



Forests Monitor/FFI project:

Strengthening forest management in post-conflict Liberia

Report on a training workshop
Monrovia 24-29 March 2008

Table of Contents

Acronyms	3
Executive summary	4
Training program	7
Detailed account of training activities	7
Day 1 - Theory	7
Day 2 – Technical skills	7
Day 3 – Fieldtrip	8
Day 4 – Scenario exercises	8
Day 5 – Scenario exercises presentations	10
Problems encountered	10
Participant’s feedback	11
Conclusions of participant’s feedback	13
Issues identified by participants and recommendations by Forests Monitor	13
1. Support and motivational measures for FDA field officers	13
2. Public access to information	14
3. Document access by EPA and FDA law enforcement agents	15
4. Penalties for disclosing confidential business information	15
5. Clarification of the relationship between different units within FDA	15
6. Equipment	16
Further conclusions and recommendations by FM	16
7. Training	16
8. Enthusiasm	19
9. Transition to a Chain of Custody System	19
10. Ambiguity in NFRL 2006	20
13. Legal ambiguities related to community rights	20
Summary of conclusions and recommendations	21
Annex – Course agenda	24

Acronyms

CoC	Chain of Custody
ELI	Environmental Law Institute
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FDA	Forestry Development Authority
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
FLED	Forest Law Enforcement Department
FM	Forests Monitor
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
IM-FLEG	Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance
LFI	Liberia Forest Initiative
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NFRL 2006	National Forestry Reform Law of 2006 ¹

¹ Download from http://faolex.fao.org/cgi-bin/faolex.exe?rec_id=067626&database=FAOLEX&search_type=link&table=result&lang=eng&format_name=@ERALL

Executive summary

This report provides a summary of a 5-day training course delivered by Forests Monitor (FM) to key Forestry Development Authority (FDA) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) agents and NGO representatives, on 24-29 April 2007, together with key findings and issues raised by participants and a set of FM's own recommendations for future action. This training was supported by Fauna and Flora International (FFI) as part of the organisation's EU-funded Liberia forest programme. It was preceded by a preparatory visit to Liberia in October 2007, which involved meetings between FM and key stakeholders at FDA, EPA and civil society groups in order to conduct a training needs assessment and develop a plan for delivering the training described in this report. The full training needs assessment report – which also includes broader observations by FM in relation to future forest law enforcement in Liberia - can be downloaded from www.forestsmonitor.org

The training program received very positive feedback from the participants, and the main comment was that more training is needed, both in terms of time and the number of FDA staff and NGOs included. Important issues raised by participants included issues of personal and job safety when investigating illegal activities, corruption by higher level officials, and the ambiguity of the NFRL 2006 on aspects such as public access of forestry sector information for civil society monitoring and the rights of communities over forest resources.

Forests Monitor's main conclusion is that in terms of realistic law enforcement, **Liberia is not ready to re-start commercial logging**. Despite attempts to put in place checks and balances (e.g. LiberFor CoC) there is a real risk that illegal logging will begin again in earnest. FDA staff do not have the equipment or the skills, many of the laws are unclear and ambiguous, especially with regards to forest use permits, community rights, and transparency and public access to forest-related information by civil society. Furthermore, the role of LiberFor will be critically undermined by running the system in parallel with the 'legalised' checkpoint/CoC system currently in place for pit-sawn wood.

FM recommends that before commercial forestry re-starts: a community forestry law is finalised and approved, the current system for taxing and transporting pit-sawn timber outside of LiberFor control is stopped, and that forest use permits are defined in more detail in the law. Most importantly, FM recommends that the capacity for law enforcement of the FDA is significantly improved in order to be able to cope with industrial logging, and that an Independent Monitor is set up in Liberia to help ensure legality in the forestry sector and to provide ongoing technical support to FDA FLED officers.

FM thus strongly recommends that international donors express support for Liberia's interest in setting up an independent monitor of forest law enforcement and governance and provide urgent political, technical and financial support for taking this process forward in the short term.

Conclusion	Recommendation
<p>1. For FLED agents to effectively carry out their mandate, they must feel that it is safe to do so. This safety is not currently perceived by FDA staff</p> <p>There is fear amongst FDA FLED officers of losing their job if it doing their job well means ‘rustling too many feathers’</p>	<p>That steps are taken to increase safety for FLED agents, such as police backup during missions in case of trouble, and that a ‘hotline’ is set up where FDA officials who are victims of corruption by officials at higher levels can denounce this situation</p> <p>That incentives and motivational measures are instilled to change create a better work culture over the long term</p>
<p>2. Existing rules governing transparency of FDA information are unclear and spread over many different laws and regulations. This hinders ease of access to civil society and the public in general</p>	<p>That a website is set up containing all concession documents that are not confidential business information, as well as the Chain of Custody database which is a public record</p>
<p>3. It is difficult for EPA & FDA field agents on the ground (e.g. during surveillance missions) to get hold of pertinent FDA documents quickly, such as concession maps, contracts, and forest management plans</p>	<p>That the MoU between EPA and FDA be amended to ensure the fluid exchange of information, and that a more direct channel for FDA & EPA agents to obtain documents is set up, e.g. via a focal point assigned to deal with this type of information requests</p>
<p>4. Disclosing ‘confidential business information’ by FDA is punished under Penal Code, but there is no clear definition of what constitutes ‘confidential business information’. However, no penalties are detailed in the law for FDA officials failing to comply with requirements for transparency.</p> <p>This, when combined with lack of clarity in the law regarding transparency poses the risk of resulting in a culture of secrecy</p>	<p>That FDA puts on a website all concession documents that are not confidential business information to take away the responsibility from individual law enforcement agents to decide what constitutes confidential business information</p> <p>That ‘confidential business information’ is clarified in the law, and that FDA agents are duly informed</p>
<p>5. It is not always clear how different parts of FDA with law enforcement roles work together</p>	<p>That FDA adopts an over-arching strategy for law enforcement, which clarifies exactly what the roles of different parts of FDA are i.e. the Law Enforcement Division, Commercial Forestry Department, LiberFor, and how they are to work together</p>
<p>6. The level of capacity needed within FDA to effectively carry out law enforcement in a setting with major industrial logging in Liberia does not exist at present.</p>	<p>That additional, longer workshops are rolled out for central as well as provincial FDA FLED staff</p> <p>That these workshops are part of a 6-month scoping mission to Liberia aimed at developing a proposal or ToR’s for a call for tender for the implementation of a permanent Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement</p> <p>That an Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement is set up in Liberia, with the view to (among other things) provide in-house technical assistance to FDA in forest law enforcement</p>
<p>7. There is genuine enthusiasm and a positive attitude to learning amongst FDA FLED and EPA staff, as well as a will to conduct effective forest law enforcement in Liberia</p>	<p>That further capacity building is secured for FDA FLED staff <i>as soon as possible</i>, to capitalize on this attitude and build a strong law enforcement division before commercial forestry starts</p>
<p>8. It is expected that the new LiberFor SGS chain of custody system will run in parallel with the existing FDA ‘chain of custody’ system for taxing pit-sawn wood being transported around the country for domestic use</p>	<p>That urgent actions are taken by FDA and LiberFor to ensure that legal commercial logging is not allowed to re-start while the current system for taxing and transporting pit-sawn timber outside of LiberFor control continues</p>

	That LiberFor/SGS refuse to begin the operation of the official CoC system until this issue has been resolved, on the basis that to do so would be a potential breach of contract and may even be illegal according to the spirit if not the letter of the National Forestry Reform Law
9. There are serious ambiguities in the NFRL 2006, especially with regards to forest use permits, community rights, and transparency and public access to forest-related information by civil society	That these ambiguities are resolved in order to reduce the risk of illegal logging that they will entail
10. The NFRL 2006 places communities at a disadvantage in the context of commercial forestry	That an adequate community forestry law is passed before industrial operations re-start, to ensure a transparent and participatory forest management process where communities have a real say over the use of their land

Training program

The training had three core elements:

1. Two days of classroom teaching in Monrovia, including a brief introduction to laws and regulations relevant to forest law enforcement, training on relevant equipment, and training on procedures/processes for detecting, recording & reporting illegal logging cases;
2. One day of field exercises for practicing these skills, which took place in a rubber plantation in Kle, between Monrovia and Tubmanburg.
3. Two days of mixed-group work on four detailed hypothetical enforcement scenarios. At the end of the two days the results of each scenario were presented by one group and then critiqued and discussed by all.

This last part of the course included the FDA support staff (legal, GIS, CoC) and members of 5 Liberian NGOs. In addition to practicing skills learned during the course, the scenarios also had the additional aims of:

- Fostering collaborative working practices amongst the three main stakeholder groups;
- Highlighting potential issues in relation to resources, skills, regulations or procedures which may hinder effective enforcement in future; and
- Developing recommendations for how identified constraints might best be tackled

Detailed account of training activities

Day 1 - Theory

Morning presentations in this first day included the global context to illegal logging and associated trade, as well as a presentation of the work of the Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (IM-FLEG) in Cameroon. Three detailed case-studies of illegal logging in Cameroon were also presented, to give participants a better 'feel' for the types of illegalities that may start taking place in Liberia once commercial forestry begins again. The case studies were chosen on the basis of relevance to the Liberian forestry sector.

The afternoon session focused on the new National Forestry Reform Law of 2006 (NFRL 2006), FDA 10 core regulations, the code of harvesting practices and LiberFor Standard Operating Procedures. Focus was placed on the aspects of these laws/procedures that are of immediate relevance to the forest law enforcement agent in the field.

Day 2 - Technical skills

The morning session covered basic GPS use, with a presentation followed by a practical session where participants were sent out in groups with a GPS receiver to map the compound around the classroom, and create a track of their itinerary. Trainers moved from group to group providing help and answering questions. The GPS session was followed by a digital photography session, which also included a presentation and a practical exercise. Photographs taken by participants during the practical session were projected onto a screen, analyzed and feedback given on their quality.

The timber scaling session included four exercises scaling timber from drawings on a handout. Again, one-to-one help was given to participants to calculate volumes and explain the relevant formulae. The investigative techniques and report writing sessions that followed were theoretical, and their practical component took place during the fieldtrip on Day 3. The investigative techniques session focused on all steps of an investigation, from mission planning (logistics, desk-based research, and types of documents to gather in advance) to aspects in the field (interview techniques, methodology to collect information, use of checklists, GPS and photography, and recording information) to the return to the office (conducting additional checks, logging data and report writing, transmitting information and following up).

Day 3 – Fieldtrip

The purpose of the fieldtrip was to practice the technical skills learned during Day 2. The fieldtrip took place in the rubber plantation Gordon Farm, located in Kle, between Monrovia and Tubmanburg. Transport was provided by the FDA bus. Participants were divided into groups and each group was given a GPS receiver, a digital camera, and a measuring tape. Tasks included scaling timber in the form of logs and in sawn planks, taking photographs of the timber (including with tape measures and GPS devices to record evidence of scale and location), marking waypoints, and taking field notes. On return to Monrovia, the groups were tasked with writing up (on flip-chart sheets) a short summary report of the field exercise findings. Feedback on the field exercises and reports was provided direct to each group by the trainers.

Day 4 – Scenario exercises

Days 4 and 5 of the workshop included additional participants from FDA headquarters and from civil society (the needs assessment conducted by FM in 2007 noted that local NGOs had already received training equivalent to that provided in Days 1-3 of this course). Participants were divided into four mixed groups that included a good balance of stakeholders and skill areas.

A presentation and examples were given to the groups on how the scenario exercise would work. To begin with, only a very small amount of information was provided on each scenario – the location, date, initiating agency, and immediate observations. The groups had to conduct appropriate checks and ask relevant questions, and were then drip-fed additional answers by the trainers, slowly working their way through the scenario in order to establish all of the relevant illegalities, while also considering what constraints might have existed had such an investigation occurred in reality.

All of the groups worked through all four scenarios, but in a different order. Each group's findings in relation to each scenario were written up on flipcharts according to a prescribed format. At the end of the analysis period, each group would be tasked with presenting their results on one of the scenarios.

The four scenarios were carefully designed to cover all the various types of illegalities likely to be encountered (e.g. illegal transport/harvesting/export/processing; illegalities by concessionaires, millers, or corrupt officials; illegalities related to road construction, the environment and social obligations; and so on) and to ensure that all of the knowledge and

skills taught over the previous three days would come in to play at some point. Each scenario included multiple illegalities and had multiple levels of complexity. Each was presented as having been 'initiated' by a different agency – one by EPA, one by FDA headquarters, one by FDA field officers and one by civil society.

Scenario 1

Initiated by an NGO and focused on a community whose traditional lands were subject to commercial logging. This scenario raised the issues of adequate execution of social agreements as well as monitoring of the whole process by FDA; adequate representation of the affected community by elected representatives; the amount of compensation paid by companies to communities and who in the community benefits from this compensation. Other issues addressed were the access restriction imposed to communities by logging companies to forest areas where operations are taking place, which restricts their access to food resources. This issue is further complicated by the fact that the NFRL 2006 Section 11.3 provides for compensation but does not specify how exactly how it should take place.

Discussion of this scenario highlighted potential problems NGO and community representatives might have in investigating illegalities in relation to community rights, particularly with regard to field access and transparency of information. The scenario also exposed a lack of clarity regarding responsibilities within FDA for enforcement of community-related requirements within commercial forestry agreements. Questions were also raised about how community rights-related aspects of the law could be enforced in the near term when the existing regulations lack clarity and a broader community rights law which may interact with existing regulations is still being drafted.

Scenario 2

Initiated by the EPA during a routine check, this scenario involved determining the exact causes of a flooded logging road, the sedimentation and siltation of a nearby river, together with the death of aquatic life. Participants had to apply their knowledge of the road construction guidelines in the Code of Harvesting practices, as well as investigation techniques in order to think about how to obtain necessary information whilst in the field (e.g. interviewing road construction crews). The scenario stressed the need to examine ultimate as well as proximate causes and to conduct a full suite of checks. In this case further checks (interviews, consulting concession documentation such as permits and maps of active blocks and approved road networks) would establish that the poorly constructed logging road had been built illegally by the concessionaire in a part of the concession not yet licensed for logging.

By requiring co-operative efforts between EPA and FDA, the scenario also explored information sharing between EPA and FDA to facilitate EPA's environmental controls in logging concessions.

Scenario 3

The third scenario was initiated by regional FDA officers during a check of a logging truck intercepted in a major road. It involved transport of timber registered in the Chain of Custody System but with an incomplete waybill, as well as the transport of hidden, unlabelled timber i.e. outside of the CoC. This scenario allowed participants to practice all

the checks required on a timber truck as well as truck seizure procedures. One important aspect was that after the illegal timber on the truck was discovered and volumes calculated, participants were expected to launch an in-depth investigation to determine the exact origin of the unlabelled timber, back to the point of cutting. This second part of the scenario was often initially missed by participants, possibly reflecting that for many of them launching a full investigation is either not part of their mandate, not possible due to a lack of resources and capacity, and/or not considered necessary given that one infraction had already been detected. It may also be part of a perceived necessity to not 'rustle too many feathers', and to the way Liberia's forestry sector has been conducted in the recent past (see issues and recommendations section below for more on this issue). Most participants agreed with and seemed enthusiastic about the need to carry out full investigations.

Scenario 4

This scenario was initiated by headquarter-based FDA agents. A container at the port of Monrovia is discovered to contain timber that has been mis-declared as scrap metal. This scenario dealt with issues of inter-agency cooperation, tracking the exporting company and ultimately the timber producer, which is found to be sourcing the timber from a Forest Use Permit without complying with the exploitation conditions outlined in the NFRL 2006 for this type of permit. It further highlights the ambiguous way in which FUPs are defined in the NFRL 2006 and hence how they may become a conduit for illegal exploitation, as has been the case with 'small permits' in places such as Cameroon.² This scenario also addressed the issue of corruption, and during discussion exposed potential problems regarding the operation of the LiberFOR chain of custody system for commercial timber for export in parallel with the existing checkpoint system for pit-sawn wood for domestic use (see issues and recommendations section below).

Day 5 – Scenario exercises presentations

During the last day participants finished completing the scenarios and each group was assigned to present one of the four scenarios, indicating which specific checks they carried out, the analysis they conducted, the result of these checks and analysis, the infractions identified and suspected, where possible accompanied with the exact section of the law that was violated, and finally to present wider and more complex issues that came up during the scenario. At the end of each presentation there was a time for questions and discussion. The audience generally provided constructive criticism on the way scenarios were conducted by other participants and asked for clarification on various points. This was a good opportunity for different agencies and NGOs to hear their different points of view and communicate.

Problems encountered

There were no major disruptions to the delivery of the workshop. The venue that FFI/FDA had originally chosen for the workshop was cancelled the day before the workshop, but FFI/FDA were able to find at short notice an appropriate substitute at the YWCA headquarters. Power was available when requested and there were no power cuts, equipment (printer, projector, screen) were all provided by FFI promptly when asked.

² REM Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance in Cameroon, Report No. 031, http://www.rem.org.uk/documents/OI_Rapport_031NA.pdf

Participant's feedback

1. Most useful session

The sessions that participants named as the most useful were the scenario exercises (roughly 30%), followed by report writing (22%) and investigative techniques (8%). Around 10% of the participants found all sessions useful, and the rest named sessions such as GPS use, field exercise and case tracking.

2. Least useful session

Approximately 50% of the participants found that all sessions were useful and that no session qualified of 'least useful'. Around 30% of the participants qualify some of the sessions as 'least useful'. These included GPS (2 participants), either because that person was already proficient in GPS or because the time allowed for GPS training was not enough. Three participants found the log scaling part of the training the least useful, but these were FDA officers already trained in scaling. The presentations on legislation were also mentioned as least useful by 3 participants. Interestingly, one of these participants mentioned the presentation on timber transport legislation as least useful, because the Commercial Forestry Department will not allow people from the Conservation Department to monitor their activities. This is further discussed in the section on 'Issues identified by the participants'. Around 15% did not answer this question.

3. Depth in which topics were covered

Thirty-seven per cent of participants thought that most sessions had been covered in enough depth, while 31% felt that more detail should have been provided on some of them. Twenty-five per cent of participants did not answer this question.

4. Amount of time allocated to each session

The majority of participants (60%) thought that not enough time was allocated to each session. The main reasons mentioned were that in general the training should have lasted for more than 5 days (lengths of time from 2 weeks to 2 months were suggested). Specific sessions where it was mentioned that more time should have been allocated include GPS training, report writing, scenario exercises, and question and answer sessions at the end of each presentation, among others. Thirty-four per cent of participants thought that enough time had been allocated to each session, and 6% did not answer this question.

5. Balance of presentations, practical exercises and discussion

Ninety-one per cent of participants thought FM had achieved a good balance between the presentations, practical exercises and the discussion, and the remaining 10% did not answer the question. Some comments that were made included that practical aspect of this course needed at least one more day but that the discussions were "fantastic". Additionally, one EPA agent expressed a desire to know more about the role that EPA will have in forestry.

6. Amount of time allowed for discussion

Seventy per cent of participants thought that enough time had been allowed for discussion, and 25% that it had not. The rest did not answer.

7. Additional training needs related to forest law enforcement that were not addressed

Fifty per cent of participants said that they had additional training needs that had not been addressed in this workshop, although not all of them specified what these needs were. Aside from additional training on the topics covered by the course, participants also noted a need for training on Liberian protected areas and wildlife conservation (by one FDA agent), trans-border trade, and trade in non timber forest products and bushmeat. Some NGO participants also expressed a desire either for the full training to be delivered to them, or a refresher course focused on practical skills, to test their current knowledge. One FDA agent mentioned that training was needed in “other techniques, formatting and approaches”.

8. Suggestions for improving the training workshop, or suggested topics for future workshops

The strongest response was that more training time is needed (26%), either for all the sessions or specifically for GPS, scenario exercises, question and answer sessions at the end of theory presentations, investigative techniques and case tracking sessions. One participant suggested training on “stock maps and area map investigation”, referring to the requirement that logging operators must have very accurate block maps of their concessions, and that FDA has a mandate to inspect these block maps. Interpreting these block maps requires additional skills. Although FDA agents are not required to draw these maps, these skills are necessary for FDA agents to effectively inspect the quality of the maps, or use them confidently to discover illegalities. Other suggestions included repeating the full training for NGOs.

Other important suggestions made were that equipment be handed over to FDA at the end of the workshop, and that the training course be repeated at each of the four FDA law enforcement regional offices, so as to encompass a broader range of regional field staff. People suggested that the following topics were included in future workshops: Code of Harvesting Practices, Social Agreements, as well as Conservation, Education, protected area management and biodiversity monitoring (all of these put forward by two FDA participants). Another interesting suggestion was that the scenario exercises be repeated in the form of a field exercise, which probably reflects the need for an independent body to guide and provide technical advice to FDA agents on their investigations, at least until they reach a certain level of expertise. Additionally, that a follow-up course is given to measure the “impact” of this course and test skills learned after participants have had some time to apply them.

Roughly 15% of participants said that they had no suggestions for improvement, 12% said they had suggestions but did not specify what these were, and about 10% did not answer this section.

Conclusions of participant's feedback

Generally feedback was very good. Due to the constraints related to the training, which required that it cover a broad range of agencies and job-roles and a broad range of different skills and information, it was inevitable that some parts of the training would be of limited usefulness to some participants, either by being known to them already or by being of little relevance to their specific role. This was noted in the needs assessment recommendations. In general this problem was minimised, and most of the training was useful to most of the participants – certainly all gained something new from it. It is also worth noting that having a few participants already knowledgeable in specific areas was beneficial, in that these individuals were well placed to assist their fellow trainees during the relevant practical sessions, providing support to the FM trainers.

Indeed, if anything the clearest message from the feedback was a desire for more training – both additional training and practice time for the existing participants, and the rolling out of similar training to additional representatives of the main stakeholder groups, particularly FDA field staff. Again, it was expected following the needs assessment that ideally more time would be allowed and more participants covered, but this is all that was provided for under the original contract. Nevertheless, an incredible amount was packed into a small space of time, and though the course was fast-paced, tiring and intensive, no significant over-runs occurred and the participants stayed focused and kept up well.

The other strong message from the feedback was the particular value attached to the scenario exercises. The scenario exercises were particularly effective in challenging participants to apply theoretical skills and technical knowledge to real-life situations, which are inevitably more complex than anything which can be re-created in field exercises. The value of this was particularly strong since the years of maladministration and war, followed by the logging moratorium, have meant that few of the participants have practical experience of conducting investigations.

Issues identified by participants and recommendations by Forests Monitor

During the course of the workshop, especially during the discussion sessions, participants raised issues relevant to the training itself and to their future role as enforcers of the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006. These issues are highlighted below, alongside FM's own conclusions and recommendations.

1. Support and motivational measures for FDA field officers

Participants expressed concern for their safety when investigating illegal activities in remote locations, especially if they have to deal unarmed with armed logging operators. Participants did not seem reassured when it was pointed out that section 18.16a of the NFRL 2006 specifically bans the employment of armed security personnel to work in or around an area

under a Forest Resources License, reflecting a lack of trust that the provisions of the new law will be effective on the ground.

Many participants also expressed the fear of losing their jobs if they decided to continue an investigation after having received orders from their superiors to stop. This was perceived as a major impediment to conducting their work. They were concerned about a potential lack of support, where they get put in a situation where they don't feel able to do their jobs.

It is hoped that the broader reform process currently underway in Liberia will reduce the chances for armed conflicts between logging operators and FDA field officers. Nevertheless we recommend that steps are taken to increase personal safety for FLED agents. For example agents should be able to call the police (not the military) for backup during field missions. More importantly, however, we recommend that a set of support mechanisms for FDA field officers is put in place which will give them the confidence to stand up for themselves in such situations, and which makes them feel that not only should persisting in doing their job not cause them career problems, but on the contrary that successful enforcement actions will benefit their careers.

FM recommends setting up a 'hotline' managed by an external body – i.e. not related to FDA - where FDA officials who are victims of corruption by officials at higher levels can denounce this situation. This hotline would have to be matched by measures to ensure that safety of the denouncing officials, both personal and job safety, is guaranteed. Changing the prevailing culture of fear of losing one's job if it uncovers corruption and/or collusion by colleagues and superiors will prove one of the biggest challenges to ensuring that agents within the FDA and other agencies in government work well. A possible strategy to create a better work culture over the long term could involve bonuses and prizes, to help ensure that the positive motivation to conduct effective enforcement outweighs any potential misgivings.

2. Public access to information

NGO participants highlighted the fact that if an NGO needs access to a certain document it first has to put in a formal request and that the NFRL 2006 or its regulations do not specify how long this can/should take. The existing rules governing transparency of FDA information are unclear and spread across a number of different laws and regulations. This lack of clarity could make it difficult to obtain information while making it relatively easy for officials to find excuses for failing to supply it.

FM recommends that FDA put on a website all concession documents that are not considered confidential business information, as well as the Chain of Custody database which is a public record (Regulation 108-07, Part 6, Section 61), so as to allow immediate and easy access to civil society. Rules regarding transparency of FDA information should also be consolidated, clarified and strengthened within the regulations, including for example the specific timelines on which FDA staff or holders of Forest Resources Licenses must reply to requests by members of civil society seeking to obtain information on CoC or investigate a forest resources license (NFRL 2006, Regulation 108-07, Part 7, Section 71b,c)

3. Document access by EPA and FDA law enforcement agents

It is difficult for EPA & FDA field agents on the ground (e.g. during surveillance missions) to get hold of pertinent FDA documents quickly, such as concession maps, contracts, and forest management plans. Participants mentioned that EPA & FDA agents wanting to get hold of these documents must put in a request that goes to the FDA Managing Director, who must give authorization for the information to leave his office. This process can take a long time, and therefore may hinder the efficient enforcement of environmental laws.

A participant from the NGO sector suggested that there should be a more direct channel for FDA & EPA agents to obtain important documents, for example via a focal point assigned to deal with this type of information requests. FM supports this recommendation, and suggests that the MoU between EPA and FDA be amended to ensure the fluid exchange of information.

4. Penalties for disclosing confidential business information

The NFRL 2006 specifies that it is an offense punishable under the Penal Law as economic sabotage for an agent or employee of the FDA to release confidential business information protected under Section 18.15, c of that Law. One of the participants pointed out that it is therefore potentially very risky for an FDA official to give away company information to the general public or anyone wishing to obtain information on logging operations (following sections 61 and 71 of FDA core regulation No. 108-07), and when asked, most participants were not confident that they knew exactly what constitutes 'confidential business information'. On the other hand, no penalties are detailed in the law for FDA officials failing to comply with requirements for transparency.

There is a real risk that the lack of clarity in the law regarding transparency, when combined with the imbalance in terms of penalties for illegally withholding or divulging information, will result in a culture of secrecy.

Following our recommendation number 3, if FDA puts on a website all concession documents that are not confidential business information, this takes away the responsibility from individual law enforcement agents to decide what constitutes confidential business information. Furthermore, FM recommends that 'confidential business information' is clarified in the law, and that FDA agents are duly informed.

5. Clarification of the relationship between different units within FDA

There was a sense that it is not clear how different parts of FDA with law enforcement roles work together. For example, a participant from FDA pointed out in the end-of-course questionnaire that our session on timber transport (outlining requisites and checks for legal transport) was least useful, because 'those who are in the Commercial [Forestry] Department will not allow Conservation Department staff to monitor their activities'. Another participant mentioned that there is currently little communication between LiberFor staff and FDA FLED staff, which highlights the fact that it should not be

automatically assumed that an increase in capacity in LiberFor staff will translate into increased capacity within FDA FLED.

FM recommends that FDA adopts an over-arching strategy for law enforcement, which clarifies exactly what the roles of different parts of FDA are i.e. the Law Enforcement Division, Commercial Forestry Department, LiberFor, and how they are to work together especially obligations on information exchange / transparency.

6. Equipment

One of the issues identified by FM during its scoping visit to Liberia in October 2007 was the lack of equipment (GPS kits, cameras and measuring equipment) available to FDA and EPA, and the danger that even if equipment was made available to them after the training, the knowledge acquired would be lost in the interim.

Participants re-iterated these concerns regarding equipment capacity and pointed out that without the necessary equipment the training would be of little value. After the workshop FFI agreed to purchase six (6) sets of equipment, one for each of the four FDA regional offices in Liberia, and two extra sets for FDA law enforcement division headquarters in Monrovia. Each set includes one GPS receiver, one waterproof digital camera, rechargeable batteries and chargers, tape measures, and calculators. The equipment was delivered to FDA by FFI in July 2008.

Further conclusions and recommendations by FM

The following are a set of conclusions and recommendations made by FM, in addition to the issues already identified and detailed in the FM scoping mission report of October 2007³.

7. Training

The training successfully introduced participants to monitoring of forest law enforcement and governance, and gave a 'flavour' of the skills that they should have. Participants were very satisfied with its content and the way it was delivered (see section 'Conclusions on Participant's'). However it is clear that one week is not enough to make a serious contribution to forest law enforcement capacity within FDA and EPA.

Liberia is at the verge of re-starting industrial logging operations. A new and quite comprehensive forestry law which gives importance to sustainable management practices has been passed, and there is a will to have a more transparent and controlled logging industry. A Chain of Custody system of unprecedented thoroughness in Africa has been designed and is likely to be implemented. However, it is clear from our experience in this workshop that the level of capacity needed to match and support those new structures does not yet exist in the FDAs Law Enforcement Division. With their current level of skills FDA FLED agents are not in a position to effectively carry out law enforcement in a setting with major industrial logging. This is essential for the serious implementation of the NFRL 2006 and for Liberia to even consider entering VPA negotiations in the context of FLEGT.

³The scoping mission report can be downloaded from www.forestsmonitor.org

Therefore, there is a need for further, in depth training in the topics covered in this workshop, as well as in basic numeracy and writing skills. In depth training should involve extensive practice with real investigations, so that FLED agents are able to deal with the complexity of illegal logging.

In the following sections we put forward three options for how this training may be delivered, together with our recommendations on what format of training may work best in Liberia.

Modify the length of the current workshop

The length of this workshop could be modified to last 2-3 weeks, or alternatively to consist of two one-week workshops, where the first one will be similar to the workshop presented in this report, and the second would take place two or three months later. In the interim period participants would be tasked with conducting real-life investigative missions and writing field reports. The second workshop would then examine the participant's work in detail, providing feedback on the reports written but also on the investigation methodology, and answering technical questions (GPS, photography, etc.) that are likely to only arise in the field.

This training could be extended to the four FDA regional offices (Sectors 1 to 4) to include more law enforcement field staff. With regards to the participants that already took place in the workshop, a follow up workshop could be carried out in the near future.

Permanent technical help to FDA

In addition to the extra workshops mentioned above, a technical expert in Forest Monitoring techniques could be based within the FDA to provide assistance to the forest law enforcement division (FLED) staff during the next months/years. FDA needs support to effectively face the many new challenges that the start of commercial forestry will entail. It is important that technical support is provided at least in the beginning of this process, to form a solid capacity base and build confidence.

It could be that Forests Monitor recommends that this technical advisor be separate from any Independent Forest Monitors that may be set up in Liberia in the future. From FM's experience, teachers cannot be monitors when there is an existing logging industry and where relationships are already established with logging operators. This is due to the nature of interpersonal relationships and the fact that an agent that is criticised by an Independent Monitor for doing its job in a non-satisfactory way tends to be unwilling to receive technical advice from this same monitor.

Independent Monitor

However, right now and in the near future (2-3 years), given that the logging industry is only starting, there is a strong possibility that permanent technical help to FDA could be successfully provided by an Independent Observer based in Liberia. Given that Liberia is a small country, there would be ample opportunity for skills transfer during joint field missions between the Independent Monitor and FLED staff all over the country, so would be

the case during regular reading committees, where the Independent Monitor and the government meet to discuss mission reports. The Independent Monitor could criticise FDA procedures, decisions by higher management, lack of follow up on specific cases, highlight evidence of corruption etc., while at the same time having a good relationship with individual staff. Furthermore, the Liberian Independent Observer could have a built-in element of capacity building for government staff, so that training is delivered in more ways than just as a 'spill over' effect of undertaking joint missions and reading committees.

FM recommendations on future training

In the light of all of the above, and considering the FDA's Managing Director's letter of interest in that an Independent Observer is set up in Liberia⁴, **FM strongly recommends that international donors express support for Liberia's interest in setting up an independent monitor of forest law enforcement and governance and provide urgent political, technical and financial support for taking this process forward in the short term.**

In order to carry this out, FM recommends that the following steps are taken:

1. Undertake a 6 month scoping study, with the aim to:
 - Coordinate and liaise with the Liberia Forest Initiative (LFI) to avoid duplicating any work
 - Carry out 2 or 3 punctual training workshops as outlined above, consisting of a first session of the same format to the one presented in this report, followed by an interim period where participants and FM carry out field missions, and a second, follow up workshop to provide feedback on mission reports
 - Experience one complete cycle of mission execution, report writing, administrative and judiciary follow-up of mission results, publication of mission reports, in order to 'test' the Liberian environment
 - Based on the experiences above, feed into the design of a longer term Independent Monitoring Project (e.g. 3 years). This will allow important questions to be addressed, such as who should be the target of training (e.g. FDA officials only, civil society, EPA), and what are the different levels of training required across different sectors of the country/different institutions
 - Get to know regional FDA staff as well as civil society actors and EPA staff with an environmental law enforcement mandate
2. Draft a proposal: the result of this 6 month period would be a detailed proposal for a future Independent Monitor to be set up in Liberia by FM
3. Alternatively, another outcome of this 6 month period would be the identification of potential funders for an Independent Monitor in Liberia, followed by the drafting of Terms of Reference for a call for tender, produced by FM in conjunction with the Liberian government.

⁴ Letter dated October 15, 2007, by FDA Managing Director Hon. John T. Woods addressed to Stuart Wilson, FM Director, expressing that 'the Forestry Development Authority would also like to further explore the options for putting in place a form of Independent Monitoring to support the government's forestry reform program' and beckoning FM and its partner organization REM to 'seek support from the international donor community to determine the basis for consulting further with the FDA and civil society in Liberia with the view of devising a project [of Independent Monitoring] for long term collaboration'.

8. Enthusiasm

We conclude that among our workshop participants there is genuine enthusiasm and a positive attitude to learning. There also seems to be a will to conduct effective forest law enforcement in Liberia. Most participants were actively engaged in learning and contributed to group discussions.

We recommend that further capacity building is secured for FDA FLED staff *as soon as possible*, to capitalize on this attitude and build a strong law enforcement division before commercial forestry starts. It is important, to keep enthusiasm levels high, that measures to motivate staff are introduced (e.g. incentives mentioned in section 1) and that mechanisms are put in place to allow staff to bypass corrupt superiors (also see section 1). If corruption starts preventing people from doing their law enforcement jobs, this enthusiasm could be very rapidly dissipated.

9. Transition to a Chain of Custody System

It is clear based on FM's discussions with FDA course participants and with other relevant officials that it is expected that the new LiberFor SGS chain of custody system will run in parallel with the existing FDA 'chain of custody' system for taxing pit-sawn wood being transported around the country for domestic use. FM's previous understanding had been that the current status quo, where laws against pit-sawing are not enforced and the resultant timber actually taxed and provided with paperwork during transport, was to be a temporary measure halted once legal logging was re-started and legal supplies of timber were available. Yet it now seems this is not to be the case. There is no timetable to phase out the pit-sawing or to halt the system of taxing and legalising it during transport, yet neither is it intended that the SGS/LiberFor system be expanded to include this wood. Instead the existing system will be allowed –indefinitely - to run in parallel with the LiberFor CoC system for timber from licensed concessions.

In FM's view, this will serve to **fundamentally undermine** the ability of the LiberFor CoC system to ensure legality in the commercial timber sector. The core logic behind the independent LiberFor CoC system is that by making it impossible for commercial logging companies to transport or sell illegal timber or for corrupt officials to assist them, the incentive to log illegally is removed. Yet with the parallel system for pit-sawn timber still in place, all of LiberFor's carefully designed and highly technical procedures of barcoding, computer databases and so on could be worthless. A commercial logging operator involved in logging illegally inside or outside its concession could simply transport the stolen timber to market within the existing pit-sawn CoC system, which lacks independent oversight and is full of holes. Though it is true that an illegal logger would still be faced with the challenge of exporting timber harvested and transported outside of the LiberFor system, this would leave the whole system dependent on the effectiveness of controls at the port – something that recent cases of illegal export suggest may be rather optimistic.

Forests Monitor strongly recommends that urgent actions are taken by FDA and LiberFOR to ensure that legal commercial logging is not allowed to re-start while the current system for taxing and transporting pit-sawn timber outside of LiberFor control continues. Forests Monitor also recommends that LiberFOR/SGS refuse to begin the operation of the official

CoC system until this issue has been resolved, on the basis that to do so would be a potential breach of contract and may even be illegal according to the spirit if not the letter of the National Forestry Reform Law.

10. *Ambiguity in NFRL 2006*

Forest Use Permits

Forest Use Permits (FUPs) are not clearly defined in the NFRL 2006. Section 5.5(c) of this law lists the type of commercial use FDA is allowed to issue FUPs for. These are: the production of charcoal, tourism, research and education, 'wildlife-related activities', harvest and use of non-timber forest products, as well as 'harvest of *small amounts of Timber for local use within the County or community*' (Section 5.5(c) v). Furthermore, in section 5.5(f) the law restricts the issuance of FUPs to various classes of persons, including 'residents of a particular county or district'. The law is vague with two respects. Firstly, it does not clearly define what constitutes a 'small' amount of timber, leaving its definition entirely open. Secondly, it does not define what a 'resident' is, potentially enabling persons from another area taking advantage of a FUP. These issues do not seem a big problem at first sight, after all these permits are only 1,000 ha, a small area compared with the FMCs which can reach 400,000 ha. However experience elsewhere demonstrates that timber extraction from 'small' permits can reach monumental proportions. For example it has recently been discovered that timber exploitation from 1,000 ha permits in Cameroon (called Authorisations de Récupération du Bois, or ARB), now produce more than 600 000m³ of timber per year, and are now the second source of timber after industrial concessions⁵. Therefore the ambiguities in FUPs in the current NFRL 2006 are potentially opening the door for large volumes of timber being exploited for commercial, non- local use, as well as diminishing their capacity to conserve forest resources, which is one of the intended uses of FUPs (NFRL 2006, section 5.5(b)).

Seizing procedures

There is no clear provision under the NFRL 2006, nor in the FDA 10 core regulations of what the exact procedures are for FDA law enforcement agents when faced with the need to seize machinery such as a truck carrying unlabelled timber. This is a problem as it means that law enforcement officers do not have clear guidelines on how to act when confronted with a situation when seizure is needed, and may result in the seizure not taking place as the officer does not have the confidence that he or she is taking appropriate actions.

13. *Legal ambiguities related to community rights*

In the NFRL of 2000 separated forest resources from forest lands, by stating that all forest resources in Liberia were the property of the Republic. This means that the government or those whom the government sells utilisation permits can exploit forest resources regardless of the legal customary landowner's wishes (Fern, 2008). The coming into being of the NFRL 2006 has not changed the legislative status of customary lands, and the government has the right to use Liberia's forestland as it sees fit. It does not recognise pre-existing customary interests in Liberia's forests (Fern, 2008).

⁵ http://www.observation-cameroun.info/documents/OI_Rapport_077.pdf

Section 10.1 of the NFRL 2006 (titled 'Community empowerment') places a duty on FDA to use regulations to, amongst other things, establish mechanisms for informed participation, access, and capacity building to ensure equitable participation and benefit sharing, as well as to grant user and management rights to local communities. It also gives FDA the duty to present to the legislature a community rights law in respect of forest lands. However, there is no timeframe for the creation of these regulations, so that in fact FDA could focus on regulations related to commercial activities to start logging, whilst not developing regulations related to community rights and participation (Fern, 2008). Furthermore, there is in the end no guarantee under NFRL 2006 that those regulations or other measures will yield true control to communities over forest resources (Fern, 2008).

The NFRL 2006 maintains the government in control of forest resources, and it means that forest-dependent communities without deeded entitlement will have no recourse to compensation when forest resources are depleted (Fern, 2008).

Under NFRL 2006, 30% of land rental fees are to be given to communities entitled to benefit sharing under forest resources licenses; as well as signed social agreements alongside FMC and TSC contracts. However land rental fees are likely to be low relative to stumpage fees, and there is no indication on how this benefit would be shared to maximise benefits to the whole community (Fern, 2008).

With regards to social agreements, communities have no veto over logging on customary land and do not have the control over the basic traits of those contracts (e.g. rents due, responsibilities and conduct of the concessionaire). Therefore, unless communities have parity in bargaining power it is unlikely that social agreements will ensure the benefits and participation that NFRL states it aims for (Fern, 2008).

A community rights law is currently being drafted in Liberia by a multi-stakeholder committee created for this end.

A major reform of Liberian law, particularly with regards to customary land tenure, is a pre-requisite for a fairer industrial logging industry. This reform would require legislation to provide security of tenure to communities over their customary lands and to reform the institutional landscape to ensure a genuinely participatory forest governance structure from the community level up, amongst other things (Fern, 2008).

Summary of conclusions and recommendations

Forests Monitor's main conclusion is that in terms of realistic law enforcement, **Liberia is not ready to re-start commercial logging**. Despite attempts to put in place checks and balances (e.g. LiberFor CoC) there is a real risk that illegal logging will begin again in earnest. FDA staff do not have the equipment or the skills, many of the laws are unclear and ambiguous, especially with regards to forest use permits, community rights, and transparency and public access to forest-related information by civil society. Furthermore, the role of LiberFor will be critically undermined by running the system in parallel with the 'legalised' checkpoint/CoC system currently in place for pit-sawn wood.

FM recommends that the following is done before commercial forestry re-starts: that community forestry law is finalised and approved, that commercial logging is not allowed to re-start while the current system for taxing and transporting pit-sawn timber outside of LiberFor control continues, and that forest use permits are defined in more detail in the law. FM also recommends that an Independent Monitor is set up in Liberia, not only to ensure legality in the forest sector in the long term, but also to provide much needed technical help to FDA FLED officers in their duties, and to build their capacity.

Conclusion	Recommendation
<p>1. For FLED agents to effectively carry out their mandate, they must feel that it is safe to do so. This safety is not currently perceived to exist by FDA staff</p>	<p>That steps are taken to increase safety for FLED agents, such as police backup during missions in case of trouble, and that a 'hotline' is set up where FDA officials who are victims of corruption by officials at higher levels can denounce this situation</p> <p>That incentives and motivational measures are instilled to change create a better work culture over the long term</p>
<p>2. Existing rules governing transparency of FDA information are unclear and spread over many different laws and regulations. This hinders ease of access to civil society and the public in general</p>	<p>That a website is set up containing all concession documents that are not confidential business information, as well as the Chain of Custody database which is a public record</p>
<p>3. It is difficult for EPA & FDA field agents on the ground (e.g. during surveillance missions) to get hold of pertinent FDA documents quickly, such as concession maps, contracts, and forest management plans</p>	<p>That the MoU between EPA and FDA be amended to ensure the fluid exchange of information, and that a more direct channel for FDA & EPA agents to obtain documents is set up, e.g. via a focal point assigned to deal with this type of information requests</p>
<p>4. Disclosing 'confidential business information' by FDA is punished under Penal Code, but there is no clear definition of what constitutes 'confidential business information'. However, no penalties are detailed in the law for FDA officials failing to comply with requirements for transparency.</p> <p>This, when combined with lack of clarity in the law regarding transparency poses the risk of resulting in a culture of secrecy</p>	<p>That FDA puts on a website all concession documents that are not confidential business information to take away the responsibility from individual law enforcement agents to decide what constitutes confidential business information.</p> <p>That 'confidential business information' is clarified in the law, and that FDA agents are duly informed</p>
<p>5. It is not always clear how different parts of FDA with law enforcement roles work together</p>	<p>That FDA adopts an over-arching strategy for law enforcement, which clarifies exactly what the roles of different parts of FDA are i.e. the Law Enforcement Division, Commercial Forestry Department, LiberFor, and how they are to work together</p>
<p>6. The level of capacity needed within FDA to effectively carry out law enforcement in a setting with major industrial logging in Liberia does not exist at present.</p>	<p>That additional, longer workshops are rolled out for central as well as provincial FDA FLED staff.</p> <p>That these workshops are part of a 6-month scoping mission to Liberia aimed at developing a proposal or ToR's for a call for tender for the implementation of a permanent Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement</p> <p>That an Independent Monitor of Forest Law Enforcement is set up in Liberia, with the view to (among other things) provide in-house technical assistance to FDA in forest law enforcement</p>

<p>7. There is genuine enthusiasm and a positive attitude to learning amongst FDA FLED and EPA staff, as well as a will to conduct effective forest law enforcement in Liberia</p>	<p>That further capacity building is secured for FDA FLED staff <i>as soon as possible</i>, to capitalize on this attitude and build a strong law enforcement division before commercial forestry starts</p>
<p>8. It is expected that the new LiberFor SGS chain of custody system will run in parallel with the existing FDA 'chain of custody' system for taxing pit-sawn wood being transported around the country for domestic use</p>	<p>That urgent actions are taken by FDA and LiberFor to ensure that legal commercial logging is not allowed to re-start while the current system for taxing and transporting pit-sawn timber outside of LiberFor control continues.</p> <p>That LiberFor/SGS refuse to begin the operation of the official CoC system until this issue has been resolved, on the basis that to do so would be a potential breach of contract and may even be illegal according to the spirit if not the letter of the National Forestry Reform Law</p>
<p>9. There are serious ambiguities in the NFRL 2006, especially with regards to forest use permits, community rights, and transparency and public access to forest-related information by civil society</p>	<p>That these ambiguities are resolved in order to reduce the risk of illegal logging that they will entail</p>
<p>10. The NFRL 2006 places communities at a disadvantage in the context of commercial forestry</p>	<p>That an adequate community forestry law is passed before industrial operations re-start, to ensure a transparent and participatory forest management process where communities have a real say over the use of their land</p>

Annex – Course agenda

Liberia Illegal Logging Enforcement Training Workshop

Monrovia
24th – 29th April, 2008

COURSE OUTLINE

Content	Persons	Time Required
DAY ONE - Theory		
Registration – 8.30am		
Session 1 – 9.00am – INTRODUCTION TO ILLEGAL LOGGING		
Chair: SAM LAWSON		
<u>Presentation 1 - Introduction to Course</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intro to Forests Monitor & trainers - Intro to FFI' broader project - Outline of goals of training - Description of course agenda - Introduce initial questionnaire - Question & Answer 	Sam Lawson, Earthsight	20 mins
Participants to Introduce themselves	SAM to facilitate	20 mins
Distribution, Completion & Collection of Initial Questionnaire	ANDREA to facilitate	20 mins
<u>Presentation 2 - Global Context</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global problem of illegal logging & associated trade - Scale of problem, countries affected - Types of illegal logging – modus operandi / typology - Corruption - Organised Crime - Question & Answer 	Sam Lawson, Earthsight	30 mins
COFFEE 10.30 am - 20 mins		
Session 2 – 11.00 am – CASE STUDIES FROM CAMEROON		
Chair: ANDREA		
<u>Presentation 3 – Independent Monitoring in Cameroon</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of REM's experience with independent monitoring in Cameroon - Question and answer 	Andrea, FM/REM	30-40 mins
<u>Presentation 4 – Illegal logging case studies from Cameroon</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - details of range of case studies encountered by REM during monitoring in Cameroon - including range of modus operandi - followed by question and answer session 	Andrea, FM/REM	30-40 mins

LUNCH		
12.30 pm - 60 mins		
Session 3 – 1.30 pm – LIBERIAN FOREST LAWS & REGULATIONS		Chair: SAM LAWSON
<u>Presentation 5 – Background on Liberian Forests & Logging</u>	Sam	15 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - background on Liberia’s forests - history of logging in Liberia; examples of illegal logging - recent reforms / current status of forest/timber use (moratorium etc, recent concession allocation) - likely development path over next few years (what can expect to see) – role of SGS/Helveta; FLEGT; IFM 		
<u>Presentation 6 – The National Forestry Reform Law</u>	Sam	20 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - main aspects of National Forestry Reform Law, 2006 - list of principle infractions, and associated penalties - inc requirements related to communities 		
<u>Presentation 7 – Concession allocation</u>	Andrea	15 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - summary of concession allocation procedures to be followed - update on current status on concession allocation 		
<u>Presentation 8 – Pre-felling requirements</u>	Andrea	20 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - summary of regulations regarding pre-felling - eg community consultation; preparation of felling plans; licenses required etc 		
<u>Presentation 9 - Rules governing harvesting</u>	Andrea	25 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - defined in Code of Harvesting practices - Minimum diameters; log marking/tagging; maximum slopes; cutting near rivers; road building and maintenance; timber dragging procedures etc 		
COFFEE		
3.00 pm - 20 mins		
Session 4 – 3.30 pm – TIMBER TRANSPORT		
<u>Presentation 10 – Rules governing timber transport</u>	Andrea	30 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rules and regulations for timber transport & export defined in CoC regulation - detailed presentation of procedures involved in SGS/Helveta system 		
<u>Question and Answer / Discussion</u>	SAM to facilitate	30 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participants to share any additional experiences of dealing with illegal logging cases or handling legal timber/logging - Discussion of best practice, modus operandi – what other aspects have not been mentioned? 		
Wrap up of Day One –	SAM to facilitate	15 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Summary of Discussions - Re-cap on what taught - Outline of next day’s course - Opportunity for questions 		

	- Housekeeping		
DAY TWO – Practical Skills			
Session 1 – 9.00 am – GPS		Chair: SAM LAWSON	
	Introduction / Outline of plan for the day	Sam	10 mins
	<u>Presentation 11 – GPS</u> - basic introduction to use of GPS devices	Andrea, FM	25 mins
	<u>Exercise – practice with GPS devices</u> - GPS devices handed out for participants to try out - simple task provided to participants (eg go outside, log and record 4 GPS points at corners of building - have to tailor to situation)	ANDREA to facilitate	40 mins
	Question and Answer	SAM to facilitate	10 mins
COFFEE 10.30 am - 20 mins			
Session 2 – 11.00 am – CAMERAS & DATA LOGGING			
	<u>Presentation 12 – Digital Photography</u> - basics of photography – framing, focus, exposure - purpose of photography in FLE - what to photograph / how to photograph it (examples)	SAM	35 mins
	<u>Exercise – practice with cameras</u> - battery / memory card insertion - turn on, frame, focus - focusing off-centre - photographing documents - turning flash on/off - reviewing and on-camera editing	SAM to facilitate	30 mins
LUNCH 12.30 pm - 60 mins			
Session 3 – 1.30 pm – TIMBER SCALING & INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES			
	<u>Presentation 13 - Scaling timber</u> Process for measuring volumes of logs, lumber Techniques for quickly estimating timber volumes	Sam Lawson, Earthsight	15 mins
	<u>Exercise – Scaling timber</u> Participants split into small groups (eg 2-3 persons) Photocopied hand-outs with scenarios, and groups have to estimate volumes in each scenario Sam then presents the correct answers	SAM to introduce & facilitate	40 mins
	<u>Presentation 14 – Investigative Techniques</u> Mission planning, logistics, making sure you have the right materials, methodology for doing an investigation. Dealing with informants, interviewing techniques, networking with communities; document types; data logging and recording	ANDREA to present	30 mins
	Question & Answer		
COFFEE 3.00 pm - 20 mins			
Session 4 – 3.30 pm – REPORT WRITING & CASE TRACKING			

	Presentation 15 – Report Writing - purposes / audiences / types - general principles - main elements	ANDREA	20 mins
	Presentation 16 – Case Tracking - uses & value of case tracking system - basic aspects of case tracking		15 mins
	Wrap up of Day Two – - Re-cap on what taught - Outline of plan for field day – logistics, goals. etc - Division of participants into groups for field day - Opportunity for questions - Housekeeping	SAM to facilitate	30 mins
DAY THREE – Field Day			
Session 1 - 9.00 am – Field Trip			
	<u>Travel to field location</u>		1.5 hours
	<u>Field exercises</u> – taking notes; scaling timber; use of GPS; use of camera - in groups		2 hours
LUNCH 12.30 pm - 60 mins			
	<u>Return to Monrovia</u>		1.5 hours
	<u>Write up of field report</u> - in groups – write up in trip report format, with data collected in annexes		2 hours
REST DAY			
DAY FOUR – Reporting Back from Field / Scenario Exercises			
Session 1 – 9.00 am – Reporting back		Chair: SAM LAWSON	
	Introduction to the day – re-cap of what taught and purpose of course (for benefit of additional participants)		15 mins
	Additional participants (NGOs, other FDA) to introduce themselves		15 mins
	Presentation 18 – Scenario Exercise Introduction		20 mins
	<u>Scenario Exercises – Group Work</u>		45 mins
COFFEE 10.30 am - 20 mins			
Session 2 – 11.00 am – SCENARIO EXERCISES			
	<u>Scenario Exercises – Group Work</u>		90 mins
LUNCH 12.30 pm - 60 mins			
Session 3 – 1.30 pm – SCENARIO EXERCISES			
	<u>Scenario Exercises – Group Work</u>		90 mins

COFFEE 3.00 pm - 20 mins		
Session 4 – 3.30 pm – SCENARIO EXERCISES		
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Group Work	90 mins
DAY FIVE – Scenario Exercises (cont..)		
Session 1 – 9.00 am – SCENARIO EXERCISES		
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Group Work	90 mins
COFFEE 10.30 am - 20 mins		
Session 2 – 11.00 am – SCENARIO EXERCISES		
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Group Work	45 mins
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Presentation and Discussion – Scenario 1	45 mins
LUNCH 12.30 pm - 60 mins		
Session 3 – 1.30 pm – SCENARIO EXERCISES		
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Presentation and Discussion – Scenarios 2 & 3	90 mins
COFFEE 3.00 pm - 20 mins		
Session 4 – 3.30 pm – SCENARIO EXERCISES		
	<u>Scenario Exercises</u> – Presentation and Discussion – Scenario 4	45 mins
	Summary Discussion & Questions / Agreement on Next Steps & Important issues to be addressed	25 mins
	Course wrap-up, distribution and completion of questionnaires	20 mins