



2nd EU REDD+ Projects Coordination Meeting

3-4 July 2012

Final report



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary.....	3
1. Meeting introduction and presentation from the European Commission.....	4
2. Update on REDD+ programmes from EU Member States and Norway.....	4
3. FLEGT and REDD+ presentation and debate.....	5
4. Projects presentations.....	6
5. Regional breakout groups.....	6
6. Thematic breakout groups.....	8
7. Concluding remarks.....	11

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex I. Agenda.....	12
Annex II. List of participants.....	14
Annex III. List of EU delegations' REDD+ focal points.....	16
Annex IV. Evaluation.....	17

Executive summary

The 2nd EU REDD+ Projects Coordination Meeting took place in Brussels, on 3 and 4 July 2012. The meeting was organised by the European Commission, and had two main aims:

- sharing updates on EU funded REDD+ projects; and
- exchanging information and taking stock of experiences in REDD+ implementation with EU partners and other actors in the REDD+ community.

About 50 participants attended the meeting, including representatives from REDD+ projects financed under the ENRTP programme¹, staff from the European Commission, representatives from EU Member States including Norway, and REDD+ practitioners.

This final report summarises the discussions and the presentations that were given at the meeting. It also provides the results of the meeting evaluation, as well as information on the participants and the contact details of EU delegations' REDD+ focal points. In addition, all presentations made during the meeting are provided through the links in the text and in the agenda.

The two-day meeting was structured around a number of presentations, breakout groups and plenary debates. It started with a presentation from the European Commission focusing on the importance of sharing REDD+ projects experience for informing policy, especially considering the lack of clarity at international level. The Commission also shared its perspectives on REDD+ as a joint mitigation, adaptation and development instrument. This was followed by presentations from all ENRTP-funded projects represented at the meeting on their projects' experience and how they interact with national REDD+ processes. The first day was completed by updates on REDD+ programmes from the German international development agency GIZ and Norway, and a session on interactions and challenges between REDD+ and FLEGT opened by the European Forest Institute.

During the second day of the meeting, participants took part in regional and thematic breakout groups. The latter were structured around four topics: measuring REDD+ performance (MRV); land tenure and planning processes; local dialogue and stakeholder engagement; and financing sustainable land use to address the drivers of deforestation and degradation.

The European Commission concluded the meeting, noting that the diversity in the scope of the projects, as well as their role and contribution to the development of REDD+ nationally and internationally, is now much more evident than [one year ago](#), when they were just launching their activities. The meeting contributed to identifying more clearly the difficulties in implementation that REDD+ projects partners are facing. Projects were encouraged to be proactive in working with other partners and processes, sharing experiences and providing feedback to the European Commission through the EU Delegations.

In the concluding remarks a new ENRTP call for proposal was also announced. The call for proposal focuses on three areas: climate change mitigation, in particular REDD+; biodiversity; and forest governance and FLEGT. The deadline for submission of the concept notes is 25 September 2012. More information is [available online](#).

¹ Thematic Programme of the European Union on Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources including Energy.

1. Meeting introduction and presentation from the European Commission

Mathieu Bousquet (European Commission, DG Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid) opened the meeting. After welcoming the participants, he presented the meeting objectives, reviewed the lessons learned from the 1st EU REDD+ Projects Meeting in 2011, and introduced the agenda.

Jacob Werksman (European Commission, DG Climate Action) gave the first presentation, [Learning from REDD+ projects](#). Werksman noted that the absence of detail and clarity on a number of issues at international level makes sharing what is working and what is not working at project level especially valuable for policy development in the European Union and globally. A clear example of where further work is needed is the area of safeguards. He also discussed the progress on REDD+ in the UNFCCC process, as well as the European Commission's perspectives on REDD+ as a joint mitigation, adaptation and development instrument. REDD+ needs to be developed at the national level, and developing countries will need to develop their capacities related to REDD+ from now until 2020. The mechanism challenges all countries to rebalance incentives, making the costs of deforestation more apparent and visible to policy makers, and investments in sustainable land use more profitable.

2. Update on REDD+ programmes from EU Member States including Norway

Ragna John (GIZ) presented two new [REDD+ initiatives](#) recently launched by the German international development agency GIZ. REDD Early Movers (REM), implemented in cooperation with the German development bank KfW, is aimed at pioneers who have already taken risks and independent action towards mitigating climate change by preserving their forests. REM provides bridging finance during the REDD+ interim phase.

The Forest Governance Programme is the second GIZ programme, started in 2012. This programme supports German development cooperation partner countries in their efforts to conserve and protect forests through the implementation of REDD+ and FLEGT, as well as to increase the effectiveness of the two initiatives in these countries. The programme also addresses cross-cutting themes including anti-corruption; accountability; the use of standards; and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). The programme operates in close coordination with the GIZ International Forest Policy sectoral programme and REDD Early Movers.

Knut Kroepelien (Mission of Norway to the EU) presented [Norway's International Climate and Forest Initiative](#), introducing the ways in which the government of Norway is working to resolve key challenges facing REDD+. These challenges include achieving real reductions in deforestation, measuring results, ensuring that REDD+ delivers a wide range of benefits, and preventing leakage. An important part of their work is the Partnership on REDD+ with Indonesia, which involves support to Indonesia's REDD+ preparations and payments for independently verified emissions reductions from deforestation and degradation of forests and peatland forests. Norway also presented the next steps of this initiative:

- continued interim arrangements for REDD+ financing seeking to bring together donors and developing countries - fast start finance and the REDD+ Partnership;
- continued financial commitment to promote sustainable, national REDD+ strategies through multilateral support structures;
- performance-based payments to some countries; and
- provide field experience and analytical input to the design of an international post-2012 REDD+ agreement.

3. FLEGT and REDD+ presentation and discussion

REDD+ and FLEGT (Forest law enforcement, governance and trade) are both development instruments and processes, supported by the EU, that contribute to sustainable forest management. The EU FLEGT Action Plan contains several policy measures to combat illegal logging and improve forest governance. One of them is Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) between the EU and timber-producing partner countries. VPAs are trade agreements that call for participatory processes for forest stakeholders and help to establish a national dialogue on forest governance.

As discussed by Christophe Van Orshoven (European Forest Institute) during his presentation on [interactions and challenges between FLEGT and REDD+](#), the two processes face similar challenges during their design and implementation phases: unclear legal frameworks, poor information systems, weak governance, corruption and limited capacities. These common challenges must be addressed for these two initiatives to be effective. At the operational level, coordination and joint activities could contribute to both REDD+ and FLEGT processes, such as constructive stakeholder dialogues, strengthening of the legal framework including those to incorporate REDD+ safeguards, and independent monitoring. But REDD+ and FLEGT VPAs are also distinct processes. REDD+ is currently still being developed within the international climate change negotiations, creating confusion for policy makers and practitioners involved in national and local REDD+ processes. At the same time many donors and other stakeholders are involved, adding to the complexity. FLEGT VPAs, on the other hand, are clearly developed bilateral processes with well-defined tasks and responsibilities for the stakeholders involved.

During the Q&A session, participants discussed practical implications of REDD+ and FLEGT interactions and the extent to which REDD+ is an instrument limited to the forest sector or that affects other sectors as well. It was also mentioned that forest certification in some Latin American countries has led to bad experiences, as it was implemented in a top-down manner; REDD+ may offer opportunities to focus more on forest conservation.

4. Projects presentations

Fauna and Flora International - Developing community carbon pools for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) projects in selected ASEAN countries
CIFOR - Opportunities and challenges to developing REDD+ benefit sharing mechanisms in developing countries
Fondo Patrimonio Natural - Gobernanza ambiental para evitar la deforestación y promover la conservación de los bosques en la Amazonia colombiana
WWF Central Africa Regional Office - Réduction de la déforestation et de la dégradation dans le Massif Forestier de Ngoyla-Mintom (N-M) par la mise en œuvre d'une gestion durable intégrée dans le cadre du paysage tri-national Dja- Odzala – Minkebe (TRIDOM)
OroVerde/Defensores de la Naturaleza - Conservación de Bosques y Desarrollo Comunitario Sostenible para la mitigación del cambio climático
UN-REDD Programme
European Forest Institute - EU REDD Facility
WWF Germany - Amazonia viva. Conservación y valorización participativa del bosque y sus servicios ambientales
RECOFTC - Sustainable Forest Management and Rural Livelihood Enhancement through Community Forestry and REDD Initiatives in Cambodia
COSPE - Programa integrado de proteção e desenvolvimento das florestas costeiras angolanas (PIPDEFA)
ONG Forestales por el Desarrollo del Bosque Nativo - Reducción de las tasas de deforestación y degradación de los bosques nativos en Chile y Argentina
Welthungerhilfe - Gestión sostenible para la conservación de dos reservas de biósfera en la Cuenca Amazónica (Perú y Ecuador) mediante la reducción de Emisiones de CO ₂ por Deforestación y Degradación de Bosques (REDD)
Monte Desenvolvimento Alentejo Central - Gestão Sustentável dos Recursos Florestais no Parque Natural dos Tarrafes de Cacheu
Global Environmental Centre - Sustainable Management of Peatland Forests in South East Asia
Live and Learn Environmental Education - Pilot effective models for governance and implementation of REDD+, in Small Islands Developing States to provide equitable benefits for forest-dependent local and indigenous people

5. Regional breakout groups

Asia and the Pacific

During this session, discussion centred around difficulties that project implementers face when engaging with national and local authorities. Lack of coordination among ministries, high turnover within administrations, complex and overlapping regulatory frameworks, and centralised versus decentralised decision-making pose significant challenges. Nevertheless, project implementers are taking part in national REDD+ working groups and contributing to the design of national REDD+ policy frameworks. Projects with a carbon market component brought up the lack of government vision on the development of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) systems and the discrepancies between the UN and voluntary carbon market requirements for MRV. As some projects are piloting potential future national MRV systems, they can provide useful input into the national debate. Participants also exchanged experiences on corruption related issues they regularly face. The availability of information greatly contributes to the identification of key problems; perhaps influential donors could increase pressure to address and fight corruption.

Africa

Participants discussed four topics based on their experience in Angola, Cameroon, Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone.

Leadership in administrations. Institutional structures that should ensure consistency across ministries, (needed to address drivers outside forests, including agriculture, finance, mining, energy and land planning) are ineffective. Potential conflicts between development priorities and REDD+ can raise sensitivities related to national sovereignty. It is expected that projects could help remediate this situation by stimulating interministerial information sharing.

Regional cooperation. So far, the only regional group working on REDD+ in Africa is the COMIFAC, which gathers Congo Basin countries. The COMIFAC has a structural role within the Rainforest Coalition but had so far only limited success in harmonising positions and facilitating the implementation of REDD+ at national levels. One aggregating topic for regional cooperation between a broader number of African countries than the ones included in the COMIFAC could be the links between REDD+ and biodiversity or adaptation to climate change, which is also a priority for Congo Basin countries. The participants stressed the importance of ensuring consistency between addressing all deforestation drivers and planning for the provision and consumption of goods and services in a low emissions development pathway. Ongoing negotiations around broader financing streams, such as the 11th EDF (European Development Fund), can provide a forum to discuss REDD+ in a broader framework, integrating sustainable forest management or conservation of protected areas, as well as promoting enlarged government leadership and regional cooperation.

The importance of "+" activities. Reducing forest degradation, conservation, sustainable forest management and enhancement of carbon stocks are particularly important activities for African countries with relatively low deforestation rates. Unfortunately these countries often lack the monitoring capacities required to demonstrate progress in these areas. They therefore need proxy indicators and simplified reporting and verification requirements that countries providing REDD+ payments would find acceptable.

The rush for resources. Agro-industries, mining and forest exploitation, often driven by foreign investment, are putting growing pressure on African forests. REDD+ does not necessarily conflict with a controlled development of these activities but emissions linked to them and their future development need to be reported, and taken into account when building reference levels. Addressing these drivers can only build on sound governance and land use planning processes.

Latin America

Discussion focused on the state of development of REDD+ frameworks in Latin America, common challenges and capacity gaps. In several Latin American countries new forest legislation has been adopted in the last few years through participatory processes that included forest communities. REDD+ and FLEGT can certainly benefit from these experiences. All countries where the project representatives who attended the session are working (Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Argentina), already had their R-PPs formally assessed, and are currently testing alternative options through pilot actions.

Participants noted that, although some of the key drivers of deforestation in Latin America are outside the forest sector, REDD+ efforts are focused on drivers and economic agents within the forest sector, including small and medium-scale forest owners, conservation projects and indigenous people. One reason is that the actors involved, namely NGOs, are themselves in the forest sector. Nevertheless, some actors are beginning to broaden their focus. Resistance also comes from large-scale agricultural interests. In most countries the ministries of agriculture needs to be more involved: REDD+ is mainly developing under the ministries of environment, which have little political weight. Other issues discussed include the need to strengthen local management capacities, and to ensure adequate land planning processes as a precondition to the development of forest policies, to mitigate conflicts.

6. Thematic breakout groups

Measuring REDD+ performance (MRV)

Michael Bucki (European Commission, DG Climate Action) gave an [introductory presentation](#), focusing on two aspects: the state of negotiations on MRV for REDD+ in the international climate change negotiations; and challenges in measuring effects of all five REDD+ activities (deforestation, forest degradation, conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks), presenting a simplified matrix approach to assist in assessing their performance in countries with low monitoring capacity.

The eight ENRTP projects that took part in the thematic group differ in their level of involvement in MRV, some very limited, others more substantial. Projects are usually willing to link with the national level authorities but this is often difficult due to methods used and coordination issues. Methodologies used at project scale, for example, VCS developed in the framework of CDM A/R, can be very complex or ill suited to implementation at national level for REDD+. There is also a lack of guidance and coordination from national level to the projects.

‘Verification’ is generally poorly understood (external audit as in CDM, internal control..?) and would need clarification, perhaps through IPCC guidelines.

Methodologies, in particular at project level, can be extremely costly and time consuming. The experience of the Greenbelt movement in Kenya was discussed as an example. The European Commission discussed the need to adopt a pragmatic, step-wise approach, especially in the preparatory phase.

Work on establishing reference emissions levels (RELs) is proving very challenging for projects, as deforestation projections are difficult to scale up from the local or project level to the national one, due to inaccuracy of the projections.

Land tenure and local land planning processes

Reducing deforestation and improving the sustainable management of forest resources is dependent upon the existence of clear and transparent tenure rights. Nonetheless, tenure is problematic and

represents a source of conflict in many REDD+ countries; there is a growing demand, largely unmet, for recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities; although there has been significant progress in the last two decades in transferring rights to forest peoples, major gaps in application and challenges in implementation remain, making it difficult to achieve REDD+ objectives. Very often tenure issues are discussed in R-PPs, but then little attention is given in national preparations and REDD+ work at field level. Additional challenges are posed by growing pressure on forests including high commodity prices, mining, oil and gas, and infrastructure.

Augusta Molnar (Rights and Resource Initiative) gave an [introductory presentation](#) to this session, and discussed the need for a mechanism responding to these growing demands. This mechanism would channel financing towards projects of tenure reform proposed by governments, indigenous people and civil society, as well as promote private investment in sustainable land use.

Participants discussed experiences and the diversity of institutional realities and processes in the countries where they work. The recognition and implementation of 'new rights' is very difficult as various existing rights are still not recognised or implemented. For example, in Indonesia and Vietnam the recognition of community rights is challenging. Formalisation of rights often entails complex and demanding procedures which are not easily accessible for forest communities; they also involve risks of corruption.

Local dialogue and stakeholder engagement

A proper participatory process encompasses more than sharing information. It includes also consultation, involvement, collaboration and empowerment. Indra Van Gisbergen (FERN) gave an [introductory presentation](#) noting that all these elements need to be integrated within the REDD+ process to ensure success. However, REDD+ has evolved very quickly and has not always allowed sufficient time for capacity building and stakeholder participation. Session participants pointed out that there may still be opportunities for more involvement and participation of stakeholders in REDD+, but time is running out. The top-down nature of the REDD+ process, a consequence of the international framework, was also discussed, as well as the need to define it further at national and local level in a bottom-up and participatory way.

Participants noted that objectives of the REDD+ process should be clearly identified and that information should be shared with stakeholders in time in order to increase transparency and involvement. Also more attention is needed for education and awareness on climate change in general that would facilitate understanding of REDD+. Stakeholders need to reflect on their internal organisational structure and external representation. Experiences from other initiatives, such as the FLEGT process, should be taken into account and stakeholder structures should build on existing platforms and networks.

Financing sustainable land use to address the drivers of deforestation and degradation

Kate Dooley (FERN) gave an [overview](#) of the current situation in financing sustainable land use, beginning with information on the current state of carbon markets. There is a lack of financing for REDD+ related activities from these markets in the medium term due to: low market demand; exclusion of forest carbon from the ETS, the world's largest carbon market; and the general

unsuitability of using a commodities market to finance forest protection (since a very small proportion of benefits go to producers). Dooley then spoke of new proposals for financing sustainable land use at scale by accessing private finance. She noted that the key difference between these proposals and traditional financial tools (such as bonds, loan guarantees, futures and risk insurance) was the use of public sector finance to enable a broad set of sustainable outcomes beyond conservation and mitigation, which would also lower risk for private investment. These outcomes would need to be monitored to justify the use of public money as an enabling force.

Participants shared experiences from projects on private sector investment and on monitoring social and non-carbon elements of projects.

They discussed motivations for different actors. For the private sector visibility is the key motivation, which is sometimes at odds with project objectives, or misused. Project developers are often strongly motivated by social development aspects of the project.

In general tenure security is seen as the greatest challenge, and investors will not want to take a risk if the tenure is not clear. Some of the NGOs represented have due diligence procedures in place to evaluate reputation risks. Rights and Resource Initiative argued that the costs of clarifying land tenure (and other legal aspects) are much lower than the opportunity cost model often used to estimate finance needed for REDD+: research indicates a cost of US \$1-10 per ha to recognise community rights, and \$23 to recognise individual property rights.

The issue of legislation / legal certainty (more generally, beyond land tenure) is an important one for any type of private sector investment. Protected Areas offer a more certain legal status for investors. In countries such as Guinea Bissau, political instability makes it difficult to attract private investment.

Social benefits are indivisible from carbon outcomes of REDD+. Failing to address the social aspects prevents achieving emissions reduction potentials in a way that is effective and sustainable in the long-term.

7. Concluding remarks

Mathieu Bousquet (European Commission, DG Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid) concluded the meeting.

At the 1st EU REDD+ Projects Coordination Meeting, one year ago, most EU partners were just launching their projects; during the last year they significantly advanced in their projects' implementation. The diversity in the scope of such projects, as well as their role and the contribution that they provide to the development of REDD+ at national and international level, is now more evident. This was reflected during the meeting in the quality of the discussions, which were more concrete, more focused and less centred on objectives and aspirations. The meeting also contributed to identifying more clearly the difficulties in implementation that REDD+ projects partners are facing, including in terms of political and institutional issues. Projects were encouraged to be proactive in working with other partners and processes, sharing experiences and providing feedback to the European Commission through the EU Delegations.

A new ENRTP call for proposals (Thematic Programme on Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources including Energy) was announced. The call for proposals focuses on three areas: climate change mitigation, in particular REDD+; biodiversity; and forest governance and FLEGT. The deadline for submission of the concept notes is 25 September 2012. More information is [available online](#).

Thanks to all those who participated in the meeting.

Annex I - Agenda

Tuesday 3 July 2012

8.00-9.00 Welcome coffee and registration of participants

9.00-9.30 Welcome/objectives of the meeting/lessons from last meeting - Mathieu Bousquet, DG Devco

9:30-10:00 Tour de table

10:00-10:30 Presentation from EC - Jacob Werksman, DG Clima

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

Chair: Mathieu Bousquet

11:00:12:30 First round of projects presentations and clarification questions

- Developing community carbon pools for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) projects in selected ASEAN countries
- Opportunities and challenges to developing REDD+ benefit sharing mechanisms in developing countries
- Gobernanza ambiental para evitar la deforestación y promover la conservación de los bosques en la Amazonia colombiana
- Réduction de la déforestation et de la dégradation dans le Massif Forestier de Ngoyla-Mintom (N-M) par la mise en œuvre d'une gestion durable intégrée dans le cadre du paysage tri-national Dja- Odzala – Minkebe (TRIDOM)
- Conservación de Bosques y Desarrollo Comunitario Sostenible para la mitigación del cambio climático
- UN-REDD Programme
- EU REDD Facility, European Forest Institute

12:30-14:00 Break for lunch

Chair: Valérie Merckx

14:00-16:00 Second round of projects presentations and clarification questions

- Amazonia viva – Conservación y valorización participativa del bosque y sus servicios ambientales
- Sustainable Forest Management and Rural Livelihood Enhancement through Community Forestry and REDD Initiatives in Cambodia
- PIPDEFA (Programa integrado de proteção e desenvolvimento das florestas costeiras angolanas)
- Reducción de las tasas de deforestación y degradación de los bosques nativos en Chile y Argentina
- Gestión sostenible para la conservación de dos reservas de biósfera en la Cuenca Amazónica (Perú y Ecuador) mediante la reducción de Emisiones de CO₂ por Deforestación y Degradación de Bosques (REDD)
- Gestão Sustentável dos Recursos Florestais no Parque Natural dos Tarrafes de Cacheu
- Sustainable Management of Peatland Forests in South East Asia
- Pilot effective models for governance and implementation of REDD+, in Small Islands Developing States to provide equitable benefits for forest-dependent local and indigenous people

16:00-16:30 Coffee break

Chair: Julia Falconer

16:30-17:00 Update on REDD+ programs from EU Member States and Norway

- GIZ
- Norway

17:00-17:30 FLEGT-REDD presentation and debate – Christophe Van Orshoven, EU REDD Facility

17:30-17:45 Introduction to day 2: breakout groups

17:45-19:00 Drinks reception at Borschette

Wednesday 4 July 2012

09:00-10:30 Regional breakout groups session

Group 1 Asia Pacific. Moderator: Christophe van Orshoven, EU REDD Facility

Group 2 Latin America. Moderator: David Sanmiguel Esteban, DG Devco

Group 3 Africa. Moderator: Valérie Merckx, EU REDD Facility

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-12:30 Thematic breakout groups session 1

Group 1 [Measuring REDD+ performance \(MRV\)](#). Moderator: Frédéric Achard, Joint Research Centre.
Presenter: Michael Bucki, DG Clima

How does your project contribute to the design of/provide input to monitoring systems for REDD+ at national level (both carbon and safeguards-related)? How is information generated at project level? How is this information being transferred to and used at the national level?

What are the lessons learned on MRV? What is proving more challenging, carbon or non-carbon MRV? What are the lessons learned on community involvement in MRV?

Is there coordination at project level on MRV? Is there a strategy in place at national level to promote such coordination?

Group 2 [Land tenure and local land planning processes](#). Moderator: Carl Frosio, EU Delegation Cameroon. Presenter: Augusta Molnar, Rights and Resources Initiative

Are stakeholders clearly identified? Do all relevant stakeholders have the capacity to participate and influence, and if not what are the bottlenecks? What possibilities do stakeholders have to influence and feed into national REDD+ policy development. What mechanisms exist that they can make use of?

How does your project promote local dialogue and stakeholder engagement?

12:30-14:00 Break for lunch

14:00-15:30 Thematic breakout groups session 2

Group 1 [Local dialogue/stakeholder engagement](#). Moderator and presenter: Indra Van Gisbergen, FERN

How is the project addressing land tenure issues and tenure insecurity?

Is REDD+ an appropriate tool to bring issues related to tenure to the national and international agenda, or is actually posing additional threats to tenure security and indigenous peoples and communities access to land? How can experience gathered at project level contribute to tackling issues related to land tenure at national level?

What are the concrete challenges and problems, and what can be done to address them?

Group 2 [Financing sustainable land use to address the drivers of deforestation and degradation](#). Moderator: Giampiero Muci, EU Delegation Sierra Leone. Presenter Kate Dooley, FERN

Public and private banking institutions invest considerable resources to support low emission development strategies for agriculture, infrastructures and energy. Are REDD+ projects positively or negatively affected by these investments, and is there a dialogue? Were they consulted/did they have any impact on these investments?

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:30 Feedback from breakout groups and debate

17:30-18:00 Way forward/Evaluation and conclusion - Mathieu Bousquet, DG Devco

Annex II List of participants

ORGANISATION	SURNAME	NAME	E-MAIL ADDRESS
ACP Secretariat	VANEYNDE	Karla	karla@acp.int
Belgian Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment/ DG 5 Environment	HERTENWEG	Kelly	kelly.hertenweg@milieu.belgie.be
CIFOR	MOELIONO	Moira	m.moeliono@cigar.org
Consultant	SALA	Bernardo	bernardo_sala@yahoo.it
COSPE (Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti)	BARDELLI	Angela	bardelli@cospe-fi.int
Defensores de la Naturaleza	MARQUEZ	Javier	jmarquez@defensores.org.gt
Defensores de la Naturaleza	NUNEZ	Oscar	onunez@defensores.org.gt
Desarrollo Rural Sustentable - DRIS	RIOS	Renato	drislima@terra.com.pe
Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V.	GRASSMANN	Robert	robert.grassmann@welthungerhilfe.de
Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V.	KOMMNICK	Reni	reni.Kommnick@welthungerhilfe.de
European Commission - CLIMA	BUCKI	Michael	michael.bucki@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	BOUSQUET	Mathieu	mathieu.bousquet@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	BREUL-BUSSON	Sophie	Sophie.BREUL-BUSSON@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	FALCONER	Julia	julia.falconer@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	HARMEGNIES	Dimitri	dimitri.harmegnies@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	LE GRAND	Simon	simon.legrand@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	MORENO	Ana	ana.moreno@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - DEVCO	SANMIGUEL	David	David.sanmiguel-esteban@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - ENV	NOGARA	Federico	Federico.NOGARA@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - Research Executive Agency	BEROUD	Florence	florence.beroud@ec.europa.eu
European Commission - Joint Research Center	ACHARD	Frederic	frederic.achard@jrc.ec.europa.eu
European Delegation - Cameroon	FROSIO	Carl	Carl.FROSIO@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Djibouti	AVELLA	Nicoletta	Nicoletta.AVELLA@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Guatemala	ANTONELLI	Claudia	Claudia.ANTONELLI@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Russia	PIRKANNIEMI	Olli	Olli.PIRKANNIEMI@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Russia	ZURDO	Diego	Diego.ZURDO@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Sierra Leone	MUCI	Giampiero	Giampiero.MUCI@eeas.europa.eu
European Delegation - Sierra Leone	VAN PRAET	Stephan	Stephan.VAN-PRAET@eeas.europa.eu
European Forest Institute	MERCKX	Valerie	valerie.merckx@efi.int
European Forest Institute	TREVISAN	Alessandro	alessandro.trevisan@efi.int
European Forest Institute	VAN	Christophe	christophe.vanorshoven@efi.int

	ORSHOVEN		
European Investment Bank	MAYERHOFER	Eva	eva.mayerhofer@eib.org
Fauna and Flora International	ROSENGREN	Linda	linda.rosengren@fauna-flora.org
FERN	DOOLEY	Kate	kate@fern.org
FERN	VAN GISBERGEN	Indra	indra@fern.org
Forestales por el Desarrollo del Bosque Nativo	MEDINA	Fernando Ariel	arielmedina@bosquenativo.cl
GCCA Climate Support Facility	HARCHIES	Manuel	m.harchies@prospect-cs.be
GIZ (Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit)	RAGNA	John	ragna.john@giz.de
Global Environment Centre	YUNG	Chin Sin	chinsy@gec.org.my
Live and Learn Environmental Education	NELSON	Anjali	anjali.nelson@livelearn.org
Live and Learn Environmental Education	TARIVIUGE	Gina	gina.tari@livelear.org
Monte- Desenvolvimento Alentejo Central ACE	LISBOA BRANDAO DE MELO	Johana	joana.lx.bm@gmail.com
Norway's Mission to the EU	KROPELIEN	Knut	Knut.kroepelien@mfa.no
Oro Verde- Die Tropenwaldstiftung	MANNIGEL	Elke	emannigel@oroverde.de
Patrimonio Natural Fondo para la Biodiversidad y Areas Protegidas	GALAN	Francisco Alberto	agalan@patrimonionatural.org.co
Regional Community Forestry Training Centre for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC)	HOU	Kalian	kalian@recoftc.org
Rights and Resources Initiative	MOLNAR	Augusta	amolnar@rightandresources.org
UN-REDD Programme	ERIKSSON	Helena	helena.eriksson@un-redd.org
WWF - Central Africa Office	DEFO	Louis	ldefo@wwf.panda.org
WWF - Central Africa Office	KALAME FOBISSIE	Blese	bfobissie@wwfcarpo.org
WWF – Germany	KLEYMANN	Hermine	hermine.kleymann@wwf.de
WWF - Peru	SILVA BULLON	Ruth Esther	ruth.silva@wwfperu.org

Annex III List of EU delegations' REDD+ focal points

Africa		
Angola	Gabrio MARINOZZI	Gabrio.MARINOZZI@eeas.europa.eu
Benin	Hoa-Binh ADJEMIAN	Hoa-Binh.ADJEMIAN@eeas.europa.eu
Botswana	Tebogo MATLHARE	Tebogo.MATLHARE@eeas.europa.eu
Burkina Faso	Ronan PECHEUR	Ronan.PECHEUR@eeas.europa.eu
Burundi	Jurgen HEIMANN	Jurgen.HEIMANN@eeas.europa.eu
Cameroon	Carl FROSIO	Carl.frosio@eeas.europa.eu
Cameroon	Nicolas BERLANGA MARTINEZ	Nicolas.BERLANGA-MARTINEZ@eeas.europa.eu
Cameroon	Wim IMPENS	Wim.IMPENS@eeas.europa.eu
Cape Verde	Cristobal DELGADO MATAS	Cristobal.DELGADO-MATAS@eeas.europa.eu
CAR	Karla KRIEGER	Karla.krieger@eeas.europa.eu
Comores	Hubert GRANDJEAN	Hubert.GRANDJEAN@eeas.europa.eu
Congo Brazzaville	Marcel VAN OPSTAL (HoD)	Marcel.van-opstal@eeas.europa.eu
Congo Brazzaville	Nicole FISHER	Nicole.FISHER@eeas.europa.eu
Congo Brazzaville	Stephane SOURDIN	Stephane.SOURDIN@eeas.europa.eu
Djibouti	Nicoletta AVELLA	Nicoletta.AVELLA@eeas.europa.eu
Equatorial Guinea	Bernard DE SCHREVEL	Bernard.De-Schrevel@eeas.europa.eu
Equatorial Guinea	Alain HOUYOUX	Alain.HOUYOUX@eeas.europa.eu
Eritrea	Marc DE BRUYCKER	Marc.De-Bruycker@eeas.europa.eu
Ethiopia	Abu YADETTA	Abu.Yadetta@eeas.europa.eu
Ethiopia	Friedrich MAHLER	Friedrich.MAHLER@eeas.europa.eu
Ethiopia - African Union	Francoise VILLETTE	Francoise.VILLETTE@eeas.europa.eu
Gabon	Bernard DE SCHREVEL	Bernard.De-Schrevel@eeas.europa.eu
Gabon	Alain HOUYOUX	Alain.HOUYOUX@eeas.europa.eu
Gambia	Fausto PERINI	Fausto.PERINI@eeas.europa.eu
Ghana	Bart MISSINNE	Bart.MISSINNE@eeas.europa.eu
Ghana	Herve DELSOL	Herve.DELSOL@eeas.europa.eu
Guinea Bissau	James FALZON	James.FALZON@eeas.europa.eu
Guinea Bissau	Antonio CAPONE	Antonio.CAPONE@eeas.europa.eu
Guinea Conakry	Beatriz BETEGON RAMIRO	Beatriz.BETEGON-RAMIRO@eeas.europa.eu
Guinea Conakry	Silvia SEVERI	Silvia.SEVERI@eeas.europa.eu
Ivory Coast	Philippe LE BUSSY	Philippe.le-bussy@eeas.europa.eu
Ivory Coast	Didier NILS	Didier.NILS@eeas.europa.eu
Kenya	Thomas YATICH	Thomas.YATICH@eeas.europa.eu
Lesotho	Josephine KALINAUCKAS	Josephine.KALINAUCKAS@eeas.europa.eu
Lesotho	Laura LINDORO	Laura.LINDORO@eeas.europa.eu
Liberia	Carlos BATTAGLINI	Carlos-Adolfo.BATTAGLINI-MANRIQUE-DE-LARA@eeas.europa.eu
Liberia	Paula VAZQUEZ	Paula.VAZQUEZ-HORYAANS@eeas.europa.eu
Madagascar	Paolo CURRADI	Paolo.CURRADI@eeas.europa.eu
Madagascar	Delphin RANDRIAMIHARISOA	Delphin.RANDRIAMIHARISOA@eeas.europa.eu
Malawi	Kavalo MUTEMWE	Kavalo.mutemwe@eeas.europa.eu
Mali	Sylvie FONTAINE	Sylvie.FONTAINE@eeas.europa.eu

Mali	David MOGOLLON	David.MOGOLLON@eeas.europa.eu
Mauritius	Hubert GRANDJEAN	Hubert.GRANDJEAN@eeas.europa.eu
Mozambique	Ana MONGE	Ana.monge@eeas.europa.eu
Mozambique	Frank RIJNDERS	Frank.RIJNDERS@eeas.europa.eu
Namibia	Titus ENDJALA	Titus.ENDJALA@eeas.europa.eu
Niger	Rafael AGUIRRE UNCETA	Rafael.Aguirre-Unceta@eeas.europa.eu
Nigeria	Klaus GAUTSCH	Klaus.GAUTSCH@eeas.europa.eu
RDC	Filippo SARACCO	Filippo.SARACCO@eeas.europa.eu
RDC	Henri GOT	Henri.GOT@eeas.europa.eu
Rwanda	Diego ZURDO	Diego.ZURDO@eeas.europa.eu
Rwanda	Seraphine.MUKANKUSI	Seraphine.MUKANKUSI@eeas.europa.eu
Sao Tome	Bernard DE SCHREVEL	Bernard.De-Schrevel@eeas.europa.eu
Sao Tome	Alain HOUYOUX	Alain.HOUYOUX@eeas.europa.eu
Senegal	Anne SIMON	Anne.SIMON@eeas.europa.eu
Seychelles	Hubert GRANDJEAN	Hubert.GRANDJEAN@eeas.europa.eu
Sierra leone	Achim Ladwig	Achim.ladwig@eeas.europa.eu
Sierra leone	Giampiero MUCI	Giampiero.MUCI@eeas.europa.eu
Sierra leone	Stephan VAN PRAET	Stephan.VAN-PRAET@eeas.europa.eu
Somalia	Isabel FARIA DE ALMEIDA	Isabel.FARIA-DE-ALMEIDA@eeas.europa.eu
South Africa	Natalija DOLYA	Natalija.DOLYA@eeas.europa.eu
South Sudan	Massimiliano PEDRETTI	Massimiliano.PEDRETTI@eeas.europa.eu
Sudan	Alvaro ORTEGA APARICIO	Alvaro.ORTEGA-APARICIO@eeas.europa.eu
Tanzania	Baptiste BOBILLIER	Baptiste.BOBILLIER@eeas.europa.eu
Tchad	Madeleine ONCLIN	Madeleine.ONCLIN@eeas.europa.eu
Tchad	Pierre TRELLU	Pierre.TRELLU@eeas.europa.eu
Togo	Marc CASTERAN	Marc.CASTERAN@eeas.europa.eu
Togo	Stephane MEERT	Stephane.MEERT@eeas.europa.eu
Uganda	Jalia KOBUSINGE	Jalia.KOBUSINGE@eeas.europa.eu
Zambia	Chilambwe LWAO	Chilambwe.LWAO@eeas.europa.eu
Zimbabwe	Severin MELLAC	Severin.MELLAC@eeas.europa.eu
Asia Pacific		
Australia	Scott WYATT	Scott.WYATT@eeas.europa.eu
Bangladesh	Jorge NIETO REY	Jorge.NIETO-REY@eeas.europa.eu
Cambodia	Koen EVERAERT	Koen.EVERAERT@eeas.europa.eu
Cambodia	Michelle LABEEU	Michelle.LABEEU@eeas.europa.eu
Cambodia	Seth VAN DOORN	Seth.VAN-DOORN@eeas.europa.eu
China	Heidi HILTUNEN	Heidi.HILTUNEN@eeas.europa.eu
Indonesia	Thibaut PORTEVIN	Thibaut.PORTEVIN@eeas.europa.eu
Laos	Delphine BRISSONNEAU	Delphine.BRISSONNEAU@eeas.europa.eu
Laos	Baas BRIMER	Baas.BRIMER@eeas.europa.eu
Laos	Helene QUENTREC	Helene.QUENTREC@eeas.europa.eu
Malaysia	Viktorija KAIHALOVA	Viktorija.KAIHALOVA@eeas.europa.eu
Myanmar	Delphine BRISSONNEAU	Delphine.BRISSONNEAU@eeas.europa.eu
PNG	Martin DIHM (HoD)	Martin.dihm@eeas.europa.eu
PNG	Clement BOURSE	Clement.BOURSE@eeas.europa.eu
Philippines	Reynaldo CANCIO	Reynaldo.CANCIO@eeas.europa.eu
Philippines	Matthieu PENOT	Matthieu.PENOT@eeas.europa.eu

Solomon Islands	Juan Carlos HINOJOSA MARTINEZ	Juan-Carlos.HINOJOSA-MARTINEZ@eeas.europa.eu
Thailand	Delphine BRISSONNEAU	Delphine.BRISSONNEAU@eeas.europa.eu
Thailand	Sutthiya.CHANTAWARANGUL	Sutthiya.CHANTAWARANGUL@eeas.europa.eu
Vietnam	Thanh HOANG	Thanh.HOANG@eeas.europa.eu
Vietnam	Berenice MURAILLE	Berenice.MURAILLE@eeas.europa.eu
Latin America + Caribbean		
Argentina	Sylvain MANISSIER	Sylvain.MANISSIER@eeas.europa.eu
Barbados	Andre POU CET	Andre.POU CET@eeas.europa.eu
Belize	Richard VANDERHORST	Richard.VANDERHORST@eeas.europa.eu
Bolivia	Cesar MORENO	cesar.moreno@eeas.europa.eu
Bolivia	Monica RODRIGUEZ	Monica.RODRIGUEZ@eeas.europa.eu
Bolivia	Ivo Hoefkens	Ivo.Hoefkens@eeas.europa.eu
Brazil	Hans DORRESTEIJN	Hans.DORRESTEIJN@eeas.europa.eu
Brazil	Arnold JACQUES DE DIXMUDE	Arnold.JACQUES-DE-DIXMUDE@eeas.europa.eu
Brazil	Cristina CARVALHO	Cristina.CARVALHO@eeas.europa.eu
Dominican Republic	Lorenzo MARTELLI	Lorenzo.MARTELLI@eeas.europa.eu
Dominican Republic	Florence VAN HOUTTE	Florence.VAN-HOUTTE@eeas.europa.eu
Chile	Soledad SUAREZ	Soledad.SUAREZ@eeas.europa.eu
Colombia	Johny ARIZA MILANES	Johny.ARIZA@eeas.europa.eu
Colombia	Susana FERNANDEZ RODRIGUEZ	Susana.FERNANDEZ-RODRIGUEZ@eeas.europa.eu
Costa Rica	Florian LUETTICKEN	Florian.LUETTICKEN@eeas.europa.eu
Cuba	Predrag AVRAMOVIC	Predrag.AVRAMOVIC@eeas.europa.eu
Ecuador	Pedro PONCE	Pedro.PONCE@eeas.europa.eu
Ecuador	Rene BOSMAN	Rene.BOSMAN@eeas.europa.eu
El Salvador	Yolanda CATIVO VAQUERANO	Yolanda.CATIVO-VAQUERANO@eeas.europa.eu
Guatemala	Claudia ANTONELLI	Claudia.ANTONELLI@eeas.europa.eu
Guatemala	Claudia BARILLAS	Claudia.BARILLAS@eeas.europa.eu
Guatemala	Annelies VANWYMELEBEKE	Annelies.VANWYMELEBEKE@eeas.europa.eu
Guyana	Lindsay JONES	Lindsay.JONES@eeas.europa.eu
Haiti	Paul WEBBER	Paul.WEBBER@eeas.europa.eu
Honduras	Andre FACHE	Andre.FACHE@eeas.europa.eu
Honduras	Vanessa VALLADARES	Vanessa.VALLADARES@eeas.europa.eu
Jamaica	Pierre Luc VANHAEVERBEKE	Pierre-Luc.VANHAEVERBEKE@eeas.europa.eu
Mexico	Marie Paule NEUVILLE	Marie-Paule.NEUVILLE@eeas.europa.eu
Nicaragua	Maria MONGE	Maria.MONGE@eeas.europa.eu
Nicaragua	Sandra MEJIA	Sandra.MEJIA@eeas.europa.eu
Paraguay	Veerle SMET	Veerle.SMET@eeas.europa.eu
Peru	Tatiana GARCIA	Tatiana.GARCIA@eeas.europa.eu
Surinam	Peter MARIEN	Peter.MARIEN@eeas.europa.eu
Trinidad & Tobago	Solomon IOANNOU	Solomon.IOANNOU@eeas.europa.eu

Uruguay	Manuel FERNANDEZ QUILEZ	Manuel.FERNANDEZ-QUILEZ@eeas.europa.eu
Venezuela	Ginette ANGULO	Ginette.ANGULO@eeas.europa.eu
		-
Neighbourhood		-
Armenia	Ina IANKULOVA	Ina.IANKULOVA@eeas.europa.eu
Azerbaijan	Parviz YUSIFOV	Parviz.YUSIFOV@eeas.europa.eu
Belarus	Elena RAKOVA	Elena.RAKOVA@eeas.europa.eu
Georgia	Michel JAMBOU	Michel.JAMBOU@eeas.europa.eu
Georgia	Camilla ABERG	Camilla.ABERG@eeas.europa.eu
Moldova	Dagmar KALJARIKOVA	Dagmar.KALJARIKOVA@eeas.europa.eu
Russia	Olga KRYLOVA	Olga.KRYLOVA@eeas.europa.eu
Russia	Vladimir KORNEEV	Vladimir.KORNEEV@eeas.europa.eu
Ukraine	Jean-Francois MORET	Jean-Francois.MORET@eeas.europa.eu
Ukraine	Oleksander KLITKO	oleksander.klitko@eeas.europa.eu
Ukraine	Gabriel BLANC	Gabriel.BLANC@eeas.europa.eu

Annex IV Evaluation

Summary

This evaluation is based on 35 questionnaires completed by meeting participants: 7 from EU Delegations, the European Commission or Member State representatives, and 28 from project beneficiaries or other invited people.

100% of the participants were satisfied or very satisfied with the meeting (66% and 34% respectively) and found it responded to their objectives.

The overall evaluation of the first day of the meeting was positive or very positive (between 91% and 97%), while 3-9% responded negatively. Most participants (91%) found the EC presentation very helpful in gaining a better understanding of EU policies. However the evaluation also indicates that there is still room to improve on showing the links between projects and EU policy, both on REDD+ and more broadly.

Most participants (93%) found the project presentation and clarification session positive or very positive. Nonetheless some participants would have liked more information about practical experience on the ground as well as a different grouping of project presentations, to facilitate discussion among carbon-related projects and separate discussions on more general projects. The evaluation also demonstrated that project presentations could be improved by using better communication tools and by devoting more time to exchange of experience.

The second day was perceived as positive and very positive (61% and 35%, respectively).

The geographical breakout groups were considered as the most useful part of the meeting according to the participants. The feedback from breakout groups and wrap-up sessions was also very appreciated and valuable (96% and 4%, respectively). Inviting finance experts as well as other organisations and experts who work on REDD+ specifically, was also recommended for future meetings.

More detailed feedback is provided in the rest of this section.

Detailed results of the evaluation

	Very negative	Negative	Positive	Very positive
Overall satisfaction with the meeting			66%	34%
Did it respond to my objectives?			86%	14%
Tuesday morning : Presentation from EC		9%	61%	30%
Tuesday morning/afternoon : projects presentations and clarification questions		5%	71%	22%
Tuesday afternoon : Update on REDD+ programs from EU and Norway / FLEGT-REDD presentation and debate		3%	78%	19%
Geographical Breakout groups		4%	48%	48%
<i>Africa</i>			60%	40%
<i>Asia - Pacific</i>			37%	63%
<i>Latin America</i>		8%	46%	46%
Thematic group on MRV		8%	76%	16%
Thematic group on land tenure		5%	54%	41%
Thematic group on Stakeholders engagement		7%	57%	36%
Thematic group on finance		5%	73%	22%
Wednesday afternoon : Feedback from thematic and geographical groups and debate			96%	4%

1. What part of the meeting was most useful to you?

- Geographical breakout groups (8)
- Thematic sessions (5)
- Networking & interaction (5)
- Project presentation (4)
- Other experience (3)
- Finance (3)
- Session on tenure rights (3)
- Wrap up (2)
- EC presentation (2)
- Key note in breakout groups (2)
- Flegt & Redd (2)
- MS update
- Ability for projects to share information with each other and with policy matters is very valuable

2. Are there issues of importance to you that were not addressed? How could we improve the meeting?

- Not so much information on the difficulties encountered by projects.
- Identify prior to the meeting specific questions to address in the working group.
- Create a platform of exchange of information of Redd+ projects.
- Keeping project implementers up to speed with UNFCCC status in more detail
- Scaling up REDD activities-> how to feed back into administrative level
- Economies of scales could be further discussed

- More on how REDD builds on payment for environmental services and earlier forest sectorial interventions
- More technical issues related to remote sensing, sampling design, ...
- Divide projects between REDD+/carbon and those more general to ease discussion
- Financing costs of avoided deforestation
- More info on practical experience on the ground
- More time for project presentations
- More for understanding positions of different parties of UNFCCC
- More feedback from final beneficiaries (to be involved?)
- Involving private sector players linked to the drivers of deforestation (mostly linked to the global market for key commodities); to be addressed in future meetings, involving EU agencies promoting multilateral agreements on economic development and market strategies.

3. Comments related to logistics, organisation and invitations

- Very good (7)
- Invitations to be sent at least 2 months in advance (7) for visa application
- Great idea to include all presentations on the memory sticks
- Circulate detailed agenda before
- Satisfaction total, well done
- Appreciated the offer made to allow us to travel long distance
- Congratulations for the logistics
- All in all very well organised
- Well organised and time schedule miraculously respected!

4. Usefulness of translation

21 persons found it useful, while 5 did not find it useful. 9 persons did not answer that question.

Other related comments :

- Translation was perfect and a very useful idea
- Easier to work in English only

5. Final recommendations

On project presentations (which generated a number of comments):

- Open space/market place for lessons learned/best practice
- Avoid a whole day of project presentation
- Follow up and continue exchange between projects
- More time for exchange of experience (2)
- To absorb project presentation, enforce more strongly that the template is adhered to
- Use communication (film, photos,...) to make it more lively
- Do all projects need to present? 50% in 2013 and 50% in 2014?
- More thought needed on how to best structure project presentation sessions to get some more in-depth learning on how projects are going in different thematic areas

On other topics

- Prepare "country updates" to feed national processes
- Clarify links between projects & EU policy on REDD
- Get feedback on the EU's assessment of the REDD process and the coherence of its policy
- A presentation really technical to strengthen capacities (MRV, FPIC)
- Bring finance experts
- Less topics, more in-depth
- Invite other organisations that work specifically on REDD+ (not EU funded) to share their experience and provide balance view
- Thank you (6)

On follow up

- Organise this event next year as well
- Explain more clearly how the findings of this year will be used
- Meeting next year to be focused on real practical experience on ground – too much discussion centered around international debates and procedures
- Have a summary on how the discussion themes evolve over time (differences from last year)

This report was prepared by David Sanmiguel Esteban (European Commission), and Agustina Grossi, Edith A. Johnson, Alessandro Trevisan and Christophe Van Orshoven (European Forest Institute).

Cover photos courtesy of Tom Ter Horst and Niina Verkerk, European Forest Institute.