocated on a competitive bid basis. In general, the EC negotiates with only one ministry in country, for example, the ministry of planning, and requests for funding for FLEG should be channelled through that ministry.

EBRD: Mikko Venermo, Principal Environmental Advisor, Environment Department, EBRD, explained that while the EBRD has no formal FLEG commitment, it does manage a pool of technical cooperation funds from share holders that could present some opportunities. Given the EBRD's focus on the private sector, it would be more likely to finance investments rather than the development of NAPs.

World Bank: Theodore Greenberg, Financial Integrity Unit, World Bank, provided suggestions on how to use anti-money laundering in national action plans. Make Environmental Crime a predicate for money laundering, make anti money laundering and asset forfeiture a component of every investigation except for subsistence logging, and create an interagency forest crime strike force of investigators and prosecutors who are independent from political interference. An assessment of forest vulnerability to forest crimes involving money laundering and organized crime should be carried out and the results should be used to help design a law enforcement strategy and targeting for investigation and prosecution. Forestry officials should coordinate with financial intelligence units, identify and publish red flags of money laundering and illegal logging, and participate on the National Anti Money Laundering Group. Potential sources for financing such activities include the Financial Action Taskforce, the Eurasian Anti-money Laundering Group, the UN Global Programme against Money Laundering and bilateral technical assistance. With regard to available World Bank resources and instruments, Greenberg advised contacting World Bank country offices directly.

Swiss Intercooperation: Christopher Duerr, Programme Officer, Swiss Intercooperation, indicated that Intercooperation is ready to support national and sub-regional ENA FLEG initiatives, and that it is already supports studies and facilitation to develop NAPs. While the funds available are limited, they are flexible and can provide a good supplement to other resources.

United States Department of State: Robert Sorenson, Deputy Director, Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental

and Scientific Affairs, United States Department of State, explained that resources may be available to fund projects to implement NAPs, but were unlikely to support their development. The nexus of money laundering and organized crime will be a future focus of good governance. The State Department is also working to make satellite imagery already available free for use for forest monitoring.

MCPFE: Malgorzata Busko-Briggs, Expert, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe (MCPFE), highlighted the high-level political process on good forest governance underway in the MCPFE. At the Ministerial Conference in Vienna in 2003, the MCPFE set goals on good forest governance, specifically, to:

- take effective measures to promote good governance and forest law enforcement, and to combat illegal harvesting of forest products and related trade, and contribute to international efforts to this end;
- adjust policy and legal frameworks and instruments to support sound enabling conditions for sustainable forest management that encourage investment and economic activity in the forest sector, including effective measures for forest law enforcement and for combating illegal harvesting of forest products and related trade; and
- provide and analyze information about the impact and underlying causes of illegal harvesting of forest products and related trade on forest biological diversity, take effective measures to combat illegal harvesting of forest products and related trade, and build capacity to ensure effective forest law enforcement .

For more information on the MCPFE, visit <http://www.mcpfe.org>

UNFF: Catalina Santamaria Lopez, Forest Policy Advisor, United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Secretariat, presented how FLEG issues are addressed within the UNFF. The problem of illegal harvesting of forest products and associated trade, first discussed during the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests and the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests, has remained a priority on the political agenda of UNFF. For example, in 2002, the UNFF issued a Ministerial Declaration calling for immediate action on domestic forest law enforcement and illegal international trade in forest products. In 2005 the UNFF held a high-level roundtable on FLEG for sustainability and at its sixth session in 2006, the UNFF called for a greater regional focus, including: a global platform for regional FLEG initiatives to exchange experiences; support for collaboration among ENA FLEG and other regional processes; and plans to address illegal practices and international trade in forest products. For more information on the UNFF, visit: <http://www.un.org/esa/forests/index.html>.

Civil Society Draft: Meaningful Public Participation in the ENA-FLEG Process

Over the course of the workshop, civil society representatives developed an initial draft of guidelines for meaningful public participation. Jules Lesniewski, Taiga Rescue Network, presented a draft on the final day of the workshop (see Box 6).

Box 6: Civil Society Draft on Meaningful Public Participation in the ENA-FLEG Process

In the St. Petersburg Declaration, *Ministers affirm and declare that they will:*

“Engage stakeholders, including indigenous people, local communities, private forest owners, NGOs and industry in the formulation of forest law and policies and in their implementation through an open and participatory process, thereby promoting transparency, reducing corruption, facilitating equity and minimizing undue influence of privileged groups”
(Point 7, St. Petersburg Declaration)

Building a Credible and Effective ENA-FLEG Multi-stakeholder Process requires:

- Participation
 - Clarity
 - Support
-
- Clarity of purpose
 - Clear mandate
 - Credible respected convener
 - High level political commitment from relevant Ministries and the head of government
 - Participation of the Ministries of trade, environment, customs, finance, forestry, etc.
 - International political, financial and technical assistance
 - Diversity of stakeholders (indigenous people, local communities, consumers, NGOs, trade association, business, government agencies etc)
 - Grassroots support
 - Access to all relevant information
 - An open and transparent process
 - Secure on-going financing of the process and its implementation
 - Capacity building and financial support for civil society participation where appropriate
 - Clearly defined roles and responsibilities
 - Specific objectives, targets and timelines
 - Consistent participation by a core group of actors throughout the process
 - Enhanced high levels of public awareness developed through media education
 - Specific agreed actions to be initiated right away in order to build confidence

Closing Plenary

John Hudson, DFID, said that the ENA FLEG process is moving from political declaration to practical action, and encouraged taking action without awaiting perfect analysis. He suggested keeping plans simple, understandable and achievable, with problems and benefits explained in terms that people understand and take interest in, such as jobs, production and government revenue. He suggested that FLEG should be integrated into nfps and other relevant policy frameworks.

Chen Xiaoqian, Forestry Policy Consultant, the Nature Conservancy China Program, said the workshop had been important for facilitating national action plan development.

She identified as next steps: increasing stakeholder awareness, clarifying roles of ministries, and speeding up the pace for developing NAPs.

Tamer Otrakcier, Head of Department for Strategic Planning, Turkish General Directorate of Forestry, remarked that the ENA-FLEG process represents the first time matters of forest governance are addressed at the ministerial level. Given the broad number of topics to be addressed within the forests sector, consistency and coordination are important along with partnership and participation.

Heikki Hammunen, Finnish Forest Industries Federation, emphasized the importance of sustainable and legal wood to industry and expressed the expectation that the ENA FLEG process will continue to provide channels for stakeholder participation and not punish legal operators, but rather motivate the whole sector to be legal.

In the closing discussion, a participant raised some concern over remaining uncertainty on how to develop NAPs and the high rate of turnover in participants from one meeting to the next. Another suggested that an information-sharing platform for ENA-FLEG should be established.

Gerhard Dieterle, World Bank, underscored the importance of keeping momentum within the process and said implementation on the ground is not easy. He said the World Bank is committed to working with countries at the policy dialogue level and in field operations.

In offering final closing remarks, Ahmet Ulukanligil, Deputy Director General, General Directorate of Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Turkey, said the Workshop had provided a good forum for information exchange and for contact between countries and funding agencies. He said that the workshop will produce real results in the field and thanked all those who had a role in the Workshop for their contribution to making it a success.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

Time	Item	Speaker
May 16, Tuesday		
0800-0900	Registration	
0900-0910	Opening and introduction by Mr. Gerhard Dieterle, Forests Advisor, World Bank, co-chair of ENA-FLEG International Steering Committee	
0910-0930	Welcoming address by H.E. Osman Pepe, Minister of Environment and Forestry of Turkey	
0930-0940	Greetings from senior officials of the Government of Turkey and the World Bank	
0940-1010	Overview of FLEG process in the ENA Region – by Messrs. Gerhard Dieterle and Ahmet Ulukanligil, ENA-FLEG International Steering Committee	
1010-1040	Press Conference / Coffee Break	
Session I: Lessons learned		
1040-1210	<p><u>1. Promoting legality through appropriate institutional arrangements, laws and regulations</u> (up to 10 minutes each presenter, followed by Q&A discussion). <i>Introduced and moderated by Andrey Kushlin (World Bank):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal separation of regulatory and management functions. Interagency cooperation in development of National Action Plans. • Streamlining and improving transparency of commercial timber sales • Simplification and improving transparency of the rural communities' rights of access to forest resources • Strengthening capacity for criminal prosecution and anti-money laundering measures 	<p>Ms. Elena Churilova (Russia)</p> <p>Mr. Arvids Ozols (Latvia)</p> <p>Mr. Nehat Çollaku (Albania)</p> <p>Mr. Theodore Greenberg (World Bank)</p>
1210-1310	<p><u>2. Monitoring forest resources and their use, and improving accessibility of information to the public</u> (up to 10 minutes each presenter, followed by Q&A discussion). <i>Introduced and moderated by Lars Laestadius (World Resources Institute):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint government-civil society monitoring of forest utilization at subnational level • IT-based systems for authorization and monitoring of forest practices and follow-up with landowners 	<p>Messrs. Vasily Gorobeyko, Denis Smirnov (Russia)</p> <p>Mr. Patrik Olsson (Sweden)</p>
1310-1430	<i>Lunch Break</i>	

Time	Item	Speaker
1430-1540	<p><u>3. Engaging stakeholders through open and participatory processes to promote transparency, reduce corruption, facilitate equity and minimize undue influence of privileged</u> (up to 10 minutes each presenter, followed by Q&A discussion). <i>Introduced and moderated by Carole Saint-Laurent (IUCN):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder engagement – lessons learned from Fisheries Management in the Baltic Sea Region. Turning declarations into action through tripartite dialogue in other FLEG regions 	<p>Ms. Karin Wessman (Sweden) Mr. Victor Teplyakov (Russia)</p>
1545-1615	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
1615-1745	<p><u>4. Ensuring that demand-side measures support action by the producer countries and promote trade in legally harvested timber</u> (up to 10 minutes each presenter, followed by Q&A discussion). <i>Introduced and moderated by John Hudson (UK DFID):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable wood procurement requirements of development banks and covenants to borrowers: EBRD case Verification of wood origin in producer countries Assessing suppliers to meet demand for verification of legality and responsible management 	<p>Mr. Mikko Venermo (EBRD) Ms. Helena Jantunen (Stora Enso) Mr. Andy Roby (UK Timber Trade Fed.)</p>
1745-1800	Results of the Day. Updates on 2 nd day program, including confirmation of subregional groups' composition.	Co-chairs; workshop secretariat
1900-2100	Welcoming reception in the garden (Cocktail Prolonge), hosted by the Turkish Government	

May 17, Wednesday		
	Session II: Formulation of Action Plans	
0900-0920	Design of Action Plans – Typical Contexts and Responses	Mr. Tapani Oksanen (World Bank)
0920-0940	Guidelines for Defining Scope and Strategies for Action Plans, followed by brief Q&A	Mr. Esa Puustjärvi (Consultant)
0940-1040	Stakeholders conduct country and subregional-level analysis (by country and subregional group)	
1040-1110	<i>Coffee break</i>	
1110-1210	Stakeholder analysis by country and subregional group (continued); summary of country cases	Group Facilitators
1210-1300	Summary of results from all groups (plenary session) (up to 10 minutes each group, followed by Q&A discussion).	Group Rapporteurs

Time	Item	Speaker
1300-1415	<i>Lunch break</i>	
1415-1445	Guidelines for Identifying Specific Activities in Action Plans, followed by brief Q&A	Mr. Esa Puustjärvi (Consultant)
1445-1600	Stakeholder analysis by country and subregional group; summary of country cases	Group Facilitators
1600-1630	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
1630-1715	Summary of results from all groups (plenary session) (up to 10 minutes each group, followed by Q&A discussion).	Group Rapporteurs
1715-1730	Results of the Day. Updates on 3 rd day program, including confirmation of excursion details.	Co-chairs; workshop secretariat
1800-2030	<i>Meeting of the ENA-FLEG International Steering Committee</i>	<i>ISC Members only</i>
2100-2300	Turkish Delight Night (entertainment program)	

May 18, Thursday		
Session III – Collaboration		
0900-0915	Resource Mobilization	Mr. Esa Puustjärvi (Consultant)
0915-1000	Stakeholders conduct country analysis, parallel sessions for individual countries and/or subregions as necessary	Assisted by Group Facilitators
1000-1015	Summary of results from all groups (plenary session)	Group Rapporteurs
1015-1100	Outlook for financing and technical support from international partners	World Bank, EU, MCPFE, FAO, bilateral agencies
1100-1200	Contact Forum for Country Representatives and Donors & <i>Coffee</i>	
1200-1215	Closing Remarks	ISC & Turkish Govt
1215-1330	<i>Lunch</i>	
1330-1930	Field trip to Kursunlu Waterfall, Aspendos Antic Theatre, Coprulu Canyon (observe forestry activities)	

48. Mr. PARFENIUK, Viktor	<i>ENA FLEG Focal Point,</i> Head of Forestry Protection Department, State Committee of Forestry of Ukraine	Address: Shota Rustaveli St., 9-a, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine Tel: +38044 230 9271 Fax: +38044 235 8547 E mail: vyv@mlg.kiev.ua
UK		
49. Mr. HUDSON, John	<i>ENA FLEG Focal Point,</i> Senior Forestry Adviser, Department for International Development	Address: 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5 HE Tel: +44 (0) 20 7023 0683 Fax: +44 (0) 20 7023 0719 E mail: j-hudson@dfid.gov.uk
USA		
50. Mr. SORENSON, Robert A.	<i>Alternate USA ENA FLEG Focal Point,</i> Deputy Director , Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs U.S. Department of State	Address: U.S.Dept.Of State, Washington, DC 20520 Tel: +1 202 647 4268 Fax: +1 202-736 7351 E mail: SorensonRA@state.gov
UZBEKISTAN		
51. Ms. VILDANOVA, Gulusa	<i>ENA FLEG Focal Point,</i> Chief Expert on Monitoring of International Projects, Main Forestry Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources of the Republic of Uzbekistan	Address: Tashkent 700113, Katartal str, 21 Tel: + 998 71 173 29 91 Fax: + 998 71 173 37 68 E mail: gvild@sarkor.uz , gvildanova@yahoo.com
EUROPEAN COMMISSION		
52. Mr. BAZILL, John	<i>Officer,</i> International Forest Policy European Commission Environment Directorate General	Address: BU9 04/68, Unit E2, DG Environment, European Commission, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium Tel: +32 2 296 5582 Fax: +32 2 296 9558 E mail: john.bazill@cec.eu.int

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

53. Ms. BUSZKO BRIGGS, Malgorzata	<i>Expert ,</i> MCPFE – Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe	Address: Warsaw, 00 793. ul. Bitwy Warszawskiej 3, Poland Tel: + 48 22 331 70 31 Fax: + 48 22 331 70 32 E mail: m.buszko-briggs@lu-warsaw.pl
54. Ms. LOPEZ, Jeanne Catalina Santamaria Lopez	<i>Forest Policy Advisor,</i> UNFF Secretariat United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF) Secretariat	Address: 1UN Plaza DC 1 12 th Floor, Room1246; NY, NY 10017 Tel: +212-963-4703 Fax: +917-367-3186 E mail: santamaria@un.org
55. Ms. MUELLER, Eva Ursula	<i>Chief,</i> Forestry Policy and Institutions Service, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	Address: Viale delle Terme di Caracalle, 00100 Rome, Italy Tel: +39 06 570 54628 Fax: +39 06 570 55514 E mail: eva.muller@fao.org
56. Ms. WESSMAN, Karin	<i>Forest Project Coordinator,</i> WWF International	Address: c/o WWF Sweden, Ulriksdals slott, 17081 Stockholm, Sweden Tel: +46 708 687328 mob +46 (0)708 687328 Fax: +46 8851329 E mail: karin.wessman@wwf.se

NGO

57. AYANOGLU, Sedat	<i>Chairman Of The Forest Law Department Of The Faculty Of Forest, Istanbul University</i> University of İstanbul	Address: İstanbul Üniversitesi Orman Fakültesi ,Bahçeköy-istanbul/ TURKEY ,34473 Tel.: +90212 226 18 23 Fax: +90212 226 11 13 , +90 212 226 18 23 E mail: ayano52@istanbul.edu.tr
58. Mr. BUCKRELL, Jonathan	<i>Forest Policy Coordinator,</i> Global Witness	Address: PO Box 6042 London N19 5WP Tel.: +44 0 207 561 6367 Fax: +44 0 207 272 9425 E mail: jbuckrell@globalwitness.org
59. Mr. BADARCH, Mendbayaryn	<i>Director,</i> Mongolian Nature Environment Conservative	Address: Ulaanba tav Tel.: 976 11 35 4272 Fax: 976 11 35 4276 E mail: MNEC@MAGICNET.MN
60. Mr. ELVAN, O. Devrim	Research Assistant	Address: İstanbul Universities Fax: 0 212 226 11 13 E mail: elvan40@istanbul.edu.tr
61. Mr. DOMULADJANOV Ibragimjon Hadjimuhamedovich	<i>President of association</i> “For ecologically clean Fergana” association	Address: Ferganskaya street, 86, Fergana city, 712022, Uzbekistan Republic Tel.: (99873) 222-29-17 Fax: (99873) 222-29-17 E mail: ekofergana@vodiy.uz
62. Mr. HUMBATOV, Zaur Israfil	<i>Head of department Botany and plant physiology ,</i> Azerbaijan Agricultural Academy	Address: Ata-Turk av.262 Ganca Azerbaijan 2000 Tel.: +994 (22) 56 44 20 Fax: +994 (22) 56 03 53 E mail: zaurgumbatov@yandex.ru
63. Mr. JOLDOSHOV, Yakub	<i>Prezident,</i> NGO “Tashtar - Ata”	Address: 715336, Nookat region , house 5, Jumabay st., apartment 3, c. Nookat, Osh district Kyrgyz Republic Tel.: (+996 3230) 2-61-29 Fax: (+996 3230) 2-62-27 E mail: yakubz@yandex.ru
64. Mr. KARPACHEVSKY, Mikhail	<i>Forest Program Coordinator,</i> International Social Ecological Union	Address: Ul. Vavilova 41, apt. 2 Moscow 117312, Russia Tel.: +7 495 963-54-20 Fax: +7 495 963-54-20 E mail: picea@online.ru , forest@biodiversity.ru
65. Mr. KROMIDHA, Genti	<i>Forestry Expert,</i> Institute for Nature Conservation of Albania	Address: Ruga “Sitki Cici”, P 12/1, Tirana, ALBANIA Tel.: + 355 682071979 Fax: + 355 4270624 E mail: GKROMIDHA@YAHOO.IT
66. Mr. LALETIN, Andrey	<i>Chairman,</i> NGO “Friends of the Siberian Forests”	Address: Academgorodok 28-9, Krasnoyarsk, 660036, Russia Tel.: 7-3912-498404 Fax: 7-3912-498404 E mail: laletin@online.ru
67. Mr. LESNIEWSKI, Jules Hannah	<i>ENA-FLEG Working Group Coordinator</i> Taiga Rescue Network	Address: 86 Lauriston Road, Hackney, London E9 7HA Tel: 044 208 525 1534 Fax: E mail: feja@brenweb.org

68. Mr. LYSTOPAD, Oleg	<i>Adviser,</i> Kyiv Ecological and Cultural Center	Address: Erkindik 27, 9, Bishkek 720040, Kyrgyzstan Tel.: 380 (44) 250-6701 Fax: 380 (44) 443-5262 E mail: lyst@ibc.com.ua
69. Mr. OKAZAKI, Tokiharu	<i>Executive Director,</i> Friends of the Earth Japan	Address: 2-75-8, Kotake-cho, Nerima-ku, Tokyo, 176-0004, JAPAN Tel.: 81-3-3955-2617 Fax: 81-3-3955-2617 E mail: okazaki@foejapan.org
70. Mr. SHVIATSOV, Anatoly	<i>Member, National co-ordinator</i>	Address: 220141 Republic of Belarus, Minsk-141, P. O. B. 353 Tel.: +375 17 260 25 73 +375 29 605 31 12 Fax: +375 17 264 24 13 E mail: nr-bull@ns.ecology.ac.by shvetsov88@tut.by
71. Mr. URUSHADZE, Alexander	<i>President,</i> Association "ZELKOVA"	Address: Tbilisi, Georgia Tel.: +(995 32) 37 38 85 Fax: +(995 32) 53 72 37 E mail: a.urushadze@mailcity.com
72. Mr. KALEM, Sedat	<i>Director, Forest Program</i> WWF-Turkey (Dogal Hayati Koruma Vakfi)	Address: B. Postane Cad. Garanti Han. No. 43-45 Kat: 5 Bahçekapı 34420 Sirkeci, Istanbul, Turkey Tel.: +90-212-528 20 30 Fax: +90-212-528 20 40 E mail: skalem@wwf.org.tr
73. Ms. BOGDAN, Irina	<i>Chairperson,</i> Far Eastern Environmental Public Interest Organization "Ecodal"	Address: 680006, Khabarovsk, P.O.Box 95/3 Russia Tel.: +7 4212 43 17 51 Fax: +7 4212 36 97 91 E mail: ecodal@clinic.kht.ru
74. Ms. BOHM, Wiebke Katharina	<i>Campaign Assistant,</i> Pro REGENWALD	Address: Frohschammerstr. 14 D-80807 München Tel.: +49 (89) 359 86 50 Fax: +49 (89) 359 66 22 E mail: wiebke@wald.org
75. Ms. HUSEYNOVA, Farida	<i>Chair,</i> Azerbaijan Greens Movement	Address: Appt.17, 47 Istiglaliyyat str., Baku, Az1001, Azerbaijan Tel.: +(99450) 329 93 91 Fax: E mail: azgrem@mail.ru , azgreensmove@mail.ru
76. Ms. XIANGJUN, Yang	<i>China Country Programme Coordinator</i> Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFIC)	Address: Yunnan, P.R.China Tel.: +86 871 5223098, +86 13888013013 (cell phone) Fax: +86 871 5223098 E mail: yxiangjun@gmail.com
77. Ms. XIAOQIAN, Chen	<i>Forestry Policy Consultant</i> The Nature Conservancy China Program	Address: Dong Xiao Lou, Zhong Shan Park Beijing, 100031, China Tel.: 86-10-66034445ext121 86-13701276022 Fax: 86-10-66034449 E mail: bluetsing@yahoo.com.cn & xqchen@naturechina.org

PRIVATE SECTOR

78. AVCI, Sabri	<i>TORID,</i> Turkish wooden products Industrialist Businessman/ Association	Address: İkitelli keresteciler sitesi.26.sk. İstanbul/Turkey Tel.: +90212 670 47 47 pbx Fax: +90212 670 47 49 E mail: asliorman@asliorman.com
79. BARDAK, İbrahim	<i>Forest Engineer</i> Orma İş.	Address: İstiklal Mah.Atatürk Bulvarı PK.36 32310 ISPARTA,TURKEY Tel.: +90 246 224 10 20 Fax: +90 246 224 10 19 E mail: yongalevha@ttnet.net.tr
80. KÖKSAL, Kaya	<i>Member of Torid</i> Torid	Address: Bagdat cad.No:133/1 Istanbul/TURKEY Tel.: +90 216 348 10 21 Fax: +90 216 348 07 05 E mail: picea@online.ru ,
81. Mr. MERDUKH, Mykhaylo	<i>Private Enterprise “Syvulia”</i>	Address: v.Vilhivka,Roghniativ r-n, Ivano- Frankivsk obl. Tel.: +8 03474 2-11-80 Fax: +8 03474 2-11-80 E mail: ktimina@worldbank.org
82. Mr. ROBY, Andrew John	<i>Head of Environment and CSR,</i> Timber Trade Federation (UK)	Address: Clareville House, 26/27, Oxendon Street, London SW1Y 4EL, UK Tel.: +44.207.389.0124 Fax: +44.20.7839.6594 E mail: ajroby@ttf.co.uk
83. Mr. TARASOV, Mikhail	<i>Environmental Specialist,</i> Metsaliitto	Address: Metsäliitto P.O Box 10, FI 02020 METSÄ Tel.: +358 1046 95051 Fax: +358 1046 95132 Mobile: +358 50 562 1102 E mail: michael.tarasov@metsaliitto.fi
84. Ms. JANTUNEN, Vuokko Helena	<i>Sustainability Manager</i> STORA ENSO OYJ Wood Supply Russia	Address: 37 Naberezhnaja reki Moiki, 191186 St.Petersburg, Russia Tel.: +7 812 702 4343, ext. 633, Fax: +7 812 702 4466 E mail: Helena.Jantunen@storaenso.com
85. Mr. OBERNDORF, Robert Burton	Asia-Pacific Focal Point, Verifor Project Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and Pacific (RECOFTC)	Address: P.O. Box 1111, Kasetsart UniversityPahonyothin Rd. Bangkok 10903 Thailand Tel.: +66-2-940-5700 ext. 3241 Fax: +66-2-561-4880 E mail: orobert@ku.ac.th

WORLD BANK

86. Mr. DEWEESS, Peter A.	<i>Lead Environment Specialist</i> Europe and Central Asia Region World Bank	Address: P.O. Box 12629, 0028 Hatfield, South Africa Tel.: +27-12-460-9716 Fax: +27-12-460-8774 E mail: pdeweess@worldbank.org
87. Mr. DIETERLE, Gerhard	<i>ENA FLEG Focal Point, Forest Adviser</i> Agriculture and Rural Development World Bank	Address: 1818 H Street, NW Washington, DC 20433, USA Tel.: +1 202 458 7334 Fax: +1 202 522 3308 E mail: gdieterle@worldbank.org
88. Mr. GREENBERG, Theodore Stewart	<i>Senior Financial Sector Specialist,</i> World Bank	Address: 1818 H.Street NW, Washington,DC 20433 Tel: + 1-202-458-5108 Fax: + 1-202-522-2433 e-mail: Tgreenberg@worldbank.org
89. Mr. KUSHLIN, Andrey	<i>Alternate ENA FLEG Focal Point, Senior Forestry Specialist ,</i> World Bank	Address: 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington DC, 20433, U.S.A. Tel.: (+1-202) 458-7268 Fax: (+1-202) 614-0005 E mail: akushlin@worldbank.org
90. Mr. OKSANEN, Tapani	<i>Senior Forestry Specialist, Senior Forestry Specialist/ FLEG Task Team Leader</i> World Bank	Address: 1818 H Street, NW, Washington DC 20433, USA Tel.: +1 202 473 1497 Fax: +1 202 522 1142 E mail: toksanen@worldbank.org
91. Ms. IVERS, Laura	<i>Communications Officer,</i> Program on Forests (PROFOR) Agriculture and Rural Development World Bank	Address: 1818 H St. Nw Tel.: +1-202-473-2396 Fax: +1-202-522-1142 E mail: laivers@worldbank.org
92. Ms. SMETANINA, Marina	<i>Russia Forest Policy Dialogue coordinator Consultant,</i> Europe and Central Asia Region World Bank	Address: Bolshaya Molchanovka 36/1 Moscow, 121069, Russia Tel.: (+7-495) 745-7000 ext 2096 Fax: (+7-495) 745-7002 E mail: msmetanina@worldbank.org

INVITED PRESENTERS/SPEAKERS/FACILITATORS/ MODERATORS

93. Mr. BAKSIC, Alija	<i>Director,</i> Employers Association of B&H Non-Government	Address: Ulica Zmaja od Bosne 4/IX 71000 Sarajevo Tel.: +387 0 33 552 470, 387 0 264 830 Fax: +387 0 33 552 461, 387 0 33 264 831 E mail: apbih@bih.net.ba
94. Mr. DOGRU, Muzaffer	<i>Team Leader</i> Forest Engineer, Forestry Planning and Projects Specialist FINNTYR Consulting and Foreign Trade Ltd. Company	Address: FINNTYR Ltd., Farabi Sokak No. 17/6, Ankara-TURKEY Tel.: + 90 312 428 26 72 Fax: + 90 312 428 26 75 E mail: muzaffer.dogru@finntyr.com
95. Mr. HAMMUNEN, Heikki Marcus	<i>Counsellor,</i> Finnish Forest Industries Federation	Address: P.O.Box 336 (Snellmaninkatu 13), 00171, Helsinki Tel.: +358 9 132 6652, +358 40 771 6652 Fax: +358 9 132 4448 E mail: heikki.hamunen@forestindustries.fi
96. Mr. LAESTADIUS, Lars	<i>Senior Associate</i> Biological Resources Program World Resources Institute	Address: 10 G. Street N.E. Washington, DC 20002, USA Tel.: +1 202 720 7633 Fax: +1 202 729 7610 E mail: larsl@wri.org
97. Mr. OLSSON, Drang Sven Gunnar Patrik	<i>GIS-Administrator,</i> Sweedish Forest Agency	Address: Box 343, 503 11 BORAS Tel.: +46-33-17 78 57 Fax: +46-33-17 73 89 E mail: Patrik.olsson@skogsstyrelsen.se
98. Mr. TEPLYAKOV, Victor	<i>Coordinator,</i> TBF Programme IUCN	Address: 3, Bld.3, Stoliarny Pereulok, Moscow 123022, Russia Tel.: +7 (495) 6093399 Fax: +7 (495) 6093411 E mail: Victor.Teplyakov@iucn.org
99. -Mr. VENERMO, Mikko	<i>Principal Environmental Advisor,</i> <i>Environment Department</i> The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	Address: One Exchange Square, London EC2 2JN, UK Tel.: +44 207 338 6074 Fax: +44 207 338 6848 E mail: venermom@ebrd.com
100. Mr.SMIRNOV, Denis	<i>Head of Forest Program,</i> <i>WWF Russia, Far Eastern Branch</i>	Address: 18a, Verhneportovaya st., 690003 Vladivostok, Russia Tel.: +7 4232 414868 Fax: +7 4232 414863 E mail: dsmirnov@wwfrfe.ru
101. Ms. KULIKOVA, Elena	<i>Forest Program Director,</i> WWF Russia	Address: 1 Palace Street, London SW1E 5 HE Tel.: (7 495) 727 09 39 Fax: (7 495) 727 09 38 E mail: ekulikova@wwf.ru
102. Ms. PUUSTJARVI, Esa Kalevi	<i>Consultant,</i> SAVCOR	Address: Savcor Indufor Ltd, Toolonkatu 11 A, FI-00 Helsinki, Finland Tel.: +358-40-900 1691 Fax: +358-9-135 2552 E mail: esa.puustjarvi@savcor.com

103. Ms. SAINT LAURENT,
Carole

*Coordinator,
Senior Forest Policy Adviser.*
Global Partnership on Forest Landscape
Restoration,
Senior Forest Policy Advisor,
IUCN

Address:
70 Mayfield Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M6S 1K6
Tel: + 1 416 763 3437
E mail: CarSaintL@bellnet.ca

SECRETARIAT

104. Mr. MEMİŞ, Talat

*Division Director of the improving
Silvicultural application*
General Directorate of Forestry,
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Address:
General Directorate of Forestry, Head of
Department for Silviculture.
Gazi, Ankara, TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 29640 00
Fax: +90 312 296 42 78
Email: talatmemis@ogm.gov.tr

105. Ms. KAMACI, Ayten

Chemical Engineer
General Directorate of Forestry,
Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Address:
General Directorate of Forestry, Head of
Department f for Training.
Gazi, Ankara, TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 29640 00/3765
Fax: +90 312 296 41 36
Email: aytenk@ogm.gov.tr

106. Ms. NEMOVA, Vladislava

Team Assistant,
Europe and Central Asia Region
World Bank

Address:
121096, Bolshaya Molchanovka str., 36/1
Tel: +7-495-745-7000 ext 2230
Fax: +7-495-745-70-02
E mail: vnemova@worldbank.org

INTERPRETERS

107. Mr. GUSAKOV,
Konstantin

108. Ms. MARKOVA, Olga
Leonidovna

109. Ms. SOYKAN, Feziha

110. Ms. KORAY, Narin

111. Ms. AKKUŞ, Pınar