

## Mallorca Experts Meeting Participant Responses

### Mallorca Experts' Meeting Evaluation

14+1 responses (out of possible 22)

	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>V.Poor</i>
Objectives defined and achieved	1	9	2	2	
Concepts clearly explained	1	8	4	1	
Time allocated	2	7	5		
Relevance to my work	4	10			
Workshop was well-organised	9	5			
Overall quality of the workshop	6	8			
Totals	115	188	33	6	0
Average	4.1				

1. *'What aspects of the workshop will be most helpful in your work on verification issues? (Please be as specific as possible)*

The discussion about legality standards

Legality standards

Legality standards, development impacts

Ownership and the sustainability of verification system, as well as independence  
All important but 'independence' most useful.

Standard setting in legality, ownership issues, especially that of government

Clarification on what verification consists of

The workshop gave me a lot of new insights into verification (relevant to my particular needs). I heard a lot of useful ideas during the meeting.

Country case studies, case studies from other sectors, regional perspectives

Thematic discussions

Country experiences/ discussion on the four key themes/ extrasectoral experiences/ the state of the art – to get updated.

Overview of case studies (sectoral/extrasectoral)/ discussion with colleagues/discussion on legality standards

Opportunity to discuss issues in small groups. Bringing together a group of people who have really thought about this. Opportunity to present IFM as a pragmatic, learning approach.

Frank discussions which admitted the complexity of the problem and highlighted real dilemmas especially in terms of legality, developing standards and participation.

Enlargement of my frame of reference for the role of independent audit (verification) of practices of practices and outcomes that are legally specified by a constitutionally based government.

2. *What issues which were not covered in the workshop would you be interested in concerning verification?*

The links (if there are any) between forest verification systems and forest certification schemes.

I don't think that more could have been productively discussed.

Institutional reforms as an environment of verification system development.

Incentives/ regulation and forest rents

It was overwhelming the amount of information and discussion: can't think of anything in particular.

I am still not clear whether this legality standard will be replacing forest certification in terms of improving forest companies' performance in their management; or is it a complementary tool to it, so that these standards of legality will have to be used in the forest certification assessment process?

Mechanisms for equitable distribution of process benefits and costs, as well as conflict resolution.

Discussion on criteria and indicators are not much. This is an important issue prior to that of legal verification.

A better understanding of the impact of the market place.

It seemed to me that a very complex issue became even more complex, when the apparent need is to simplify and find consensus.

Terminology: the Verifor literature is confused, let alone the rest of us. Clearer understanding of expected workshop outputs: workshop doc? Revised theme papers?

There has been a certain reluctance to confront the real political economy of illegality. Also we did not look at plantations or legality and forest conversion (Brazil presentation an exception).

Conservation of the natural capital of the forest estate as a primary commitment on which all others are based ie. Legality of acquisitions, revenue to government, poverty reduction, fairness to indigenous people, etc.

*3. Please comment on the overall quality and value*

The best thing of the workshop was the quality and dedication shown by the Verifor team. I also greatly enjoyed meeting and sharing ideas with such a distinguished group of participants.

The workshop was useful in getting a view of different people's understanding of the scope and goals of the solutions we are trying to develop – and the need to keep focussed on achievable objectives.

At times, the discussion seemed to be very academic. The practical examples from the countries contributed a lot to a better understanding of the issues. I also found the case studies from other sectors (esp. Kimberley Process) particularly useful.

Workshop synergy was apparent. Learning experience has been tremendous. Likely to lift level of confidence of participants in driving verification processes back home.

Well-organised, tackling key issues and high level discussions.

OK – has raised more questions than answers but that is inherent to the stage we are at.

The workshop was professionally organised. Well done.

A group of well-informed and experienced participants that generated very active and lively discussions.

It is well organised.

I found some of the text/English used relatively inaccessible – must have been even more difficult for non-English speakers.

Well prepared, well conducted.

Very useful – probably the best opportunity to discuss this topic to date with all the right people and such international representation. ODI's 'convening power' is very effective.

We were never really told what ODI/Verifor wanted from the workshop and the lack of clarity about definitions and expected outcomes may have frustrated dialogue.

I would have preferred fewer general presentations and more focus on specific problems faced on which the alternative experience could be focused. I.e. Working up to principles with the specific issues faced by countries or the grizzly details of an actual VPA.

*4. Do you have any additional comments and suggestions?*

No, I just want to wish you good luck with the second phase.

Need to consider non-sector models. What are the lessons? How do they apply to our problems?

The last session on Friday afternoon showed that there are huge differences between regions, and also between countries with strong governance and countries with weak governance. The project may wish to focus on those countries that have a clear need for verification.

Regional networking should be a key agenda for future initiatives.

A bit more time should have been allocated for group discussion and that the guiding questions be circulated beforehand, well in advance.

Money will make things happen – a practical and commercial approach is needed.

Need to follow up with socializing into each country, national level and so on.

Please make country presentations available as they explicitly link the four themes to each case study.

I look forward to the election monitoring case study as this appears to me as the closed 'layperson's analogy' to IFM.

A report which highlights the dilemmas and lack of clear consensus will have more policy value than a report of the meeting which papers over the cracks. Small groups might be used more effectively in examining a case history and discussing how the themes could be pursued to best effect.

The place (Palma) was well selected!

*Additional comments from one participant:*

Concern: that using the idea of 'illegal logging' invites legalisation by definition rather than by specification of environmental, social and economic outcomes of forestry. (Conversion more important than legality)!

Is the 'legal frame' a 'reduction to the feasible' or a precursor step in a chain leading to SFM and socio-economic equity? If the latter then make the trajectory concrete/Is the reduced legal frame a recognition that there is actually no 'green premium' in the market for responsible forestry? (Access barrier but no help with greater costs). Is the legal frame likely to replace certification which, like FSC, contains legal, SFM and social C & I in its requirements?

Do we need an overarching rationale, like the UN Millennium Development Goals as the source of content for the sectoral efforts in forestry? I.e the link to the implications arising from related resource sectors, eg. Mining, water, agric, agroforestry, etc.?

Will national sovereignty drive the definition of legal to 'compliance with local law as certified by the local government'? Unless there are standards invoked on the efficacy of the body of laws and the administration in practice (and of course, by whom?)

Where there is a dichotomy between the exigencies of trade organisation and the promotion of socio-economic development, and (a low?) regulated civil society?

Is VERIFOR:

- a. a trade regulator?

- b. A development organisation?
- c. A forestry quality assurance organisation?
- d. Using trade regulation as a vehicle for a development agenda?