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Notes on the study:

• **Aim**: inform the deliberations of decision makers and other stakeholders in the countries and participating institutions on how FLEG has been addressed since the SPD

• **Focus**: mapping of national SPD implementation by the ENPI FLEG program partner countries and the international society, identifying substantive results achieved

• **Conduct**: analysis of ENPI FLEG documentation and other available secondary data, complemented with limited interviews of key informants and a survey of the ENPI FLEG Focal Points (all except the Russian Federation Focal Point responded to the survey)

• **Product**: Summary report and seven Country Notes
Mapping of SPD implementation:
For the mapping the 11 national-level SPD commitments were organized under the following five thematic areas:

1. Political commitment, legislation and regulations (SPD 1 and 2)
2. Institutions and capacity development (SPD 3)
3. Strategies and actions to address the underlying causes of Illegal logging and associated trade (SPD 4, 5 and 8)
4. Stakeholder rights, participation and engagement (SPD 6 and 7)
5. Information, awareness and transparency (SPD 9, 10 and 11)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National SPD commitments</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AZ</th>
<th>BLR</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>RU</th>
<th>UK R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political commitment, legislation and regulations (SPD 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions and capacity development (SPD 3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies and actions to address the underlying causes (SPD 4, 5 &amp; 8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder rights, participation and engagement (SPD 6 &amp; 7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, awareness and transparency (SDP 9, 10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions:

• All of the seven ENPI FLEG countries have, to a varying degree, implemented activities in all five thematic areas, and achieved at least intermediary results.

• In relatively few cases there has been significant, large scale implementation of actions on the ground that could be expected having so far resulted in concrete reduction of illegal logging and related trade.

• This may indicate that the country strategies for ENPI FLEG, and for FLEG in general, have not sufficiently considered how to build the bridge towards large-scale implementation and successful sector-level reform, and that there have been strong counteracting forces.
Conclusions:

• The engagement with the local communities and the emphasis on local community rights for forest use has been a significant feature in many of the ENA FLEG country programs.
• This has introduced new approaches and concepts and enabled the voices of the local communities to be better heard in forest governance related processes.
• Considerable progress has also been made in promoting stakeholder dialogue at different levels, and in pilot-level implementation of actions involving local stakeholders.
Conclusions:

- More emphasis has been given to the G (governance) than the LE (law enforcement) of FLEG.
- This indicates that in the country programs more priority is given to addressing the underlying causes of illegal logging and associated trade (prevention), and in taking a long-term view of the issue, than in directly combating this phenomenon (detection and suppression).
- Overall, there seems to have been some reluctance to engage in “hard action” (i.e. action involving law enforcement and the criminal justice system, or actions directed to customs control).
- This lack of hard FLEG focus may have somewhat diluted the impact of the program on illegal logging and related trade, at least in the short-term.
Recommendations:
Regarding the need for and targeting of external support:
• The vastly different resources and national capacities of the SPD partner countries need to be kept in mind in defining the appropriate strategies and assessing the need for and usefulness of external support.
• The countries with an important commercial forest sector can best be supported e.g. by uniform enforcement of the EUTR in the EU MS, and through political dialogue and scientific cooperation.
• The smaller countries with low forest cover, low economic significance of the forest sector in the national economy, and low institutional capacities are likely to require continued external support.
Recommendations:
The appropriate FLEG strategies are also likely to be very different from country to country:

• In countries where the commercial forest sector is nationally important in terms of industrial output, trade and employment, the institutions are strong and have a sufficient mandate, a sectorally focused approach to FLEG makes sense also in future.

• In counties where forests contribute mainly to local livelihoods and biodiversity conservation FLEG can best be addressed in the context of sustainable land management, conservation of biodiversity/high-value forest areas, rural development, energy policies, climate change etc.