



Ministry of Economic Affairs



Call for Papers

for an ETFRN News on

Linkages between FLEGT, REDD+ and beyond: Challenges and opportunities for improved forest management

To be published in December 2013

In response to concerns about forest loss and degradation, a number of international policy initiatives have emerged. Key among these are the *EU Action Plan for Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT)* and 'REDD+' initiatives: *Reducing Emissions for Deforestation and Degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks*. Both initiatives, and also others such as forest certification, the Non-legally Binding Instrument on All Types of Forests (NLBI), or National Forest Programme (NFP) processes address the same underlying causes of deforestation and forest degradation. Ideally all these processes, including REDD+ and FLEGT, should be compatible and mutually reinforcing, but practice shows that this is often very challenging. Documenting and analysing existing experiences and lessons about how these initiatives interact will help policy makers, practitioners and knowledge workers to better understand what works well and what doesn't so well.

We are kindly inviting you to submit a short article (*maximum 3,000 words*) to this ETFRN News on your experiences with linkages between FLEGT, REDD+ and beyond. This may be an excellent opportunity to showcase your work and to contribute to the discussion on these linkages.

We would particularly like you to focus on the analysis of **practical examples** of linkages between FLEGT and REDD+ and other supply and demand side approaches at country level to decrease pressure on forests. In addition, experiences with linkages of REDD+ and/or FLEGT with other forest related initiatives, such as forest certification, different (i.e. VPA and non VPA related) aspects of the EC FLEGT Action Plan, or national forest policy review processes, will be included, as well common approaches improving forest governance. Suggested themes are listed in the box below, but authors are by no means required to limit themselves to these questions.

SUBMISSION OF ABSTRACTS

If you are interested to contribute, please contact **before 24 June 2013** Guido Broekhoven (guido.broekhoven@gmail.com) with the topic and a **short outline** (app. 200 words) of your article. Based on the number and nature of the proposed articles, an editorial committee will select the ones that are most suitable for publication in this issue of ETFRN News. We will provide a short instruction and general guidance on the process to authors once you have been selected to write a full article. For more information you can also contact *Guido Broekhoven* at guido.broekhoven@gmail.com

LINKAGES BETWEEN FLEGT, REDD+ AND OTHER INITIATIVES

FLEGT and REDD+ have several features in common. They contribute to improved *forest governance*, in particular by strengthening inclusive and transparent multi-stakeholder processes and by facilitating legal and institutional reforms. FLEGT, through Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) that are signed between the EU and timber exporting countries to address illegal timber trade, links good forest governance with legal trade instruments. Every VPA takes into account country specific circumstances with regard to forest governance, forest-related legislation, forest and land rights, organisation of the timber trade, forest sector initiatives and the capacity to implement agreements. REDD+ is a mechanism in development under UNFCCC which aims at keeping trees standing and links performance based incentives with land-use planning and reforms. Like FLEGT VPAs, forest governance issues, together with country specific circumstances, need to be seriously taken into account to make REDD+ an effective instrument to slow, halt and reverse forest cover and carbon loss.

Both processes aim to improve forest management. However, FLEGT focuses on forest products, whereas REDD+ focuses on forest services. FLEGT uses markets and trade as entry points to achieve its aims and REDD+ uses performance-based payments; its link to markets remains to be agreed. These issues may offer interesting opportunities for sharing lessons and opportunities. Furthermore, FLEGT has generated experiences or conditions that could be relevant for sustainable supply and demand side initiatives for other commodities.

REDD+ focuses on addressing *direct and indirect drivers* of deforestation and forest degradation through mobilising public-private finance on a performance base. It could benefit of the reforms promoted by FLEGT VPAs in tackling illegal logging, one of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. VPAs could benefit from new perspectives REDD+ can bring to the illegal logging debate.

Common challenges of both processes include unclear legal and regulatory frameworks - particularly regarding land use and access to resources, difficulties in engaging forest dependent stakeholders, poorly developed information and verification systems and transparency mechanisms, corruption, and weak law enforcement and judicial systems.

Notwithstanding these common features, in practice these two initiatives also differ from each other. For example, FLEGT VPAs are the result of a bilateral negotiation process focusing mainly on the forestry sector. Their bilateral nature and restricted focus makes it easier to come up with stricter commitments, but addressing governance issues that extend beyond the forestry sector is more difficult. The multilateral dimension of REDD+, involving a complex range of stakeholders at local, national and international levels, makes it harder to reach strict consensual commitments. But it requires strong coordination with a number of other economic sectors (such as the agriculture and mining sectors), which are beyond the scope of FLEGT. In addition, while the FLEGT framework is relatively clear and predictable for stakeholders to engage with, REDD+ still involves a substantial degree of uncertainty as multilateral negotiations are still on-going and institutional and policy preparations at country level are developing.¹

Better integration and coordination of the FLEGT and REDD+ processes into the national planning processes (e.g. through National Forest Programmes) has been advocated to overcome some of these differences and in particular to support stakeholder engagement in the various processes, to ensure that activities contribute to the improvement of forest governance in a coherent manner and

¹ See: Christophe Van Orshoven, Tim Dawson, Iola Leal, Alessandro Trevisan and Melissa Othman. 2012. FOREST GOVERNANCE AND THE INTERRELATION BETWEEN FLEGT AND REDD+. European Forest Institute. In: FSSP Newsletter. Vol. 32 - 33, January 2012. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) of Vietnam.

that FLEGT and REDD+ processes will be mutually supportive within the country, improving efficiency and avoiding overlaps or duplication of activities or any interference that would put progress in one or the other process at risk.

The EU FLEGT Action Plan is celebrating its 10th anniversary in 2013. The first VPA was ratified in 2009 (Ghana). Since 2007 a range of countries are engaged in REDD+ preparations and at the same time negotiating or implementing a VPA. They are at different stages of preparation and implementation. The context, experiences and progress in each country are different. Therefore it is relevant to examine how the planning and implementation of REDD+ and FLEGT VPA initiatives are coordinated, what challenges are experienced and how the coordination can be strengthened, including the coordination with other policies, strategies, structures or processes that aim to promote sustainable forest management. Linkages should be explored on a country-by-country basis as a way of improving forest management and sustainable use of forest resources.

Guidance questions

that could be addressed in your case study/article:

General

1. How do REDD+ and FLEGT currently interact and overlap (e.g. synergies, complementarity and challenges) in their design and implementation at national level? And how does the international set up of these two mechanisms influence these interactions at national level?
2. Which challenges are common to both FLEGT and REDD+? In what instances might either or both instruments be most productive? In which areas might FLEGT and REDD+ work at cross purposes?
3. How do FLEGT and/or REDD+ relate to other forest related initiatives (e.g. synergies, challenges and commonalities)?

Goals

4. What is the potential of FLEGT and REDD+ to jointly promote and contribute to sustainable and equitable development at local level?
5. FLEGT and REDD+ are mechanisms to achieve similar aims. What are the implications of their similarities (and their differences)?

Governance

6. How has the emergence of REDD+ and FLEGT changed forest governance goals and existing forest organisational structures and capacities?
7. What practical and potential interactions (e.g. synergies or conflicts) exist between FLEGT and REDD+ (and other forest related initiatives) with regards to:
 - Stakeholder engagement and dialogue, including of the private sector;
 - Law enforcement;
 - Independent monitoring for FLEGT and REDD+;
 - Corruption, information and transparency needs for REDD+ and FLEGT;
 - Land tenure, access rights and use rights;
 - Interaction with other sectoral policies and extrasectoral issues (e.g. land use planning, agriculture); (and how do FLEGT and REDD+ compare in dealing with extrasectoral issues?);
 - Interaction between levels of governance;
 - The distribution of benefits to governments and other stakeholders;
 - Demands on and capacities and effectiveness of government institutions and other stakeholders in meeting REDD+ and FLEGT goals? How do newer and older institutions compare?
8. What are the (potential) linkages between Monitoring, Verification and Reporting systems (MVR, related to REDD+) and Timber Legality Assurance Systems (TLAS (Related to FLEGT)?

Legal aspects

9. What practical and potential interactions (e.g. synergies or conflicts) exist between FLEGT and REDD+ (and other forest related initiatives) with regards to:
 - The revision of legal frameworks;
 - Embedding REDD+ safeguards in national legal and regulatory frameworks?
10. Are the legal reforms envisaged and implemented under FLEGT consistent with reforms promoted by REDD+ or other initiatives?
11. Are the ways in which FLEGT and REDD+ (and other governance initiatives) influence implementation and enforcement of the national forest sector legal framework consistent?

Markets and trade

12. Linkages with and lessons with other sustainable supply chain management of other commodities?

13. FLEGT focusses on the market for forest products, whereas REDD+ focusses on forest services. What, if any, is the implication of the difference in focus between the two initiatives, e.g. with regards to investment incentives for business and governments?
14. How do FLEGT and REDD+ relate to voluntary certification?

Other issues

15. Can REDD+ contribute to solutions related to conversion timber? (Conversion timber is plantation timber that is legally produced under the FLEGT licencing system and which is produced on land that was converted from forest into plantation before or outside the scope of the FLEGT system. This issue is particularly relevant in south-east Asia.)
16. Are other aspects of the EC FLEGT Action Plan in any way linked to REDD+ or other forest related initiatives?

The **ETFRN News** provides an independent platform of exchange of information and views, published by the European Tropical Forest Research Network (ETFRN). It is a network of European organizations involved in (sub) tropical forest research. The News publishes on specific themes bringing together field level practice, scientific insights and international and national policy endeavours to enhance common understanding, exchange of experience and joint learning, and to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Previous ETFRN News:

- ETFRN News 51: Biodiversity conservation in certified forests (September 2010).
- ETFRN News 52: Chainsaw milling: supplier to local markets (December 2010).
- ETFRN News 53: Moving forward with forest governance (April 2012).
- ETFRN News 54: Good business: Making private investments work for tropical forests (December 2012).

All publications are available at www.etfrn.org