

Working together effectively

This briefing is part of a series produced to inform European Union and Member State officials, both within the EU and in Delegations and Embassies outside the EU, about FLEGT and REDD+ and the linkages between them.

FLEGT is a European Union initiative to assist developing countries in preventing illegal logging and benefiting from timber markets (see Briefing Note 1). REDD+ is an international mechanism framed by the international negotiations on climate change to provide incentives for developing countries that protect and restore their forest carbon stocks (see Briefing Note 2). The synergies and interactions between the two initiatives are discussed in this Briefing Note.

1. BACKGROUND

FLEGT can support successful REDD+ implementation by promoting improved forest governance and law enforcement, addressing some of the drivers of forest degradation and establishing strong and effective multistakeholder processes, thereby creating enabling conditions for scaled-up investments and providing a transparent and inclusive national process for policy-making in the land use sector. REDD+ can support FLEGT through increased momentum to support change in the forest sector, access to finance and significantly increased political attention.

In many tropical countries there is active engagement with both FLEGT and REDD+ (see Annex 1 for a country by country summary). There are clear overlaps between the two, presenting both opportunities and challenges for those involved:

- There is an opportunity for both country governments and donors to **build on the synergies** between the two actions and make better progress on delivering the objectives of both.
- There is a risk that **lack of co-ordination** results in confusing messages, competition between the initiatives repetition of work, inefficient use of funds and less effective delivery on the objectives of either action.

In response to requests for guidance from European Commission (EC) and Member State (MS) officials on how to better understand this, an *ad hoc* working group was convened by DG Development comprising officials from the EC and development and environment officials of several Member States and Norway¹. This Briefing aims to summarise the ways in which officials can help to ensure that FLEGT and

REDD+ are mutually supportive with each initiative increasing the effectiveness of the other, as well as highlighting the risks posed by poor communication and interaction.

Section 2 provides practical suggestions for improving the co-ordination and collaboration between FLEGT and REDD+. Section 3 provides more detail on the overlaps and synergies between FLEGT and REDD+ in terms of both outcome and process which are likely to be relevant. Section 4 provides further information and contact details.

2. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS FOR EU AND MS OFFICIALS

In practice there are four main areas which EU and MS officials should consider taking action:

- Knowing the actors involved in both FLEGT and REDD+ through an institutional analysis of the different players involved as often different government agencies are;
- Knowing which initiatives are active and understanding the underlying motivations to engage or not engage with FLEGT and REDD+;
- Understanding the processes being followed by each initiative;
- Understanding the outcomes and building collaboration.

This can then provide a strong basis for actively promoting synergies and minimising competition between the two initiatives.

¹ The *ad hoc* working group comprised: officials from DG Development, DG Environment and DG Climate; development officials of several Member States including France, Germany, Finland, UK, NL, Belgium, Italy and the Czech Republic; and officials from Norway.



2.1. KNOW THE ACTORS INVOLVED

The first step in ensuring maximum synergies between FLEGT and REDD+ is to ensure that there is good communication between all those involved. This includes a wide range of groups including government departments, donors and multilaterals, NGOs, communities and the private sector.

Discussions with a wide range of officials indicates that there have been cases where conflicts between different groups have arisen simply as a result of poor communication and that things improved quickly when communication was improved. Of course this is not always the case since issues can be the result of actual disagreement or conflict between different stakeholder groups. In the latter case it is important to understand what those differences are and how they are likely to affect progress. It is important to:

- Ensure good communication between EC and MS officials involved in REDD+ and FLEGT - know who they are and maintain regular communication. It may take some work to understand who is doing what initially, but it is important to contact colleagues in other delegations and embassies to understand who is involved. In some countries there are now regular meetings to provide a space for updates and discussion;

EXAMPLE: To inform the discussions of the ad hoc working group, the EC asked various officials in delegations to provide information on what was happening nationally. Simply collecting this information from other EC and MS colleagues locally was sufficient to trigger discussions which led to better working relationships between officials.

- Ensure that FLEGT and REDD+ national programmes promote good communication between different stakeholder groups in the country and particularly between groups involved with REDD+ and groups involved with FLEGT.

EXAMPLE: There has been concern in some countries that one set of donors is providing funding to one Ministry for FLEGT while another set are providing funding to another Ministry for REDD+ creating or exacerbating rivalries between the two Ministries.

2.2. KNOW WHICH INITIATIVES ARE ACTIVE AND THE MOTIVATIONS FOR ENGAGEMENT

FLEGT VPA formal negotiations are always led by the EC so it should be relatively straightforward to understand and monitor progress (further information on contacts can be found in Section 4). However, there are a number of different REDD+ initiatives (see Box 1) led by different institutions. This is likely to remain the case at least until a global agreement is reached under the UNFCCC and probably beyond. Therefore, it is important to clarify which of the initiatives are active in each country in order to understand what process they follow and what actors are involved.

Annex 1 provides a summary of different initiatives in different countries to act as a starting point. The websites of each initiative provide further information on national-level activities which provides an easily accessible source of further information (see Section 4).

Understanding the motivations of different stakeholder groups in engaging or not engaging with different initiatives is more complex.

In some cases, it is simply a result of which groups are involved in agreeing and managing an initiative. For example, it is often different Ministries which are responsible for FLEGT and REDD+, and each Ministry may have groups of external stakeholders with whom they routinely consult. There have already been several examples where tensions arose between groups working with FLEGT and REDD+, but these tensions were resolved and synergies developed once better communication between different groups was actively pursued.

But it is also important to be aware that not everyone will be looking for synergies. Some stakeholder groups are likely to see one initiative as preferable for delivering their objectives, or wish to promote it because they have more involvement or control. Understanding these underlying motivations is crucial to being able to find ways in which to minimise any conflict and maximise collaboration.

REDD+ Initiatives

Details on the main REDD+ initiatives at country level are provided in Briefing Note 2. In summary they are:

- The Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), managed by the World Bank, which supports the development of REDD+ plans and will fund some pilot projects (and is financed by several EU Member States and the EC).
- UN-REDD which is a joint programme of UNDP, UNEP and FAO and will support preparation for REDD+ (and is financed by several EU Members States and the EC).
- The Norwegian Government's International Climate and Forest Initiative which supports the two initiatives above but also works directly through bilateral agreements with some countries.
- Bilateral agreements between various EU Member States and national governments.
- The Forest Investment Program, which is about to become active, is a World Bank managed fund which will support REDD+ related activities (and is financed by some EU Member States).

In addition, there are also existing projects in many countries which have been developed within the voluntary carbon market.

A SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES IN EACH COUNTRY IS PROVIDED IN ANNEX 1.

2.3. UNDERSTAND THE PROCESS

In order to build better synergies it is necessary to understand the different processes which are underway for FLEGT and REDD+ and ensure that they are complementary wherever possible. Both FLEGT and the various REDD+ initiatives require a process which takes several months (or more) and goes through phases of planning, stakeholder engagement, consultation, reporting and implementation. Ensuring a basic understanding of these for each initiative active locally should provide a good basis for discussion about synergies.

The *ad hoc* Working Group is now actively collaborating with FCPF and UN-REDD to build a better understanding of the overlaps between the processes for a VPA negotiation, the preparation of

an FCPF REDD+ Preparation Plan and development of a UN-REDD national programme. The results will be summarised in a Briefing Note in 2011.

In the meantime, Section 3 provides more detail on the key parts of the processes where there is scope for co-operation and collaboration (and potentially also for conflict) between initiatives.

2.4. UNDERSTAND THE OUTCOMES AND BUILD COLLABORATION

In order to maximise the synergies between FLEGT and REDD+ it is important that those involved in each process are clear about the outcomes they are trying to achieve – both in the planning phase (eg better stakeholder engagement, greater transparency) and in the implementation phase (eg reduced corruption, better enforcement, reduced forest degradation from illegal logging). Where an existing FLEGT initiative is already seeking to achieve an outcome needed for REDD+ then it is important to consider whether this can be supported and enhanced in any REDD+ programme rather than creating a new process and similarly where a process or activity is underway for REDD+ then efforts should be made to build on this for FLEGT.

Section 3 provides an overview of many of the process and implementation outcomes which FLEGT has the potential to deliver to provide a basis for further discussion at a country level.



3. BUILDING SYNERGIES

This section discusses in more detail the areas of potential synergy between FLEGT and REDD+, as well as areas of potential competing interests, which are relevant for EU and MS officials. They are discussed in five sections:

- **Addressing drivers of forest loss:** fundamental to the success of REDD+ is finding effective ways to reduce forest loss in practice. Many of the drivers are directly or indirectly related to the illegal activities which FLEGT addresses.
- **Addressing challenges of governance and illegality:** both FLEGT and REDD+ have to address the crucial issue of poor governance which not only underlies illegal logging and trade, but also drives both legal and illegal forest loss.
- **Effective processes:** much has already been learnt from FLEGT about effective ways of undertaking national processes relating to forest governance and management. REDD+ processes could benefit from this and in turn contribute new lessons to FLEGT.
- **Mechanisms for MRV:** monitoring, reporting and verification will be major issues for both FLEGT and REDD+ with considerable potential synergies.

FLEGT is establishing monitoring systems to ensure legal compliance, independent third party checks and will establish governance monitoring in some cases.

- **Harmonised aid delivery:** relatively large amounts of development finance are planned to flow into REDD+ programmes. Some development finance is already being targeted at actions to improve forest governance. There is strong commitment and much relevant experience to harmonise and coordinate aid delivery.

3.1. ADDRESSING DIRECT DRIVERS OF FOREST LOSS

The objective of REDD+ is to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and conserve existing forest. To do so, it needs to address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. FLEGT can be a tool to help achieve this. The table below maps the various types of driver which REDD+ programmes will need to address and identifies those which are addressed, fully or partly, by FLEGT.

Most of the drivers operate to some extent in all REDD+ countries, though the relative importance of different drivers varies widely. Therefore, the importance of FLEGT activities for REDD+ in a particular country will depend on the relative importance of the drivers

Direct drivers which will need to be addressed for REDD+	Extent to which driver is addressed by FLEGT		
	Full	Part	Comment
Commercial logging	✓		Addresses degradation which occurs when commercial activities don't fully implement legal requirements such as those requiring low-impact harvesting. These exist in most REDD+ countries but are not fully enforced
Illegal logging	✓		Addresses deforestation and degradation from illegal logging which is a major driver of forest degradation and loss in many REDD+ countries
Energy (fuelwood, charcoal etc.)		✓	May have some impact on illegal collection of wood through better governance and enforcement.
Clearance for legal commodity agriculture			Not directly
Clearance for legal subsistence agriculture			Not directly
Illegal clearance for agriculture		✓	May address to some extent as governance is addressed and income from illegally harvested timber (which is often used to cover the costs of clearance) is reduced. Depending on stakeholder interest could seek clarity in legal requirements for land clearance and prevent sale of timber from illegal land clearance
Land speculation (clearance to secure title)		(✓)	May impact indirectly if illegally harvested timber is harder to sell and so clearance costs harder to cover
Infrastructure and mining		(✓)	May impact on illegal or informal mining activities if there is a general improvement in governance and if sale of timber arising from illegal activity is prevented
Fire		(✓)	May reduce incidence of illegal or accidental fire if there is a general improvement in governance

which FLEGT can help address in the national context. However, it is likely that in almost all countries which are involved in FLEGT that there are issues which need to be addressed for REDD+ to be successful and which the FLEGT programme is already seeking to address. In addition, many of the policies and measures required for sectors where FLEGT does not act directly may be very similar to those required for FLEGT.

3.2. ADDRESSING CHALLENGES OF GOVERNANCE

In addition to the direct drivers discussed above, REDD+ programmes will need to address a wide range of underlying factors, many of which result from poor governance. Governance issues which REDD+ will need to address cover a broad range from corruption and poor governance within government through inadequate enforcement to issues such as stakeholder engagement, transparency and allocation of resources. These are all issues which FLEGT has had to address in the development of Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs). Therefore again the successful delivery of FLEGT objectives provides direct support to the achievement of REDD+ objectives.

- **Discussing governance issues:** Discussions about governance, particularly if they touch upon areas such as corruption or poor practice, can be extremely sensitive and political. VPA negotiations have proved a relatively effective arena for

discussing these challenging issues. Almost all countries developing REDD+ strategies and plans will need to improve governance and for many it will not be easy. Therefore making use of FLEGT as a mechanism which already has something of a track record in several countries in Africa and Asia, either directly or by providing opportunities for south-south information sharing and learning, may be very useful.

Where FLEGT VPA discussions are already underway in a country, they should be supported and can be used to deliver REDD+ governance objectives. Where there is no VPA discussion consideration should be given to whether it could be a useful tool to support improvements in forest governance and reduce deforestation and thus support delivery of REDD+.

EXAMPLE: Guyana has been one of the global leaders in looking at ways to use REDD+ to protect its forests without compromising economic development. As part of this process, the country has agreed on payments for reduced deforestation with the government of Norway.

As part of the agreement between Guyana and Norway, the government of Guyana agreed to approach the EU to begin discussions about a VPA as a mechanism which would contribute to improved forest governance.

- **From centralised to local:** REDD+ planning is undertaken nationally but implementation will have to be undertaken locally throughout the country. The legality assurance systems required for timber licensing under VPAs are similarly developed centrally but then have to be implemented at the local level and many of the issues and challenges this has raised will be relevant to REDD+ as well.
- **Allocation of resources:** One of the most challenging issues in REDD+ is likely to be the allocation of resources. This includes both the allocation of existing resources such as tenure and use rights, and the allocation of any income generated by REDD+ which is likely to be paid to government that then decides how it is distributed. Some of these issues have also been addressed through FLEGT since it is necessary both to clarify tenure and use rights, and to consider allocation of resources to different actors including illegal loggers and local

Improving forest governance is a key part of Voluntary Partnership Agreements. As REDD+ will also need to address poor governance, successful delivery of FLEGT objectives provides direct support to the achievement of REDD+ objectives.



communities encroaching illegally in forests. Much of this is very relevant for REDD+.

- **Governance of the process:** one of the biggest challenges for REDD+ in many countries is likely to be agreeing appropriate mechanisms to oversee the development and implementation of REDD+ programmes, including crucial aspects such as stakeholder engagement, provision of information and distribution of funds. FLEGT VPAs include the formation of a Joint Implementation Committee (JIC) comprised of representatives from Partner Countries and the EC and generally including both government and civil society, to oversee the implementation of FLEGT VPAs. This may be a useful model for REDD+ processes in some countries.

3.3. EFFECTIVE PROCESSES

There is already considerable experience from FLEGT processes which may be able to contribute to successful development of REDD+, while emerging experience from REDD+ can also contribute to FLEGT processes. Some key areas where lessons from FLEGT may be useful for REDD+ are summarised below.

- **Consultation and multi-stakeholder processes:** FLEGT VPA negotiations require consultation with all major stakeholders and have proved an effective framework for a consultation process which is predictable and accessible and where the way in which comments are utilised is reasonably transparent and understood. This has encouraged the development and use of ongoing multi-stakeholder dialogues in producer countries which have proved a very effective way of engaging a wide range of stakeholder groups and building their understanding and ability to have a meaningful role in planning and delivering better governance and legality in the forest sector.

Developing REDD+ national programmes also requires input from a wide range of stakeholders. Where FLEGT VPA dialogues already exist, they can potentially provide ready-made basis for developing consultation platforms for REDD+ programmes. Similarly, where REDD+ platforms exist, and FLEGT comes afterwards, these REDD groups may provide

important and influential groups with which to work.

Conversely, if FLEGT VPA or REDD+ dialogues already exist but are not given a role in the new mechanism, the existing process may be undermined wasting investment in building trust and capacity. It can also provoke a very negative response from stakeholders that feel undermined, creating opposition to the newer initiative which then has to be addressed.

EXAMPLE: Ghana was the first country to agree a Voluntary Partnership Agreement with the EU. As part of the process of negotiating and implementing the agreement, a stakeholder dialogue was initiated which gave a wide range of actors including industry and civil society groups access to the discussions and influence over decisions. There was wide support for this both within and outside government.

When the development of a national plan for REDD+ began the initial consultation was limited and the stakeholder group that had formed through the FLEGT VPA negotiation was not utilised. This was widely criticised by industry and civil society in Ghana who felt that a lot of work to build effective working relationships was being undermined and policy commitments agreed between stakeholders and government were no longer the focus of attention and thus 'lost'. Subsequent involvement of the group members greatly improved the REDD+ consultation process.

In DRC, the REDD platforms may help identify subset of stakeholders and identify governance challenges to move forward quickly with FLEGT dialogue.

- **Reaching different stakeholder groups:** FLEGT and REDD+ can differ in their effectiveness in reaching different stakeholder groups. FLEGT VPAs are trade agreements and the consultation process has tended to be very effective in engaging the private sector. REDD+ processes could build on this. Conversely, REDD+ is receiving a lot of attention from representatives of local communities and Indigenous Peoples which could be very useful for FLEGT. At a government level FLEGT and REDD+ often involve different Ministries or different groups within Ministries.
- **Dealing with external pressures on the process:** There has been considerable pressure on REDD+ programmes to move quickly. There has similarly

Both FLEGT VPA negotiations and the development of REDD+ national programmes require input from a wide range of stakeholders.



been strong pressure on the FLEGT VPA negotiation processes to demonstrate results quickly. Experience from FLEGT VPA processes has shown that this urgency and a defined timeframe for negotiations does help maintain momentum and lend purpose to dialogue. Nonetheless despite this urgency, the need for genuine involvement of a range of stakeholders will slow the tempo of the process. For FLEGT, what has been helpful is framing stakeholder input throughout the negotiations, thus creating an iterative process with repeated opportunities for stakeholder input and engagement. This allows for immediate progress while not alienating important stakeholder groups. This may be a useful approach in managing the similar pressures for REDD+.

- Negotiation to implementation:** The shift from negotiation to implementation can also be challenging in a different way. The negotiation process generates a significant amount of political attention, which in turn creates the pressure noted above. Once an agreement is reached, political attention can decrease sharply with significant implications for the political will to ensure that implementation proceeds quickly. This may also be an issue for REDD+ which is currently the focus of huge political attention, at least some of which is likely to waver once full implementation is underway.

- Bilateral negotiations:** There is considerable experience within FLEGT of bilateral negotiations on forests through the VPA process. These have evolved over several negotiation processes based on learning about who needs to be involved, when they need to engage and how such negotiations can be linked to a multi-stakeholder consultation process. It now seems likely that a significant proportion of the fast start financing pledged for REDD+ will be delivered through bilateral mechanisms. The experience of negotiating VPAs could provide many useful lessons if negotiated bilateral agreements are needed.

3.4. MECHANISMS FOR MRV

An important component of any REDD+ programme will be mechanisms for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV). A major part of this will be MRV related to forest cover and condition, but it will also include the effectiveness of activities (particularly during the early phases of REDD+ implementation) and potentially the distribution of money to different stakeholder groups. The institutional and technical capacity to monitor deforestation and degradation which will be developed for REDD+ could be useful for FLEGT directly if it provides information on illegal activities, but may also have indirect uses in building a greater national capacity and culture of effective monitoring and verification in the forest sector.

FLEGT Legality Assurance Systems (LAS) also include a range of requirements for MRV ranging from on-the-ground monitoring of forest management to ensure laws are met, to independent third-party monitoring of the whole system. These may be useful for REDD+ both directly in providing information which can be used to provide part of REDD+ MRV and indirectly in providing models which REDD+ can also utilise.

- Transparency:** a crucial element of MRV is public availability of key information, but this is also a very sensitive issue for many governments. FLEGT VPAs include detailed requirements about transparency and information which must be publicly available. Much of this information is probably directly relevant to REDD+ and can be used as part of an

MRV programme. Furthermore, this may provide a useful example of an agreement where transparency has been accepted by both sides.

- **Monitoring forest management and condition:** a key component of a FLEGT LAS is a functioning system for regular monitoring of the condition and management of forests. The information collected may be useful in providing some on-the-ground input into monitoring of forest carbon – particularly with respect to forest degradation – for REDD+.
- **Independent monitoring of the system:** FLEGT includes a requirement for third party monitoring of the system. The approach taken is designed to meet the needs of the EU for credible oversight while also maintaining Partner Country sovereignty. Clear requirements have been developed within the FLEGT programme for the type of organisation, the activities required and for the need for consultation and transparency in undertaking the work. However, responsibility for identifying and hiring the third party monitor remains with the Partner Country.
- **Stakeholder oversight:** As discussed above, FLEGT VPAs include the formation of a Joint Implementation Committee. This committee is tasked with overseeing the VPA in general as well as receiving the reports on the third party monitor, monitoring the implementation of any actions required and dealing with complaints.

Addressing all of the drivers of forest degradation and loss within REDD+ programmes will require a wide range of actions and initiatives. In many cases, building the capacity for better governance and control of illegal activities will be a key part of this, particularly during Phase 2 of REDD+ implementation (see briefing note 2).

- Where financial support is already being proposed or provided under a FLEGT VPA or similar agreement, it is important that donors providing support for REDD+ are aware of this and ensure efficient use of resources.
- There is also a serious risk, already occurring in one or two instances, that lack of co-ordination between donors providing FLEGT VPA funding and donors providing REDD+ funding creates internal tensions and unhelpful competition between different departments or individuals in producer country governments.

3.5. HARMONISED AID DELIVERY

Donor co-ordination: Payments for REDD+ in the long term will be based on results achieved but during the initial fast start phase, much of the financing will be for preparation activities and will be paid in the same way as conventional aid financing (see Briefing Note 2). FLEGT VPAs are trade agreements with benefits in the long-term coming from trade in legal timber, but in the short term all VPAs include support for improving governance and implementing a legality assurance system.

Therefore, in the short-term both initiatives are using development funds to support preparation and therefore it is important to ensure good co-ordination between the two.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION AND RESOURCES

The EU FLEGT programme

The FLEGT programme is coordinated by the European Commission with input from the individual Member State governments. Within the Commission DG Environment and DG Development share responsibility for the programme coordination while the European Forest Institute (EFI) provides technical support through the EFI FLEGT Facility.

Further information on FLEGT is available from:

- European Commission: A set of EU briefing notes (BN) on FLEGT is available for reference from: http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/environment/forest/flegt_briefing_notes_en.cfm
- Chatham House runs an illegal logging website which has comprehensive information on everything relating to illegal logging including FLEGT: www.illegal-logging.org

The European Forest Institute has a website on the EU FLEGT Action Plan at www.euflegt.efi.int



REDD+

Within the EC DG CLIMA leads on REDD+ with other DGs such as ENV and DEV also involved.

The European Forest Institute (EFI) has a REDD expert within its existing Forest Governance Facility.

Further Information on REDD+ is available from:

UNFCCC: The UNFCCC has a REDD web platform which provides information and updates on the official process at: http://unfccc.int/methods_science/redd/items/4531.php

All the initiatives have websites which provide information on who is involved, where finance is coming from and recent activities as well as many programme documents.

- REDD+ Partnership: www.reddpluspartnership.org
- UN-REDD: www.un-redd.org
- FCPF: www.forestcarbonpartnership.org
- FIP: www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/node/5
- Norway International Climate and Forests Initiative: www.miljo.no/climate-and-forest-initiative

Databases on REDD activities: A number of databases are being developed to try to ensure that data on what is happening with REDD is easy to find. The REDD+ Partnership is developing a global database which can be accessed from the Partnership website (www.reddpluspartnership.org). A global summary of REDD projects can be found at <http://redd-database.iges.or.jp/redd/>.

Summaries and updates on REDD+: There are lots of organizations providing summaries of REDD and what is happening. A useful platform created by a network of research institutes and aimed at southern civil society is REDD-net: www.redd-net.org.

News sites: A widely used news site covering rainforest issues is Mongabay. It often includes stories about REDD+: <http://rainforests.mongabay.com/redd/>

ANNEX 1: SUMMARY OF THE COUNTRIES WITH FLEGT AND/OR REDD+ INITIATIVES

The table below provides an indication of the countries where there are activities relating to FLEGT and/or REDD+ early action REDD+ initiatives. As these change frequently it is best to check the websites of the individual initiatives for more recent information on a particular country.

	FCPF	FIP	UN-REDD	Govt of Norway	FLEGT VPA
Argentina	✓		Partner		
Bangladesh			Partner		
Bhutan			Partner		
Bolivia	✓		Pilot		Stakeholder interest
Brazil				✓	
Burkina Faso		✓			
Cameroon	✓				VPA
Cambodia	✓		Pilot		interest
Central African Rep	✓		Partner		VPA
Chile	✓				
Colombia	✓		Partner		Interest: governance not VPA
Congo, Dem Rep.	✓		Pilot		Negotiations
Congo, Rep of	✓		Partner		VPA
Costa Rica	✓		Partner		
Cote d'Ivoire					Interest
Ecuador			Partner		Interest
El Salvador	✓				
Equatorial Guinea	✓				Interest
Ethiopia	✓				
Gabon	✓		Partner		Negotiations
Ghana	✓	✓			VPA
Guatemala	✓		Partner		
Guinea					Stakeholder interest
Guyana	✓		Partner	✓	Interest
Honduras	✓				Interest
Indonesia	✓	✓	Pilot	✓	Negotiations
Kenya	✓		Partner		
Laos	✓	✓			Interest forest governance
Liberia	✓				Negotiations
Madagascar	✓				Interest
Malaysia					Negotiations
Mexico	✓		Partner		
Mozambique	✓				
Nepal	✓		Partner		
Nicaragua	✓				Interest forest governance
Nigeria			Partner		
Panama	✓		Pilot		
Papua New Guinea	✓		Pilot		interest
Paraguay	✓		Pilot		
Peru	✓	✓			Stakeholder Interest
Philippines			Pilot		
Sierra Leone					Interest
Solomon Islands			Pilot		Stakeholder Interest
Sri Lanka			Partner		
Sudan			Partner		
Suriname	✓				
Tanzania	✓		Pilot	✓	
Thailand	✓				Interest
Uganda	✓				
Vanuatu	✓				
Vietnam	✓		Pilot		Negotiations
Zambia			Pilot		

This Briefing Note was prepared by Proforest with inputs from EC and Member State officials, the government of Norway and representatives of FCPF and UN-REDD.

Please send any comments to info@proforest.net

proforest
