Congo Basin Regional Workshop Report: Civil society and Independent Monitoring of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (IM-FLEG)

Brazzaville, Republic of Congo, 2-6 March 2009

Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents the activities and results of a regional workshop implemented by Forests Monitor in collaboration with Resource Extraction Monitoring (REM), FERN, and the Centre for the Environment and Development (CED). Since January 2007, Forests Monitor, in partnership with REM and CED, has been implementing the project *Capacity building in the Congo Basin and Implementation of Independent Monitoring of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (IM-FLEG) in the Republic of Congo*. One of the primary objects of this project is to increase civil society capacity to undertake IM-FLEG in the Congo Basin for national appropriation of the monitoring process. Regional and national workshops are part of the strategy to achieve this objective. So far, national workshops have been held in Central African Republic and Gabon. A third is to take place in Democratic Republic of Congo later this year. The objectives of the regional workshop presented in this report were to:

1. Facilitate regional exchange among civil society on: forest law enforcement and governance related problems and opportunities; how IM-FLEG can contribute to solutions; and the roles civil society in IM-FLEG
2. Strengthen the technical capacity to carry out investigation missions and produce credible reports on forest illegalities
3. Outline preliminary country strategies for civil society involvement in improving forest law enforcement and governance in countries represented at the workshop

A total of 22 participants each representing a national NGO from Gabon, Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and CAR attended the workshop (Annex 1). One representative from Cameroon – Samuel Nnah, CED– was present and acted as the principal facilitator.

Objectives were achieved through a combination of presentations, group discussions, technical training, scenario exercises, and group work. The majority of time was dedicated to technical training in common investigation techniques (calculating log volumes, inspecting documentation, conducting interviews, and GPS) and scenario exercises. The latter allowed participants to practice what they learned in the technical training in 'real world' situations and gain an understanding of the importance of analytical ability, adaptability, and interpersonal skills in conducting successful investigations.

Country strategies developed by participants on how civil society should contribute to solving forest law enforcement and governance problems revealed reluctance among many participants to engage in IM-FLEG due to low confidence in technical capacity and political sensitivity of the topic. The proposed strategies revealed, however, a strong commitment among participants to increase/protect community rights and fight corruption. Yet, the links between objectives, activities and desired results were not sufficiently strong in the majority of the strategies.

Based on discussions with participants, the workshop was viewed as a valuable step in increasing civil society involvement in IM-FLEG. The most common participant suggestions for improvement were: focus most capacity building on technical monitoring techniques and scenarios, which can both be used in IM-FLEG and external monitoring approaches. It is indeed perceived to be a more realistic option for national NGOs to carry out monitoring externally in the short term rather than in formal partnership with governments. Follow up

activities include the distribution of the Forests Monitor IM-FLEG training manual to participants, the administration of a brief questionnaire within 2 to 3 months to see if participants have employed any lessons learned from the workshop, and organise a 2-3 day regional workshop to evaluate and consolidate actions and strategies within a few months

Definitions

Independent Monitor(ing) of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (IM-FLEG): IM-FLEG operates via in-country formal contracts with the recipient government and donors, which enables access to official data and processes. The monitor undertakes regular investigations in the field to detect illegal activities by the private sector; systematically documents related problems within the concerned government to tackle or deter those illegalities; works to trigger official action through tailored recommendations to governments and donors and joint meetings to follow and promote their progress through administrative and judicial systems.

External monitoring: External monitoring of forests carries out similar investigative activities in the field but without formal partnership with the concerned governments. This gives the external monitor more flexibility and speed, as well as the possibility to voice strong criticism, however access to data is more restricted which leads to a lesser possibility to monitor government action (or lack of) and detect certain types of illegalities or fraud.

Both approaches are useful and complementary, as they promote improvement in forest law enforcement and governance in different ways. Combined, they can be more effective as they support each other.

Activities and Observations

This section presents a breakdown of activities, results and analysis for each of the 3 workshop objectives.

Objective 1: Facilitate regional exchange among civil society on forest illegalities and governance related problems and opportunities, how its monitoring can contribute to solutions, and the roles civil society in IM-FLEG

Presentation on FLEGT, Iola Leal FERN: This presentation summarized the history, goals and strategy of FLEGT and highlighted specific aspects of FLEGT most relevant to civil society such as protection of local resource user rights, transparency, and independent monitoring, including IM-FLEG. Following the presentation, a group discussion took place, which raised issues regarding forest products covered under a VPA and the geographical coverage of a VPA beyond the EU market.

External monitoring - presentation on relevant CED activities in Cameroon, Samuel Nnah: The goal of this presentation was to inform participants that national civil society involvement in monitoring is already a reality in the Congo Basin. To illustrate this, Mr. Nnah described CED's monitoring program, implemented in collaboration with Forest Peoples Programme (FPP), which involves empowering local resource users, including marginalized Pygmy populations, with the capacity to record and transmit reliable data on illegal logging activities using GPS devices.

IM-FLEG - three presentations on the FM-REM project in Congo: These presentations outlined major goals and activities of the FM-REM programme, particularly those elements related to building monitoring capacity of national civil society. The first presentation provided a general overview of the approach while the other presentations provided details of the *Shadow Team* training, i.e. a long-term and on-the-job training in IM-FLEG for 6 national civil society representatives in Congo. These presentations promoted further group discussions on civil society related activities in the context of IM-FLEG.

Presentations from Gabon, CAR, Congo, and DRC participants on the national situations: Prior to arriving in Brazzaville, participants were asked to coordinate with colleagues to develop a short presentation on specific governance and law enforcement problems of the forest sector and current civil society initiatives underway to address these problems.

A number of problems, such as a lack of transparency, insufficient legal text to protect local resource users, and widespread corruption were commonly reported in all of the presentations. However, country specific issues were also raised, such as the lack of application of certain laws, revealing an understanding of specific gaps in forest legislation posing challenges to good governance. The presentation from CAR was particularly interesting as it included a list of specific legal text missing from legislation deemed necessary for good governance.

Civil society activities presented included public education on forest law enforcement and governance related issues, lobbying for the application of certain laws, and defending local community rights. Gabon, however, did not present any activities. From these presentations and group discussions, it appeared that civil society involvement in this field is limited and that participants lack a clear vision about how to tackle the issues.

Objective 2: Strengthen the technical capacity to carry out investigation missions and produce credible reports

Activities under this objective represented the bulk of the workshop. There were three main components to achieving this objective: 1) a presentation and discussion on conducting a forest sector legal review; 2) technical training and scenarios in methods to collect and analyse data; and 3) a presentation, group discussion and exercise on best practice in reporting.

Presentation on how to conduct an analysis of the law, Dorothée Massouka, Legal Expert, REM, Congo: The presentation outlined the main elements of an analysis of the law including legal procedures, the different types of illegalities, the penalties of each illegality and the judicial process of prosecution. During the group discussion following the presentation, participants asked how an external monitoring program can gain access to all the legal texts necessary to conduct a thorough review. The response was that in theory, in most countries, legal texts should be available to the public. However, members of the Congo FM team pointed out that even with a partnership some legal documents are difficult to acquire. A participant from CAR suggested that a regional review be conducted with a focus on local community rights with the overall goal of identifying which laws tend to be implemented and which tend to be overlooked.

Presentation: Introduction to preparation and implementation of IM-FLEG missions, Serge Moukouri, REM

Before the technical training sessions, this presentation was given to provide an overview of the fundamental steps of field missions and some of the main tools/methodologies for collecting information. The fundamental steps presented were: 1) mission preparation including the collection of documents (annual cutting permits, maps, agreements with the government, etc.) on the entities to be investigated; 2) the collection of evidence of using credible methodologies and; 3) the production of a mission report.

Technical training in collecting and analysing information

Participants were divided into 4 groups based on technical capacity in the subject areas. Each group participated in all 4 training modules, which were:

Inspecting documents

Participants were taught how to inspect four of the most important documents: annual cutting permit, forest inventory map, *carnet de chantier* (record book of cuttings), and the *feuille de route* (log transport document). Participants learned: what the common infractions for each document type are; how to detect illegalities through a series of inspections and cross checks; how to interpret detected illegalities in the context of larger and more systemic scams; and how to identify fraudulent documents. Real documents inspected during FM-REM field missions were used for this training to ensure that participants gained experience with actual documentation (any names or ID numbers on the documents were blocked out).

Inspecting volume declarations

One of the most common illegalities is under declaration of log and timber volumes in order to reduce export taxes. This module trained participants in a common detection method – calculate volumes and comparing them against those claimed volumes. Participants were trained how to calculate volumes using basic, but accurate tools and formulas.

Detecting 'spatial' infractions using a GPS

This training focused on how a GPS unit and maps can be used to detect 'spatial' infractions, such as logging outside of legal limits. However, due to time constraints and requests from participants to focus more on how to operate a GPS rather than how a GPS can be *used*, training sessions were dedicated primarily to the former. Nevertheless, the instructors did explain how geographic coordinates collected using a GPS can be used in IM-FLEG.

Collecting reliable information from local resource users

This training familiarised participants with best practices for gathering information from local informants. Topics included: preparing for the interviews; best ways to communicate objectives of the interview; interview 'etiquette' including body language and dress; structured versus non-structured techniques; different interview types such as group versus individual; and basic tips on how to structure questions that encourage residents to divulge information on sensitive issues, such as illegal logging, while protecting sources.

Scenarios – experiential learning

Following the technical training, each group participated in 4 different scenarios, which tested the skills gained from the training by putting participants into a 'real' life situation.

Facilitators played various roles such as logging company manager or local community member depending on the scenario. Participants were given a brief description of each scenario and a list of objectives but no instructions. This challenged them to devise and implement an investigation to achieve the objectives. Facilitators offered periodic guidance but participants were, for the most part, on their own during this 'learn by doing' exercise.

Scenario 1 – Gathering information from communities
The overall objective given to participants was to investigate allegations of illegal logging near a village, which required gathering reliable information from local informants. Facilitators posed as an agreeable village chief and a disgruntled resident distrustful of researchers. The varying reactions of the community members forced the participants to adjust their strategy 'on the fly' and be able to identify windows of opportunity in a conversation to gather relevant information. Approaches among participants varied - one group decided to lie and present themselves as wildlife researchers. This was strongly discouraged during the restitution following the scenario.

Scenario 2 – Inspecting compliance at a log processing plant
This scenario required participants to investigate claims of under declarations of log volumes at a processing factory. Participants had to identify the necessary documents to inspect and what specific types of information should be collected and analysed. Most groups correctly chose to calculate compare declared volumes on the *feuille de route* with volumes they calculated themselves. Participants were, for the most part, successful in completing the calculations correctly, but required considerable guidance on interpreting the figures and conducting the volume comparisons.

Scenario 3– Visiting a logging company office to inspect documents
In this scenario, the ability of participants to conduct an investigation of documents that logging companies are required to maintain by law was put to the test. Two facilitators played the role of logging company representatives and attempted to influence the participant's investigation by offering small 'favours' or putting up various obstacles to stall the investigation. This underlined the importance of knowing how to interact with private sector representatives in order to conduct a successful investigation.

Participants were expected to: 1) identify key documents to be inspected (logging concession maps, log registry book, log transportation records, and annual cutting permits); 2) assess the validity of the documents presented and; 3) inspect the documents to detect infractions. The document inspection required participants to understand not only the documents and information recorded in them, but also the relationship between the different documents as the inspection process required various cross-checks between documents. This proved to be the most difficult aspect of the exercise for participants. For instance, participants failed to detect inconsistencies of tree species recorded in the log registry book and the transportation documents. However, nearly all groups were successful in detecting infractions related to under declaration of volumes and the annual cutting permit, including illegally harvested species and over harvesting.

Scenario 4 – Inspecting logging boundary limits
In this scenario, participants participated in a mock visit to a logging concession to inspect boundary compliance in accordance with an annual cutting permit. On this journey through

the 'forest' (a map was drawn on the ground), facilitators described various obstacles and observations and asked participants how to proceed. For example, one group encountered a tree laying across a logging road on the boundary of an annual cutting permit.   Was the log put their intentionally to block access? What are the indicators of a natural tree fall or intentional placement?   If it was placed intentionally, what might this indicate? The logging company claims that the adjacent area is the parcel of last year's cutting permit. Is this true? Why is the road in the 'last year's cutting permit area' still maintained? These are the sort of participants were faced with, testing their ability to analyse various observations, make on-site adjustments to the investigation, and recommend further action.   This scenario also offered further practice in how a GPS unit can be used in monitoring – in this case, GPS units were used for orientation on a map and to record geographic coordinates of observations.

Presentation: Preparing mission reports, Serge Moukouri, REM
Once all 4 groups completed all 4 scenarios, each group was assigned to write a mission report for one of the scenarios and present it to the group for discussion. But prior to writing the report, a presentation on reporting was given which: 1) discussed the importance of mission reports in IM-FLEG; 2) outlined the characteristics of a good report, stressing the importance of basing all conclusions and recommendations on evidence alone; 3) specified what not do include in mission reports, particularly speculations and; 4) discussed why mission and thematic reports are produced e.g. to inform the public, catalyse change, etc.).

Following the presentation the group discussion explored various issues including: access to documentation not always in the public domain (i.e. annual cutting permits, concessions maps) for external monitoring programs; document sharing between IM-FLEG and external monitors; differences between reports of an auditor, certifier, and IM-FLEG; differences between IM-FLEG and external monitoring reporting styles; protocol for when the government reading committee in IM-FLEG disagrees with findings in a mission report; difficulties in getting the government to act on recommendations in the reports and the role of the IM project steering committee; and using reports to engage actors in a process of reform, including national NGOs as campaigners armed with IM-FLEG data since the IM-FLEG cannot lobby directly (CED gave example of how they use the IM-FLEG information to lobby in Cameroon) and; effective ways to diffuse information because as one participant stated "the best way to hide information is to write it down."

Group presentations: Scenarios
Each of the 4 groups presented their scenario mission reports consisting of an executive summary, introduction, methodology, results, analysis, and conclusions/recommendations. The contents and style of each report was critiqued by the group. A common problem was that reports presented conclusions and/or recommendations that seemed logical but were not supported by the evidence.   Other shortcomings identified included volume calculations that seemed unrealistic; data presented without an explanation; inclusion of irrelevant observations, such as the attitude of logging company representatives; and explanations to downplay or even justify infractions were given. The group discussion, stressed the importance of rectifying these problems to achieve objectives, and provided advice on how to improve the reports.

Objective 3: Outline preliminary country strategies for civil society involvement in improving forest law enforcement and governance

Country strategies were developed in two phases: one the first day, before the technical training, and one toward the end of the workshop to incorporate lessons learned. As part of the effort to encourage participants to develop proposals from the strategies, a presentation and discussion on fundraising techniques also took place.

Group work to define preliminary country strategies: During the first day of the workshop, groups were asked to prepare a strategic planning table outlining specific problems, causes, challenges and opportunities and the contribution of SC to potential solutions. This exercise aimed to catalyze the development of a preliminary strategy offering a logical and feasible approach to specific problems. Some country representatives did a good job in identifying specific problems. For the most part, however, groups offered only general problems (i.e. lack of transparency) followed by generic solutions (lobby for transparency). In short, the strategies failed to provide the foundation to build a feasible approach to increase civil society participation in issues of forest law enforcement and governance, as a result further effort was made into developing and discussing strategies.

During the last day of the workshop, participants were again divided into country groups and asked to update the country strategies. The strategic planning table was modified to include: general problem, specific problems, specific objectives, justification of objectives, activities to achieve objectives and expected results.

Each group presented their planning table to the entire group. Notable observations from this exercise include:

1. *Strategies revealed a strong commitment to increase/protect community rights and fight corruption.* However, specific and logical approaches to achieve these objectives were not included in the strategy outlines.
2. *IM-FLEG and external monitoring activities were not common in most strategies.* When participants were asked why IM-FLEG did not appear to be a priority, reasons given included low technical capacity (trainings of the workshop were limited), lack of human and financial resources, and preference to avoid politically sensitive issues.
3. *An overall lack of clear links between the problem, objectives, activities and expected results.* For instance, one of the expected results in the DRC strategy was increased recognition of local rights. However, the only activities given to achieve this result were civil society capacity building workshops and fund raising trips.
4. *Lack of specificity when defining problems and objectives.* This may indicate that the proximate and underlying causes of the problems are not well understood. However, when asked to describe an issue – in this case "what exactly does defending community rights mean in the context of forest law enforcement and governance?" – participants engaged in a conversation about the complex issue of statutory versus customary rights. Clearly, the knowledge is there, but the ability to apply it to the development of a strategic plan appears to be missing.

Presentation on fundraising, Iola Leal, FERN: As a follow up to the development of preliminary country strategy, this presentation provided basic guidance on how to develop a proposal and listed potential sources of funding. Participants were encouraged to develop their strategies into specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) proposals.

Discussion on European Commission and NGO funding opportunities, Lea Turunen, European Commission Delegation, Congo-Brazzaville: Ms. Turunen described the different types of funding opportunities from the EC and the application process. She stressed the importance of respecting guidelines set forth in the call for proposals as well as developing SMART proposals. She also described the differences between the rather laborious processes of applying to large grants as opposed to the simplified process of applying to a smaller grant program expected to materialise in the near future.

Participant Feedback

Before closing the workshop, participants were asked to share their options of the workshop. Three common comments were: 1) the technical training was very valuable but participants need more long-term on the ground training before they will feel confident in their ability to carry out a credible investigation; 2) more discussion is merited on the relationships between timber certification, various audits, and IM-FLEG and; 3) a comprehensive training program focusing on how to establish and carry out an *external* monitoring program would be more valuable as external monitoring is perceived a more realistic option among participants as opposed to a full blown IM-FLEG project with attendant rigorous reporting and government and donor engagement.

Conclusions and Recommendations

To what extent were the objectives of the workshop achieved? Regarding Objective 1 (facilitate regional exchange on forest law enforcement and governance related problems, solutions, and how civil society can contribute to solutions), the workshop succeeded in raising awareness among participants of how national NGOs can get involved with monitoring by providing specific examples from the region – i.e. external monitoring in Cameroon (CED) and the *shadow team* program of FM in Republic of Congo. Group discussions on problems and solutions also seemed to increase awareness and spark ideas for solutions in different countries – though these need further development.

Regarding Objective 2 (strengthen technical capacity in collecting, analysing and reporting of data on illegal forestry activities), the workshop succeeded in increasing capacity in log and timber volume calculations, document inspections, conducting interviews, and using a GPS for mapping illegal logging activities. Equally important is how participants learned, through the scenario exercises, the importance of strong analytical and inter-personal skills in investigations. The technical training segments of the workshop were viewed positively by participants. However, the time allocated was viewed as insufficient and participants felt that their technical skills were not advanced enough to carry out missions and produce credible reports. Note, however, that the goal of the workshop was not to develop the necessary capacity to carry out IM-FLEG, but to familiarise participants with the various tools and strategies used in independent monitoring.

Regarding Objective 3 (development of preliminary strategies for civil society involvement in IM-FLEG), each group of country representative did succeed in preparing a strategy document including problems, objectives, activities and expected results. However, these preliminary strategies represent only vague frameworks. Interestingly, monitoring was not a common activity in the strategies. In fact, the Gabon strategy does not even mention IM-FLEG. Participants stated that this is because participants lack confidence in their technical skills, are hesitant to develop a monitoring program due to the political sensitively of the issue, and do not see clear links between the problems and IM-FLEG as part of the solution. Clearly, increasing national civil society involvement in IM-FLEG will require more concentrated efforts particularly in developing technical skills and strategic planning.

Conclusions and recommendations from the workshop are summarised in the table below.

Conclusion	Recommendation for participants and/or Forests Monitor
Preliminary country strategies need work if they are to achieve any meaningful objectives primarily because they need to establish clearer links between objectives, activities and desired results	Participants with particular interest in developing an IM-FLEG strategy refine their strategies based on SMART guidelines.
	Forest Monitor provides them with further guidance to develop an effective strategy within the existing project framework.

The workshop succeeded in increasing technical capacity in IM-FLEG skills, but not to the extent that participants feel confident enough in their abilities to carry out investigations and produce credible reports.	Participants interested in establishing a monitoring program in their country develop a proposal in partnership with an organisation experienced in IM-FLEG to develop their capacity further and gain practical monitoring experience. Forest Monitor : 1) distribute the IM-FLEG training manual to all workshop participants (and other NGOs in the region) to be used as a resource for on-going capacity building and 2) Help develop the *shadow team* into an NGO capable of implementing an IM-FLEG program independently.
Many participants do not think IM-FLEG is feasible for their organisations and remain ambivalent about pursing external monitoring as it is viewed as a risky activity	Participants explore in more detail the monitoring opportunities in their country with other members of civil society, the donor community and government. Forest Monitor – for future capacity building activities in the region, training should focus more on the specific steps NGOs wishing to establish external monitoring programs can take. Short term in-country engagement would be more appropriate for this as they could address the site specific opportunities and challenges in greater depth with the likelihood of producing improved national strategies. Forest Monitor sends out a brief questionnaire in 2 to 3 months to see if participants have taken further steps to get involved with IM-FLEG. Results from this will help FM modify future efforts to raise national civil society participation in IM-FLEG. Forests Monitor will also organise a 2-3 day regional workshop to evaluate and consolidate actions and strategies in a few months.
Results from the FM-REM Congo project are not widely accessed by members of civil society in the region because, according to many participants, they are not aware of how to access the information.	FM increase visibility of the project in the region by announcing the release of mission and thematic reports (posted on the internet) via a listserve containing the emails of all interested NGOs in the region, radio announcements, and press releases. This listserve would be used also to create a live debate and source of support in the implementation of the actions in national contexts.

Annex 1: Participant list

Nom	Organisation	Pays	Email	Telephone
EKEMI-MFODO Séraphin	FOVIGENA	Gabon	reaotoba@yahoo;FR	(241) 06 68 06 24
YEMBI Paulin	GADDE	Gabon	yembipaulin@yahoo.fr	(241) 07 55 11 90
AZIZET Arielle	Brainforest	Gabon	ari_zy2001@yahoo.fr	(241) 07 40 09 74
NDOTIT Saturnin	ASF	Gabon	ndotit@yahoo.fr	(241) 06 24 80 50
IMBOKO Bienvenu	RRN	RDC	bienimbo@yahoo.fr	(243)998859483/ 895173019
MUHINDO Alphonse	Réseau CREF	RDC	reseaucref@yahoo.fr	(243) 998 38 48 39
MULUMBA Pierre	OCEAN	RDC	banyfils@yahoo.fr	(243) 815980550
Pasteur YELA Matthieu	CEDEN	RDC	ftv-coood@yahoo.fr	(243) 810914739
MOUTE Cendri Mignot	OCDH	RCA	sandrymoute@yahoo.fr	(242) 75 05 26 06/ 72 76 50 39
MUMBA Fréddy	CENADEP	RDC	frmumba@yahoo.fr	(243) 997839528
PASSE SANAND Patrice	OCDN	RCA	ocdn2001@yahoo.Fr	(236) 75 56 47 02/ 70 97 31 29
NDEMALINGOU Thimothée	OCDR	RCA	tndemalingou@yahoo.fr	(236) 70 18 34 23 / 727 727 95
MBELET-KOUNDJA Lydie Euloge	AFJC	RCA	lydiembelet@yahoo.fr	(236) 70 95 96 34/ 21615455
TURUNEN Lea	DCE	R Congo	lea.turunen@ec.europa.eu	(242) 424 43 69
ITSOUA MADZOUS G.L.	CEDEV	R Congo	imadzous@voila.fr	(242) 531 74 11/ 973 72 11
NKODIA Alfred	UERPOD	R Congo	nkodiaalfred@yahoo.fr	(242) 729 66 26/ 615 16 79
KIYINDOU YOMBO Nina	OCDH	R Congo	ninakiyindou@yahoo.fr	(242) 537 92 64
Kouffa Grégoire Hadjinsy	SAM	R Congo	hgkouffa@yahoo.fr	42) 520 64 06/ 950 00 05
MOLEBANDA Pierre	APEDS	R Congo	apetds2003@yahoo.fr	(242) 557 13 31/ 979 09 99
MABIALA Lambert	CJJ	R Congo	lambertmabiala@yahoo.fr	(242) 559 23 29
HANIMBAT Maixent	FGDH	R Congo	maixentfort@yahoo.fr	772 57 64
MULLEY Brad	FM	UK	bmulley@forestsmonitor.org	
NNAH NDOBE Samuel	CED	Cameroun	samnnah@cedcameroun.org	(243) 22134581
DOMBOLO Bob Hermann	OI FLEG / Equipe Homologue	R Congo	bobhermann2002@yahoo.fr	(242) 576 05 91
MOUSSIESSI MBAMA Romaric	OI FLEG / Equipe Homologue	R Congo	moussiessi_romaric@yahoo.fr	(242) 578 2268/ 6795967
LOUZALA KOUNKOU Bled- Dumas	OI FLEG / Equipe Homologue	R Congo	bled_louzala@yahoo.fr	(242) 6704803
KIBONGUI Edouard	OI FLEG	R Congo	kibonguiedouard@yahoo.fr	(242) 596 59 84

Nom	Organisation	Pays	Email	Telephone
NTOUNTA Teddy	OI FLEG	R Congo	bonateddy2@yahoo.fr	(242) 525 55 19
NGAKOSSO Faustine	OI FLEG	R Congo	fangakosso@yahoo.fr	(242) 528 43 72
MASSOUKA Dorothée	OI FLEG	R Congo	massoukadorty@yahoo.com	(242) 505 36 09
MOUKOURI Serge	OI FLEG	R Congo	smoukouri@rem.org.uk	
SCHMITT Antoine	OI FLEG	R Congo	schmittant@hotmail.com	(242) 5824892

Annex 2: Workshop programme

Activité	Responsables	Heure
JOUR 1		
Ouverture et introduction	FM	9h30 / 10H30
Présentation = FLEG et FLEGT (P : 15 min / Q : 30 min) Gouvernance et illégalité forestière / Observation indépendante « avec (OI) et sans (OE) » partenariat / FLEGT	FERN	10h30 /11h15
Pause CAFE		11h15 / 11h30
Présentation = OE – Cameroun (P : 15 min / D : 30 min) Activités de suivi de CED sans partenariat (approche et étude de cas)	CED	11h30 / 12h15
Présentation = OI - Congo-Brazzaville Présentation du projet (P : 5 min / Q : 5 min) Etude de cas (P : 10 min / Q : 15 min) Equipe homologue et société civile (P : 10 min / Q : 10 min)	FM	12h15 / 13h15
Pause DEJEUNER		13h15 / 13h45
Présentation = ONG / RCA, RDC, Gabon, Congo (P : 15min / Q : 15 min) Identification des problèmes majeurs de respect de la légalité et gouvernance Objectifs et activités principales des ONG dans le secteur forestier (FLEG / FLEGT)	Participants région	13h45 / 15h45
Présentation = foras nationaux CEFDHAC (P : 15 min / Q : 30 min) Possibilités offertes dans le cadre de concertations	CEFDHAC	15h45 / 16h30
Groupes de travail / stratégies par pays Stratégies actuelles et futures à envisager	FERN	16h30 / 17h30

Activité	Responsables	Heure
JOUR 2		
Rappel des activités et points clefs de la journée précédente	Un participant	8h00 / 8h30
Restitution des groupes de travail sur les stratégies par pays (30 min / pays)	FERN	8h30 / 10h30
Pause CAFE		10h30 / 10h45
<u>Présentation = légalité forestière (P : 20 min / Q : 40 min)</u> Approche d'une revue des textes légaux et réglementaires / problèmes posés	OI - REM	10h45 / 11h45
<u>Présentation = éléments méthodologiques des missions d'observation (P : 20 min / Q : 40 min)</u> Cas des missions de l'OI FLEG au Congo et Cameroun Différences dans le cas de l'OE au Cameroun	CED / REM	11h45 / 12h45
Pause DEJEUNER		12h45 / 13h15
Formations pratiques / par groupes de compétences mixtes (P : 15 min / E : 15 min / R : 10)		13H15 / 16h15
Formation 1 Utilisation du GPS dans le cadre de l'OI FLEG	FM/REM	
Formation 2 Cubage billes et sciages / estimation des volumes sur base des souches	FM/REM	
Formation 3 Analyse de documents (carte d'exploitation / carnet de chantier / feuille de route)	FM/REM	
Formation 4 Collecte d'informations auprès des populations locales	CED	
<u>Présentation = rédaction des rapports et gestion de l'information</u> Rappel des éléments de base du reporting (P : 15 min / Q : 15 min) Structure des rapports du projet OI FLEG Congo (P : 15 min / Q : 15 min)	REM	16h45/17h30

JOUR 3		
Rappel des activités et points clefs de la journée précédente	Un participant	8h00 / 8h30
Exercices de mise en situation / par groupe nationaux	CED / FM / REM	
Etape 1 Présentation des scénarios (20 min) Mise en scène et discussions (1h par scénario / 4h / début : 2h)		8h30 / 10h30
Pause CAFE		10h30 / 10h45
Etape 2 Mise en scène et discussions (suite : 2h)		10h45 / 12h45
Pause DEJEUNER		12h45 / 13h15
Etape 3 Rédaction des rapports (1h par rapport / 4h00)		13h15 / 17h15
JOUR 4		
Rappel des activités et points clefs de la journée précédente	Un participant	8h00 / 8h30
Exercices de mise en situation / par groupe nationaux	CED / FM / REM	
Etape 4 Restitution d'un scénario par groupe et discussions (1h min par scénario / 4h / début : 2h)		8h30 / 10h30
Pause CAFE		10h30/10h45
Etape 4 Restitution d'un scénario par groupe et discussions (suite : 2h00)		10h45/12h45
Pause DEJEUNER		12h45/ 13h15
Groupes de travail / reprise des stratégies par pays Stratégies actuelles et futures	CED / FM / REM	13h15 / 14h15
Restitution des groupes de travail (30 min / pays)		14h15 / 16h15
DIVERS / discussions		16h15 / 17h15
Cocktail	-	18h00
JOUR 5		
Fundraising	FERN. Commission Européenne	8h30 / 10H00
Pause café		10h00 / 10h15
Evaluation de l'atelier		10h15 / 10H30
Clôture de l'atelier		11h00