

Creating “The Lisbon Process”:

A Report on the FSC-WWF Lisbon Conference on Smallholder and Community-based Forestry Operations

7-10 May 2008

Executive Summary. On May 7th to 10th, 2008, a group of 60 FSC stakeholders gathered in Lisbon with four explicit purposes in mind:

1. To identify, discuss, and propose solutions for the obstacles that continue to face small, community-based, and indigenous forest operations, whether individually or within groups;
2. To compare the solutions to these problems that are being developed in different regions of the world;
3. To discuss with representatives of FSC and Accreditation Services International the solutions that might be most consistent with continued credible certification, at lower costs for these operators; and
4. To consider motions that might be submitted to the FSC 2008 General Assembly on behalf of these forest operations

The organization of the workshop reflected recent development in several parts of the global arena in which there have been energetic and comprehensive attempts to improve the access to the benefits of FSC certification on behalf of small-scale, community-based, and indigenous forestry operations, but without much connection or coherence across their efforts.

The meeting was originally designed for an estimated 25-to-30 participants; but the importance of the topic struck a chord in the FSC global network, and the workshop participation was closed out at 60 participants, with more than 20 of them paying their own way. The 60 participants came from 23 different countries, including 21 participants (one-third of the total) from the FSC South. Fifteen (one-fourth) were women. Roughly 10 represented forest products companies; about 13 represented FSC and WWF; six participants were from the funding community; and the remainder (about half) were from various forestry-related NGOs.

The agenda developed by a Steering Group was heavily participatory, with a) a pre-workshop survey of the most critical issues faced by these forestry operations (with results summarized in this report), b) a number of commissioned initial presentations on conditions faced by these operations in distinct regions of the world (available on the FSC ftp site), c) active, focused breakout sessions, and d) a

workshop-wide collaborative process to identify the most important actions needed to fulfill the goals of the meeting.

More than 15 working groups were identified and initial personal commitments were made to create them. They focused on topics ranging from improving market access for these kinds of operations to creating user-friendly information and a one-stop website for all the information needed on SLIMF certification, group certification, and the marketing of products from operations of this type.

Follow on activities completed shortly after the workshop included immediate action on extending the certification of small operations in France (with Tembec) and the production of an information guide (by Proforest, financed by WWF). Furthermore it was proposed to organise side events at the FSC General Assembly to maintain the momentum of the Lisbon Process.

Introduction and Summary. In early 2008 there emerged a recognition at the FSC and at a number of partner organizations that there was a growing need for a workshop to bring together several simultaneous, but distinct, new efforts to facilitate greater access to the benefits of FSC certification for small forest owners, such as “family forest” holders in the U.S., community-based forests in many parts of the world, indigenous forest holders, group certification participants, and others with relatively small and low-intensity forestry operations. The introduction of group certification in 1998 followed by the approval of streamlined procedures in 2004 for the certification of “small, low-intensity managed forests” have given opportunities to increase access to FSC certification for small operations. However, uptake on those approaches has been relatively slow to occur, and the difficulties and costs of FSC certification remain a major challenge for small-holders around the world. In the context of achieving key objectives in the FSC Global Strategy,

There are new efforts underway to incorporate these “marginalized” participants in the FSC system, including some in the U.S., in Europe, in Central America, and elsewhere worldwide. These efforts have enjoyed significant support from some major industry players who have found that they are unable to meet the burgeoning demand for FSC-certified products without being able to incorporate the millions of small-holders around the world. The different efforts, however, had had little communication. They were coming to FSC with a large number of disparate, but very interesting, proposals for making FSC certification available to this class of forest owners as quickly as possible. What seemed to be needed was a workshop-style meeting of representatives of these groups as early as possible in 2008 in order to provide an opportunity for sharing their perspectives and experiences, for discussing with FSC and ASI staff the obstacles they face, and for bringing greater strength and coordination to their efforts. This is the meeting which was held in Lisbon and which set in motion a new process for assisting smallholders, community-based forestry operations, and others, which we will call the “Lisbon Process” within the FSC.

Background. Mindful of the need to reappraise the functioning of the SLIMFs procedures and of the strategic importance of widening access to small operations within the FSC system, the FSC International Center had commissioned an evaluation of the SLIMFs Initiative. The preliminary results of this effort could be presented at the workshop that was proposed. At the same time, the potential and constraints of the wider FSC system, particularly group certification, need to be examined. Moreover the FSC Global Strategy, developed in 2007, has several explicit objectives related to small forest operations, namely:

Objective 1 (a) Indicator: 100% increase in certificates in small and medium forest enterprises within the total FSC portfolio leading to at least 15% of total area certified.

Objective 2(c). Local stakeholders, communities, and indigenous people have equitable access to the benefits of FSC certification. Indicators: Community, indigenous people and SLIMF's managed forests increase to no less than 15% of total certified area. FSC certification systems are more responsive to the needs of communities and indigenous peoples who control or manage forests, and lead to a substantial increase in their membership and participation in FSC certification.

Objective 2(d). FSC contributes to improving market access and serves to develop a wider range of benefits from certification for small scale, community based, and indigenous peoples operations. Indicator: Dedicated FSC programs and other partnerships exist to support and generate benefits for both forest managers in tropical regions, and for small and low intensity managed forests (SLIMF) and community certified operations around the world. Indicator: FSC procedures are simplified and streamlined as necessary to support participation in FSC by small and low intensity operations

Objective 2(e). Develop a support unit for small and low intensity managed forests to provide access to capacity building services for such operations. Indicator: Within two years, a modular program is in operation, targeted at achieving certification for small and low intensity managed forests within a 5-year time line with continuous progress as a basic condition.

Objective 2(f). Work towards ensuring that economic as well as social benefits of well managed forests are shared equitably throughout the supply chain. Indicator: Within 2 years an "FSC Fair Trade" model is developed, with its target being primarily small-scale, community-based, and low intensity managed forests. Indicator: Major market players in FSC receive reputational benefits in addition to maintaining or enhancing market share for their products.

Objective 3(c) Equitable access is provided to the FSC system for all stakeholders, including small operations and community interests in the Global North and South; Indicator: Independent assessments of the effect of FSC standards and systems "on the ground" demonstrate equitable and improved access by diverse stakeholders over time

In order to achieve these ambitious aims, it was seen as necessary to begin with a dynamic program that will deliver in the medium term. The May workshop was a major step along the road and it brought together key players from both the FSC North and the FSC South, from industry, and from the NGO and donor communities to propose concrete solutions to the challenges faced.

Some initiatives underway: The need to tackle the issue of widening FSC access to small operations has seen the coincidental emergence of initiatives in various parts of the world. In the U.S. this has led to the creation of an FSC Family Forest Alliance, a network of small NGOs, dedicated to improving access for small-holders in the U.S. In a workshop organized by the Family Forest Alliance in July 2007, with the support of the Johnson Foundation and five of the largest paper and packaging oriented forestry companies, the companies expressed their urgent need for dramatically increased supply of FSC-certified fiber from NIPF (non-industrial private forests) in the U.S. in order to meet rapidly increasing demand for FSC-certified paper. It is widely accepted that more than 60% of exploitable forest lands in the U.S. are held in these very small operations. Representatives of state government agencies expressed an interest in creating group certification under FSC standards for small-scale forest land owners under state programs that could engage as from 20,000 to 40,000 owners in individual states, bringing tens of millions of additional acres of forests

under FSC certification. As a result of that meeting, the Family Forest Alliance has begun to work directly on proposals for modifying FSC-US standards, for promoting stronger and larger group certifications, and for engaging with FSC-IC on proposals for changes in standards and certification processes (such as the sampling sizes required for “super-groups”), and for promoting the streamlined standards and group certification processes among the hundreds of thousands of family forest owners in the U.S.

At the same time, but without apparent linkages, a group of FSC advocates in Central America have obtained funding to appraise the SLIMFs procedures in that region that would bring the benefits of FSC certification to hundreds of thousands of additional small-scale forest land owners, community-based forests, and indigenously-owned forests. Their process, encouraged by the Danish environmental NGO Nepenthes, involves a combination creating new SLIMF standards in several countries, with a wide range of promotional activities to allow forest holders to learn about the opportunity to become certified at lower cost under these new standards.

Similarly, there is a new effort underway in the U.K. to address the SLIMF conditions in the U.K. Wood Assurance System which is the combined FSC and governmental set of standards for well managed forests. The effort, led by a British NGO, the U.K. Small Woods Association, in collaboration with FSC-UK, seeks to establish a new, smaller “very small woods” category for certification that embraces forests under 10 hectares (25 acres). This category encompasses 17 percent of all forest lands in England. Key obstacles to certification for the 1600 woodland owners in this category have been time, cost, and complexity of certification, partly because the vast majority of these landowners have other principal sources of income, and their forest management activities must be done in spare time.

Finally, the WWF has proposed new activities in a very similar vein in the European context, especially with the Baltic States in mind. They are proposing, and seeking to explore, a model where certified loggers are given an important role and that could be especially useful for small-holders. This effort has similarities with the SmartLogger program of SmartWood and to programs sought by some major U.S. forest products companies as a mechanism for accelerating the flow of certified wood fiber into the marketplace. Whether the approach can be made consistent with FSC principles and criteria will require discussion among the affected parties.

The FSC-IC, meanwhile, has been in intensive discussions with the Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International, FLO eV, on the possibility for creating a set of dual-certified Fair Trade and FSC forest products that provide market recognition for forest products from small-scale, indigenous, or community-based forestry operations, especially in the global South, so that they might obtain better market competition with large-scale FSC products.

Initial proposal, design, and growth of the concept. The meeting, as initially proposed, was designed to bring together 25-to-30 leaders in the community of FSC stakeholders most concerned about these goals. A Steering Committee was formed, consisting of the following persons, in alphabetical order:

- Gemma Boetekees, ICCO (Netherlands)
- Michael Conroy, consultant to FSC-IC (US)
- Kathryn Fernholz, Dovetail Partners and FSC Family Forest Alliance (US)
- Phil Guillery, Tropical Forest Trust (US)

- Craig Norris, NCT Forestry Cooperative (South Africa)
- Margareta Renström, WWF Sweden (Sweden)
- Alan Smith, Social Strategy Manager at FSC-IC (Germany)

Others were invited from the FSC South, but they were not effectively able to participate in planning, though they did participate in the workshop. A broadly representative list of invited participants was developed by the Steering Committee, as well as invitation materials and a preliminary agenda. And WWF Portugal and the Portuguese National Initiative of FSC (in the person of Vera Santos) agreed to host the meeting in Lisbon, selected as a relatively inexpensive location that was relatively easy to get to from most parts of the world. The logistical tasks were very time consuming and our thanks go to Vera for the hard work she put in to make the event a success.

The principal objectives developed by the Steering Group for the workshop included the following:

- a) To identify, discuss, and propose solutions for the obstacles that continue to face small, community-based, and indigenous forest operations, whether individually or within groups;
- b) To compare the solutions to these problems that are being developed in different regions of the world;
- c) To discuss with representatives of FSC and Accreditation Services International the solutions that might be most consistent with continued credible certification, at lower costs for these operators; and
- d) To consider motions that might be submitted to the FSC 2008 General Assembly on behalf of these forest operations.

Funding for the meeting, at that anticipated scale, was obtained from the FSC Global Fund, WWF International, and ICCO. But a rather amazing thing happened “on the way to Lisbon”! As soon as word of the meeting spread, many additional participants asked to be included, companies offered further financial support,¹ and more than 20 additional participants agreed to participate while paying all of their own costs. What was clear is that the key themes of this meeting struck a very loud and harmonious chord in the FSC community. And the final attendance was closed out, due to space constraints, at fully 62 participants, including participants from Portugal.

The Participants. Annex 1 includes a full list of the participants, with their affiliations, countries of origin, and e-mail addresses. Participants came from 23 different countries, including 21 participants (one-third of the total) from the FSC South. Fifteen (one-fourth) of the 60 were women. Roughly 10 represented forest products companies; about 13 represented FSC and WWF; six participants were from the funding community; and the remainder (about half) were from various forestry-related NGOs.

¹ Additional funding was provided by Tembec, Mondi, Portucel Saporcel, the Coop Group (Switzerland), and Greenpeace, as well as a number of important but smaller contributions.

The Agenda. An initial agenda was developed by the Steering Committee, and it was modified continuously up to, and throughout, the meeting. The final agenda, attached as Annex 2, illustrates the highly-participatory nature of the meeting, which included the following key “moments”:

A series of background presentations on conditions affecting smallholders, communities, and indigenous forestry operations were invited for an opening session. A total of nine brief and disciplined presentations were initially made, most of them accompanied by PowerPoint projections. They included the following presentations, all available on the FSC’s FTP site set up for this workshop (ftp.fsc.org, with Login: 130809-portugal-workshop).

- FSC certification of small-scale forest operations: Background from FSC-IC;
- Small producers in the tropics and their challenges in FSC certification: Report of a World Bank study
- Challenges of FSC certification for small and medium scale operations in Southern Africa;
- FSC certification of smallholders in SE Asia;
- FSC certification of small and community forests in North America;
- FSC - certification of small forest owners in Europe;
- Certification of community-based and small forest operations: The situation in Latin America;
- Background on industry perspectives on certifying smallholders; and
- Introduction to group certification in Switzerland (distributed after the meeting).

As the workshop progressed, further presentations were given either as explanatory tools or introductions for the session topics. These included:

- A summary presentation on a pre-workshop survey of all participants on critical issues facing smallholders and community forestry in the FSC. The survey is appended as Annex 3; the summary of the results is discussed below.
- Reports on special topics, such as:
- A progress report on the FSC evaluation of certification under SLIMFs rules and regulation;
- A progress report on the link between FSC and ecosystem services;
- An update on the exploration of dual certification by FSC and the Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International; and
- A report on FSC certification in Portugal.

However, the majority of the workshop focused on building consensus on critical changes that needed to be made in the FSC system if the benefits of FSC certification were to become more readily available to smallholders and community and indigenous forestry operations. These discussions, analysis of conditions, proposals for change, and commitments to concrete actions in order to bring about those changes were undertaken in a series of breakout sessions, report-back sessions, and plenary sharing of ideas. The list of both general commitments and topically-specific commitments are appended as Annex 4.

Survey results on challenges facing smallholders. The steering group developed and administered a pre-workshop survey to all participants identified as of one month prior to the

workshop. It was designed to help focus the activities that would take place during the workshop itself. A copy of the survey is included as Annex 3a. Of the 56 copies of the survey distributed, there were 32 responses, an excellent return. The results of the survey were presented early on the first full day. Although the survey was open-ended, the results were synthesized into the 11 categories listed in the table below. Each respondent was invited to list up to three challenges and to select from those three “the most critical challenge” facing smallholders. The results are presented in order of the number of respondents who focused on that challenge as “the most critical,” and then by overall number of respondents who considered that challenge among their “top three.”

Priority	Theme	Challenges	Critical challenges
1	Cost reduction & cost control	15	8
2	Benefits in relation to costs	14	8
3	Complexity & difficulty meeting technical demands, and bureaucratic processes	16	4
4	Need for customization for small scale (one system does not fit all)	15	4
5	Finding markets / Creating market pull	9	4
6	Knowledge, capacity, technical advice	15	3
7	Compliance issues	2	1
8	Absence of (strong) NIs and PR in favor of FSC	3	0
9	Role of Certification Bodies	2	0
10	Legal issues	2	0
11	Organizing land owners	1	0

What is apparent from this table is that there was clear pre-workshop consensus on the top six challenges facing smallholders (as well as community-based and indigenous forestry operations). The meaning of each of those “top six” challenges is explained a bit more in the following examples of textual responses.

1. Cost reduction and cost control:

- “Costs compared to the revenue generated through a small volume of timber/NTFP sold can mean that certification is impossible.”
- “Small operations normally have lower margins and the indirect and direct cost of certification can make management operation not worth pursuing.”
- “High initial investment for meeting the standards/requirements and assessment costs, which is higher than their present income and benefits”

2. Benefits in relation to costs:

- “Because there is no point in a smallholder or community getting certified if the benefits derived from doing so don't cover the costs or are absent”
- “The smaller the operation the expensive (per ton of timber produced) certification becomes. Without significant price premiums improved market access small scale growers will not get certified (or maintain certification).”
- “The immediate cost of producing timber sustainably is greater than any financial benefit derived from certification and until that is addressed certification will not be attractive.”
- “Smallholders won't go for certification unless there is some net benefit. As economic benefits like e.g. marginal price-premiums make little difference on small timber volumes, the costs of certification must be equally low to produce that net, or at least a zero sum game.”

3. *Complexity & difficulty meeting technical demands, and bureaucratic processes.*

- “In the case of Indonesia, there are no agreed-upon national indicators, and therefore no national indicators for SLIMFs. Especially in the case of extremely small agroforests (on average <1 ha), there are many P&C that are difficult to interpret or apply... This results in guesswork on the part of the group manager as well as the assessor.”
- “SLIMF streamlined requirements do not go far enough. Reporting requirements are too onerous, translation issues, sampling intensities too high.”
- “Too complicated and bureaucratic existing group certification models, standards not feasible for very small forest owners, lack of certification through loggers, lack of easy implementable standards for very small forest holdings.”
- “Standards based barriers to certification. i.e. the rigidity of the language of the FSC criteria, coupled with inflexible accreditation standards guiding interim and national standard setting rules. Specific example: criterion 7.1 on management planning.”

4. *Need for customization for small scale (one system does NOT fit all).*

- “FSC general policies that are not applicable for smallholders: there's nothing specific for local communities in developing countries (millions of the poorest people in the world who depend directly on forests for their livelihoods).”
- “The challenge is exacerbated by the fact that FSC's broad goal to stimulate change through the marketplace can be met without the involvement of smallholders (it's the big players that influence the marketplace); but FSC's social goals can't be met without their involvement.
- “Standards must be differentiated more: the SLIMF standards don't really make a difference between industrial and community-based operations.”

- “SLIMF standards used by FSC so far puts in the same basket communities in the tropics and smallholders in US or Europe. It makes difficult the development of policies targeting specifically the access and benefits of FSC certification for communities in the tropics.”

5. *Market access – Market pull.*

- “Tropical community forestry donors and NGOs have found FSC certification useful to a) leverage international funds, and b) provide proof that what they are promoting is good forestry. However the markets that community operations traditionally supply are not aware of such a scheme and were not demanding this. Therefore there were no immediate financial rewards for those who sell to local markets...”
- “Largest markets are domestic but only a tiny proportion are FSC conscious. Buyers who are FSC conscious may have difficulty finding smallholders, dealing with smallholder products (quality, quantity and delivery) and paying any sort of premium in the light of higher transaction costs of dealing with them.”
- “Without access to a market (niche) demanding FSC certified products and providing added value to these products (be it that the buyers are willing to pay more for the products, place orders on nontraditional timber species, accepting smaller volumes – or other benefits) smallholders and community-based forestry operations face severe problems improving their livelihoods and maintaining their FSC certificates.”
- “Smallholders and community-based forestry operations often have low capacity to operate properly on the market. They often have difficulties getting access to markets demanding FSC certified products and to promote their products in a sound manner. Some of these operations have traditionally had their clients coming to them and not been proactive in searching for clients.”

6. *Knowledge, capacity, technical advice.*

- “In order to have successful and long term insertion of small holder participation in timber value chains there is a need to link up with buyers of the timber products (raw material and/or products). Parties (both small holders and buyer organisations) need to improve their organizational capacity to establish these commercial engagements.”
- “FSC needs to complete the process of SLIMFs standards development. There also needs to be auditor guidance/training related to smallholders and community-based forestry to ensure the standard is consistently applied. The FSC can work with its partners to develop additional communication tools to support adoption.”
- “There is an institutional capacity deficit of both small holder (communities) and private enterprises to construct long term transparent and fair commercial relationships that allow increasing mutual benefits and incentives for applying FSC certification schemes.”

Final Outcomes of the Workshop. After 48 hours of dialogue, debate, and creative thinking, (and a further day visiting FSC certified forestry sites in Portugal), the participants created concrete proposals for moving forward on tangible processes to resolve these issues within a relatively short time. Fifteen specific initial commitments were made, and are listed in Annex 4. Of potentially greatest interest, there were 16 working groups created, including lists of the participants prepared to commit time to their development. They covered the following general topics. The analysis, proposals for solution, and list of willing participants in these working groups are provided in Annex 4.

Working groups created for continuing the workshop as a “Lisbon Process” for improving access to the benefits of FSC certification among smallholders, community-based, and indigenous forestry operations:

- A Working Group 1 on Market Access: To establish national and international linking services that provide information, build capacity and provide links between small forest producers, markets, service providers and policy processes.
- A Working Group 2 on Market Access: To support the creation of a mechanism that links FSC and Fair Trade to distinguish small forest producer products in the market and to generate a price premium for smallholder and community-based forest products.
- A Working Group on Revising FSC P&C: To produce a well-written, widely supported Policy Motion reflecting the needs of smallholders that can be approved at the GA in South Africa in November 2008.
- A Working Group on Greater Flexibility in Approaches to Group Certification Structures: To find ways to make group certification work better and be more economical.
- A Working Group on Collaboration among NIs on SLIMFS and Group Certification: To promote that collaboration in order to expand access to, and effectiveness of, group certification processes.
- A Working Group on Reducing Intensity of Costs and Administration through a Landscape Approach: To develop proposals for communicating SLIMF rules more clearly, create a central registry of SLIMF interpretations, and make sure that all CBs are applying SLIMF rules the same way.
- A Working Group on Reducing Intensity of Costs and Administration through a Risk-Based Approach: To reduce costs under SLIMF on the basis of real risks of non-compliance, rather than assuming that all operations are equally risky.
- A Working Group on Forest Benefits from Environmental Services: To find how FSC can become directly engaged in markets for payments for environmental services, particularly for small forest owners.
- A Working Group on Standards for SLIMFS: To clarify policies and procedures relevant for communities, small, and low-intensity forest management operations.

- A Working Group on Developing a Website for SLIMFs and Group Certifications: To place all current information in one place, including guidance documents, case studies, and manuals.
- A Working Group on Training to Improve Capacity: To develop new approaches to training auditors, group managers and group COC operators.
- A Working Group on Forest Associations and Cooperatives to Organize Smallholders: To develop a support capacity within the FSC to share experiences and tools.
- A Working Group on Business Approaches to Stakeholders and Communities: To “bring producers to market: and “the market to producers” through a new business development service for smallholders and community forest operations.
- A Working Group on Final Consumer Campaign to Drive Demand: To increase market demand for FSC brand recognition and, particularly, for smallholder and community-based products.
- A Working Group on User-Friendly Information Materials for Smallholders and Communities: To make more usable information available to small forest owners and other less-sophisticated players in the FSC system.

Postscript on Follow-on activities:

To ensure continuity and monitor the commitments, it was proposed to maintain the steering group and define a communications mechanism to keep in touch. Three side events for the FSC General Assembly were proposed in relation to the Lisbon Process: one on small operations, specifically to maintain the momentum of the Process (organizers: WWF International or FSC IC), another on payment for environmental services (organizers: FSC US) and a third on indigenous peoples and certification (organizer: Jaime Levy). Additionally Craig Norris offered to host a workshop subsequent to the General Assembly in a region of South Africa where there are smallholder plantations. Immediate activities undertaken immediately after the Lisbon workshop included a visit to smallholder forests in South West France by FSC IC, ASI, FSC France and Tembec to promote smallholder certification in that part of the world. Also WWF international financed the production of an information guide on various aspects of small operations certification, to be undertaken by Proforest.

Annex 1: List of Participants

Name	Company or organization	Country	e-mail
Auld, Rob	MUCAARD	U.K.	rob.auld@mucaard-uk.org

Barr, Robin	Tropical Forest Trust	U.S.	r.barr@tropicalforesttrust.com
Blackwell, Emily	Soil Association	U.K.	EBlackwell@SoilAssociation.org
Boetekees, Gemma	ICCO	Netherlands	Gemma.Boetekees@ICCOenKerkinActie.nl
Bogdanov, Zhivko	WWF. FSC NI	Bulgaria	zhbogdanov@wwfdcp.bg
Bokkestijn, Albert	SNV-Latin America	Netherlands	abokkestijn@snvworld.org
Carrera, José Román	Rainforest Alliance / TREES program	Guatemala	jcarrera@ra.org
Cosmas Makamet	Forcert	Papua New Guinea	cmakamet.forcert@global.net.pg
Cuny, Pascal	SNV-Africa	Cameroon	pcuny@snvworld.org
Conroy, Michael	FSC consultant	U.S.	michael.conroy@earthlink.net
Dam, Peter	Forcert	Papua New Guinea	forcert@global.net.pg
de Bonafos, Hubert	ASI	France	h.bonafos@accreditation-services.com
Fanso, Gordian	FSC-IC	Cameroon	g.fanso@fsc.org
Fernholz, Kathryn	Dovetail Partners	U.S.	katie@dovetailinc.org
Flückiger, Stefan	Berner Waldbesitzer BWB	Switzerland	stefan.flueckiger@bwb-pfb.ch
Gardiner, Peter	Mondi group	UK	Peter.Gardiner@mondigroup.com
Gatter, Stefan	Servicio Forestal Amazónico	Ecuador	stgatter@macas.ecua.net.ec
Germuishuizen, Steve	Grasslands	South Africa	steve@aes.co.za
Goux, Eglantine	FSC France	France	rosacanina650@yahoo.com
Guillery, Phil	Tropical Forest Trust	U.S.	phil.guillery@gmail.com
Gunn, John	Trust to Conserve N.E. Forestlands	U.S.	jgunn@megalink.net
Herrera, Sergio Elias	Consejo Hondureño para la Certificación	Honduras	sherrera@caribe.hn/

	Forestal Voluntaria		certificacionforestal@caribe.hn
Humphries, Shoana	University of Gainesville	U.S.	shoana_h@hotmail.com
Jickling, Jon	Rainforest Alliance/ Smartwood	U.S.	jjickling@RA.org
Juul-Olsen, Lasse	WWF DK	Denmark	ljuul@wwf.dk
Karjalainen, Harri	WWF Finland	Finland	Harri.karjalainen@wwf.fi
Kern, Theo	Aargauischer Waldwirtschaftsverband	Switzerland	theo.kern@awv.ch
Levy, Jaime	Al Tropico	Ecuador	jrlevy@altropico.org.ec
Lindhe, Anders	Consultant	Sweden	anders@saperda.se
Manczak, Maj	WWF DK	Denmark	m.manczak@wwf.dk
Manoharan, Dr. D.T.	WWF India	India	tmanoharan@wwfindia.net
Martinelli, Bruno	FSC NI Brazil	Brazil	brunom@fsc.org.br
Mbolo, Marie	FSC	Cameroon	m.mbolo@fsc.org
McDonnell, Chris	Tembec	Canada	chris.mcdonell@tembec.com
McQueen, Duncan	IIED	UK	duncan.macqueen@iied.org
Mildam, André	Nepenthes	Honduras	am@nepenthes.dk
Ngubane, Steven	FSA	South Africa	steven@forestrysouthafrica.co.za
Norris, Craig	NCT Forestry Cooperative	South Africa	craig@nctforest.com
Oberndorft, Robert	RECOFTC	Thailand	robert@recoftc.org
Ochaeta, Juan Jose	FORESCOM	Guatemala	juanjoseochaeta@yahoo.com
Osei, J.W.	Kumasi Wood Cluster	Ghana	jwosei@yahoo.com
Perez, Noemi	SLIMF consultant	Mexico	pereznoemi@prodigy.net.mx
Renström, Margareta	WWF International	Sweden	margareta.renstrom@wwf.se
Rhebergen, Marije	ICCO	Netherlands	Marije.Rhebergen@ICCOenKerkinActie.nl

		s	
Robinson, Dawn	ProForest	U.K.	dawn@proforest.net
Santos, Vera	FSC Portugal	Portugal	verafsantos@netcabo.pt
Smith, Alan	FSC-IC	U.K.	a.smith@fsc.org
Steer, Karen	FSC US	US	karennsteer@gmail.com
Subedi, Bhishma	ANSAB	Nepal	bhishmasubedi@ansab.org
Ukkerman, Rob	SNV-Asia	Netherlands	rukkerman@snvworld.org
van der Goot, Chris	Ecohout	Netherlands	chrisvdgoot@hotmail.com ; ecohout.cg@12move.nl
Volgelsanger, Dr. Walter	City Forest Administration, Schaffhausen	Switzerland	walter.vogelsanger@stsh.ch
Voivodic, Mauricio	Imaflora	Brazil	mauricio@imaflora.org
von Mirbach, Martin	WWF Canada	Canada	mvonmirbach@fscscanada.org
Zudrags, Maris	Stora Enso Latvia	Latvia	Maris.zudrags@storaenso.com

ANNEX 2: FINAL AGENDA FOR THE WORKSHOP

Day/time	Activity
7 May	
17:00	Registration
18:00	Plenary session - Room Atlantico 1 Introductions, background, and expectations for the workshop Short presentations from different geographical and actor perspectives
20:00	Reception and dinner – Restaurant Navegadores
8 May	
08:30	Plenary session: What are the key challenges facing smallholders and community-based forestry operations when they seek FSC certification? - Presentation of the results of the rapid survey of priority themes identified by participants (<i>Gemma Boetekees</i>) - Working methodology for the 2 days (<i>Kathryn Fernholz</i>)
09:30	Breakout groups: Identification of key topics
10:15	Plenary session: Report-back from breakout groups
11:00	Coffee break
11.15	Breakout groups: Discussion of topics and ways forward
13:00	Lunch
14.00	Plenary Session: Interim report back
15:15	Coffee Break
15.30	Plenary session: Presentation on the FSC-IC SLIMF Review Process (Noemi Perez)
16:00	Breakout groups: Finalise Discussions from morning
17:15	Plenary session: invited speaker from Portugal, Eng. ^a Sara Pereira of Fenafloresta (National Federation of Forest Producers' Cooperatives)
17:30	Plenary session: Identification of topics for Friday
17:45	End of meeting

19:30	Dinner
9 May	
08:30	Plenary session: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation alternative income-earning possibilities, such as ecosystem services and carbon offsets (<i>Kathryn Fernholz</i>) - Presentation of discussion topics and selection of groups.
09:30	Breakout groups: Discussion of topics and ways forward
10:30	Coffee break
10:45	Breakout groups: Finalisation of proposals
11:30	Plenary session: Report-back from breakout groups and agree action points
12:30	Lunch
13:30	Plenary session: - Presentation on the FSC-Fair Trade process (<i>Michael Conroy</i>)
14:00	Plenary session: - Agree action points on Thursday output
15:00	Coffee break
15.15	Plenary session: Next steps continue
16:45	Meeting Evaluation (<i>Michael Conroy</i>)
17:00	End of meeting
19:00	Departure from the hotel Closing dinner - restaurant Tromba Rija by invitation Grupo Portucel Soporcel

Annex 3: Quick pre-workshop survey on critical challenges facing smallholders.

To make it possible to have a quick start of the meeting, we are looking for your input. Please take a moment to reflect on the issues you would like to discuss in the smallholders meeting in Portugal, because they are your most important challenges, or successes. The results of this inquiry will be presented at the beginning of the meeting, in the morning session of 8 May.

Please note: do not use more than max. 50 words in each box!!!!

What in your opinion are the 3 most important challenges facing smallholders and community-based forestry operations when they seek FSC certification?	
1	
2	
3	

Of these 3, which one is in your opinion most critical? Please identify just 1 challenge and explain the logic for your choice. Also develop the challenge (which parts, elements, risks and opportunities, etc are at the basis of your identification that this is the most critical challenge?)	
Which challenge?	
Why did you choose this challenge?	
What are the different elements of this challenge?	

The previous questions were about challenges. Have you already found solutions for one or more of your previous challenges, that worked? If so, please identify your 2 most successful solutions in this box.	
1	
2	

During the meeting, we will discuss in smaller round tables. You have the possibility to sit at 2 discussion tables, on 2 subjects. On which 2 subjects would you be able to contribute best with your experience and knowledge?	
1	
2	

Annex 4: List of Decisions and Commitments from the Portugal Meeting on Smallholder and Community Based Operations (edited for clarity)

DECISIONS & COMMITMENTS	
Part 1, Specific broad task commitments	
1	WWF INDIA committed to work with FSC-IC on involving Indian ICT students to work on the FSC website
2	ICCO committed to develop WIKI for group certification managers and (in collaboration with FSC) open it up for all group managers
3	CRAIG NORRIS committed to host a meeting in alliance with FSC GA for forest associations and smallholders, probably after the GA
4	MICHAEL CONROY committed to put all presentations, documents on the FTP website within 2 days and the report of this meeting within 2 weeks
5	STEERING GROUP will take up the task to look at the proposal of a package motion coming out of this meeting that would have a broad support of the participants of this meeting
6	MARTIN VON MIRBACH'S GROUP will draft a motion for the GA on P&C more suitable for smallholders
7	SNV will initiate a TOR for fundraising to business approaches to stakeholders and communities and for a side event at the GA for linking smallholders and businesses
8	JOHN GUNN and KATIE FERNHOLZ will look into a side event at the GA on Payment for Ecological Services (PES).
9	VANESSA LINFORTH volunteers as resource person for the Steering Group
10	ALL PARTICIPANTS OF THIS MEETING will send links on interested docs and information on smallholders issues to Michael Conroy, for publication at the FTP
11	ALL PARTICIPANTS AT THE MEETING called upon all non-members present to become voting members of the FSC
12	ALAN SMITH will inform all participants what the costs may be for organizing side meetings at the GA
13	STEERING GROUP will distribute e-mail list of participants
14	STEERING GROUP IN COLLABORATION WITH FSC will make sure that an

	article on this meeting will be published in News and Notes
15	STEERING GROUP will make sure that people here at this meeting will re-gather at FSC GA in South Africa
	Part 2: Commitments to tasks by specific working groups (in random order)
16	<p><i>MARKET ACCESS WORKING GROUP 1:</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Lack of market access and lack of price premiums.</p> <p>Proposed solutions: We want to establish national and international linking services that provide information, build capacity and provide links between small forest producers, markets, service providers and policy processes (e.g. similar to the WWF producer-buyer networks or the FAO and IIED Forest Connect alliance)</p> <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida (Group leadership volunteer) • Duncan Macqueen IIED (Already committed to a network of partners in 10 countries doing just this. Forest Connect – China, Ghana, Guyana, Guatemala, Ethiopia, Laos, Mozambique, Nepal) • José Carrera, RA • T.R Manoharan, WWF India • Albert Bokrestijn, SNV • Juan José Ochaeta, Forescom • André Mildam, Nepenthes • Craig Norris, NCT Lasse Juul-Olsen, WWF DK • Maj Manczak, WWF DK • Chris v d Goot, Ecohout • Phil Guillery, TFT • Bhishma Subedi, ANSAB
17	<p><i>MARKET ACCESS WORKING GROUP 2 :</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Lack of market access and lack of price premiums.</p> <p>Proposed solutions: We want to support the creation of a mechanism that links FSC and Fair Trade to distinguish small forest producer products in the market and to generate a price premium for smallholder and community-based forest products.</p> <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Duncan Macqueen IIED • Albert Bokrestijn, SNV

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bishma Subedi, ANSAB • Rob Auld, MUCAARD • Robin Barr, TFT • Mauricio Voivodic, Imaflora • Karen Steer, FSC US • Marije Rhebergen, ICCO
18	<p>REVISION OF P&C WORKING GROUP:</p> <p>Problem analysis: The Principles and (especially) the Criteria are not written in a way that ensures their relevance is widely recognized, especially by the small forestholders that need to implement them in order to fulfil FSC's vision. There is an opportunity because the P&C are under review by the board, following the resolution passed at the 2005.</p> <p>Proposed solutions: What needs to be achieved is a well-written, widely supported Policy Motion that can be approved at the GA in South Africa in November 2008. This motion should include four elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Call for a systematic and comprehensive review and revision of all Principles and Criteria; 2. Require that the revised wording be made more broadly relevant in all regions, all forest types and all forest tenures; 3. Acknowledge that the appropriate place for specific prescriptive detail is in Indicators and/or Guidance developed at the national or international levels; 4. Include a timeline that ensures that adequate consultations take place in time for a proposal enjoying broad support to be brought to the next GA (in 2011). <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karen Steer, FSC US • Mauricio Voivodic, Imaflora • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Ana Maria Costa, LPN • Jon Jickling, RA/ SmartWood • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Steven Ngubane, FSA • Egglantine Goux, FSC FR • Martin von Mirbach, WWF CA
19	<p>WORKING GROUP ON GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN APPROACHES TO GROUP CERTIFICATION STRUCTURES:</p> <p>Problem Analysis: Current group certification rules are unnecessarily and</p>

	<p>excessively rigid with respect to changes in group size and sampling levels required; and they don't reflect well the reality of either emerging "super-groups" or "super-small" forestry areas.</p> <p>Proposed solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Find new ways to improve cost reduction; 2. Find new ways to engage contractors in the system and smallholder forest certification; 3. Find new ways to address properly <i>very low intensity</i> (by m3/\$) and <i>super small</i> (by area) forest management (10-30 or more years between major interventions/impacts) 4. Provide new flexibility for group manager, since existing requirements don't provide enough. 5. Provide "fair trade" label to contractors that forest owners can trust. <p>Added benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adding (licensed/registered) contractors to a system that goes beyond the existing system means bringing best forest management practices also to non-certified forests through contractors; 2. Contractors provide direct <i>link to the markets</i>; 3. Improves forest management practices in general through bringing the <i>best</i> forest management practices to small and "new" forest owners through contractors/logging companies <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maris Zudrags, Stora Enso • Bruni Martinelli, FSC BR • Craig Norris, NCT • Karen Steer, FSC US • Robin Barr, TFT • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • Anders Lindhe, consultant • Chris McDonell, Tembec • Stefan Fluckiger, BWB • Paula Guimaraes, Portucel-Soporcel • Susana Brigido, FPPF
20	<p>WORKING GROUP ON NI COLLABORATION:</p> <p>Problem analysis: NIs developing national standards (especially indicators relevant to SLIMFS and group certification) encounter problems that other Nis have already addressed, and their experience could be valuable. The existing processes (NI listserve, NI meetings) don't seem to be adequately addressing this need for information-sharing within the FSC network</p> <p>Proposed solutions: Better collaboration and information-sharing between National Initiatives (NIs) on issues relating to standards development, especially with respect to incorporating SLIMFS and group certification.</p>

	<p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eglantine Goux, FSC FR • Martin von Mirbach, WWF CA • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Ana Maria Costa, LPN • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • J.W. Osei, Kumasi Wood Cluster • Albert Bokkestein, SNV • Theo Kern, AWW • T.R. Manoharan, WWF India
21	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON PRICE PREMIUMS</i></p> <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dawn Robinson, Proforest • Rob Auld, MUCCARD • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Albert Bokkestein, SNV • Marije Rhebergen, ICCO
22	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON REDUCING INTENSITY OF COSTS AND ADMINISTRATION THROUGH A LANDSCAPE APPROACH:</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Compliance of all P&C s on small individual FMUs is often not possible.</p> <p>FSC STD-20-007 says this it is not necessary, because compliance can be assessed across a group of FMUs and/or at the landscape level and/or based on a sample. <i>But</i> not all CBs and other actors apparently know this. WHY not? Second problem is the wording of FSC-STD-20-007, scn 3.3.5, i.e., don't use 'may', rather use 'shall' or 'must.' Third problem is that FSC-STD documents are only distributed to CBs, not to other actors. This document is a) not even widely know, b) is not very digestable, and c) is not being implemented honestly. Is this in the interest of some CBs to keep audit costs high?</p> <p>Potential solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicate SLIMF rules clearly; 2. Create a central register on the implementation of SLIMF rules; 3. Make sure that all are applying SLIMF rules in the same way (landscape/group level compliance; FMPs etc) <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Phil Guillery, TFT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • Maris Zudrags, Stora Enso • Karen Steer, FSC US • Chris McDonell, Tembec • Robin Barr, TFT • John Gunn, TCNF • Sergio Herrera, • Jon Jickling, RA / SmartWood • Vanessa Linforth, Sativa • Walter Vogelsanger, City Forest Adm Schaffhausen • Steven Germuishuizen, Grasslands
23	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON REDUCING INTENSITY OF COSTS AND ADMINISTRATION THROUGH A RISK BASED APPROACH:</i></p> <p>Problem Analysis: The current system is too costly, complex and designed for large scale operations.</p> <p>Proposed solution: Reduce the administrative and auditing costs within the FSC SLIMF policies based on the risk of non-compliance while maintaining the credibility of the system, and providing compliant templates to group managers and allowing more self-assessment/reporting .</p> <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Chris McDonell, Tembec • Maris Zudrags, Stora Enso • Phil Guillery, TFT • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • Dawn Robinson, Proforest • Anders Lindhe, consultant • Stefan Fluckiger, BWB
24	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON FOREST BENEFITS FROM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES:</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: How do we directly engage the FSC in PES markets particularly for small forest holders?</p> <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albert Bokkestein, SNV • Ana Maria Costa, LPN • Alan Smith, FSC • André Mildam, Nepenthes • Bishma Subedi, ANSAB • Dawn Robinson, Proforest

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duncan Macqueen IIED • Eglantine Goux, FSC FR • J.W. Osei, Kumasi Wood Cluster • John Gunn, TCNF • José Carrera, RA • Karen Steer, FSC US • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Rob Ukkerman, SNV • Robin Barr, TFT • Sergio Herrera, Consejo Hondureno para la Certification Forestal Voluntaria • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Stefan Fluckiger, BWB • T.R Manoharan, WWF India • Gordian Fanso, FSC IC • Robert Oberndorf, RECOFTC
25	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON STANDARDS FOR SLIMFS:</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Lack of clarity of what the policies are for national standard development for SLIMFs</p> <p>Potential solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify policies and procedures that are relevant for all including communities, small and low intensity forest management operations 2. Help FSC IC acquire the capacity to deal with the SLIMFs issues in a timely manner (includes staff and resources that ensure guidance and experience sharing) <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Dawn Robinson, Proforest • Eglantine Goux, FSC FR • J.W. Osei, Kumasi Wood Cluster • Jon Jickling, RA / SmartWood • Karen Steer, FSC US • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Sergio Herrera, Consejo Hondureno para la Certification Forestal Voluntaria • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Stefan Fluckiger, BWB • Vanessa Linforth, Sativa • Walter Vogelsanger, City Forest Adm Schaffhausen • Noemi Perez, FAST • Peter Dam, Forcert
26	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON WEBSITE FOR SLIMFS AND GROUP</i></p>

	<p>CERTIFICATION:</p> <p>Problem analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hard to find all official documents related to group/SLIMF certification at existing FSC web pages; 2. There exist different manuals/guidelines/case studies/presentation on group certification and SLIMF's but it is scattered around/hidden under different organizations home pages (like WWF, Proforest, NEPCon) <p>Proposed solutions: "One-stop" information place (helpdesk?) for people interested into small forest owner certification.</p> <p>Possible content:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Official FSC documents related to small forest owner certification (group certification/SLIMF) 2. Workspace for draft versions 3. Best practices (manuals/guidelines/case studies/presentations etc produced by FSC or other organizations) 4. Experience exchange (forum?) 5. Training materials/announcements (online training?) 6. Link to the market: info for those who are interested to buy products from local communities 7. Promotion of existing group certifications – list of existing groups by countries with contacts in case some forest owner wants to join <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noemi Peres, FAST • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida
27	<p>WORKING GROUP ON TRAINING TO IMPROVE CAPACITY</p> <p>Problem analysis: Lack of official training material. Lack of central information center for official FSC guidance. Auditors and also consultants need training framework. Small forest holders need capacity building. FSC NIs and regional offices need to be trained as trainers.</p> <p>Potential solutions: Three different issues to address:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training and registration of auditors 2. Training and capacity building of group managers and small forest owners 3. Training for group COC as well. <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Maris Zudrags, Stora Enso • Peter Dam, Forcert • Robert Oberndorf, RECOFTC • Vanessa Linforth, Sativa • Rob Auld, MUCCARD
28	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON FOREST ASSOCIATIONS AND COOPERATIVES TO ORGANISE SMALLHOLDERS :</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Many groups (forest associations, cooperatives, and smallholders) have been formed and developed with FSC certification as a common infrastructure. A formal framework does not exist to share these experiences and tools to support the development and expansion of additional groups.</p> <p>Potential solution: Implement Objective 2e of the FSC IC Strategic Plan to develop a support/capacity building unit within FSC to create this framework.</p> <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bhishma Subedi, ANSAB • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • John Gunn, TCNF • Karen Steer, FSC US • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida*** (FACILITATOR VOLUNTEER) • Stefan Fluckiger, BWB • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • André Mildam, Nepenthes • Susana Brigido, FPPF • Cosmas Makamet, Forcert • Daniela Silva, FLOPEN
29	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON BUSINESS APPROACHES TO STAKEHOLDERS AND COMMUNITIES:</i></p> <p>Problem analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SLIMF's can either be the start or end of connecting with FSC markets; 2. There are risk issues with new supply chains, information gaps, lack of knowledge and trust;

	<p>3. There is a need for models to build capacity, profiles of benefits;</p> <p>4. Trade fairs have value, but momentum often falls afterwards.</p> <p>Potential solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bring “producers to the market”, bring the market to producers ; 2. Create supporting policy environment, integrated business models that are appropriate to the country, procurement policy (set asides for small business); 3. Set up a business development service (to define rules of engagement); 4. Sell SLIMFs as a “Corporate social responsibility” service. How SLIMF is perceived by the “outside” is important – different SLIMF business approaches exist. <p>People interested to be involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albert Bokkestein, SNV (lead group coordinator) • Bhisma Subedi, ANSAB • Chris v d Goot, Ecohout • José Carrera, RA • Phil Guillery, TFT • Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida • Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria • Rob Ukkerman, SNV
30	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON FINAL CONSUMER CAMPAIGN TO DRIVE DEMAND :</i></p> <p>Problem analysis: Lack of recognition of the FSC Brand by the final consumer in most countries, especially with respect to the extra challenges faced by smallholders and community-based operations.</p> <p>Proposed solutions: Increase market demand for smallholder and community-based products and, more broadly, FSC brand recognition.</p> <p>People interested in being involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ana Maria Costa, LPN • Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR • Gordian Fanso, FSC IC • Marie MBolo, FSC Africa • Jose Carrera, RA • Rob Auld, MUCCARD
31	<p><i>WORKING GROUP ON USER FRIENDLY INFORMATION</i></p>

MATERIALS FOR SMALLHOLDERS AND COMMUNITIES:

Problem analysis: There is a severe lack of FSC-focused user-friendly information material in for for smallholders and communities interested in certification.

Potential solutions:

1. Develop a package of FSC user-friendly information for smallholders and communities aimed at NGOs, local governments, CBs, supporting FSC certification. Some of the key topics are: CoC, FSC system – What is it?, HCV/Biodiversity; Simple monitoring methodologies; management planning, environmental and social impacts assessments.
2. All responses include templates, examples, simple ppt slides as well as movie clips of regional, national or local relevance.
3. Starting with international/generic standards, aimed at being adapted to regional, national and local context, languages, ..., by local actors. All downloadable from FSC website.
4. Ideally done by FSC, within FSC. If not, then endorsed/guided by them, but they must be fully involved for the ownership of the final product.

People interested in being involved:

- Ana Maria Costa, LPN
- Bruno Martinelli, FSC BR
- Dawn Robinson, Proforest
- Karen Steer, FSC US
- Robert Oberndorf, RECOFTC
- Robin Barr, TFT
- Shoana Humphries, Univ of Florida
- Stefan Fluckiger, BWB
- Vanessa Linforth, Sativa
- Zhivko Bogdanov, WWF Bulgaria