



PROJECT TITLE:

Promoting Chain sawing in alignment with sustainability and legality principles through a consolidated developed regulatory framework to support the GFP initiative.

Final Report

January 14, 2010



Key National stakeholders attending the forums (Consultation/Validation)

Name of Institution: Rural Integrated Center for Community Empowerment (RICCE)

Project Start Date: September 16, 2010

Project End Date: January 14, 2011

Reporting Period: September 16, 2010 to January 14, 2011

Table of Content

	Pages
1. Table Of Cnotent-----	1
2. List Of Table-----	2
3. List Of Abbreviation:-----	3
4. INTRODUCTION-----	4-5
5. Objective of the Study-----	6
6. METHODOLOGY -----	7-8
7. Location of the Consultation-----	9
8. STUDY AND DISCUSSION-----	9-10
8.1 Desk study -----	10
8.2 Media Awareness -----	11-12
8.3 Multi-Stakeholders Consultation -----	12-13
9. Findings- Participants Views -----	14-32
10. Stakeholders Profile-----	33
11. Validation of Draft Regulation-----	34-35
Stakeholders Comments -----	35-48
12. Discussion -----	49-50
13. Constraint-----	50
14. Conclution & Recommendation-----	51-52
14.1 Conclusion -----	51
14.2 Recommendation -----	52
15. References-----	53
16. Guiding Questionnaires-----	54
Participants Listing-----	54-65
Term of Reference of Study-----	66-70
Draft Regulation-----	71-79
Financial Report-----	80-81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 ----- participants grouping per county

Table 2 ----- Government views of option, Monrovia

Table 3 ----- Timber Union Views, Monrovia

Table 4 ----- Civil society views, Monrovia

Table 5 ----- Government views, Gbarnga

Table 6 ----- pit sawyer views, Gbarnga

Table 7 ----- Civil Society views, Gbarnga

Table 8 ----- Community views, Gbarnga

Table 9 ----- Government views, Tubmanburg

Table 10 ----- Pit sawyer views, Tubmanburg

Table 11 ----- Civil society views, Tubmanburg

Table 12 ----- Community views, Tubmanburg

Table 13 ----- Government views, Zwedru

Table 14 ----- Pit sawyer views, Zwedru

Table 15 ----- Civil society views, Zwedru

Table 16 ----- Community views, Zwedru

Table 17 ----- Government views, Buchanan

Table 18 ----- Pit sawyer views, Buchanan

Table 19 ----- Civil society views, Buchanan

Table 20 ----- Community views, Buchanan

Table 21 ----- Consolidated views of stakeholders per sector

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

CDA	County Development Agenda
CFDC	Community Forest Development Committee
FEE	Friends of the Ecosystem System and Environment
FDA	Forestry Development Authority
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
FMC	Forest Management Contract
FUP	Forest Use Contract
GOL	Government of Liberia
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LMI	Liberia Media Initiative
NFRL	National Forestry Reform Law of Liberia
PUP	Private Use Permit
TSC	Timber Sale Contract

I. INTRODUCTION

The implementation of the Liberia forest sector reform is much more challenging than was envisaged by several stakeholders. The New National Forestry Reform Law (2006) and accompanying regulations make up the key components of the legal framework. Implementation of the legal framework started in 2007 and gathered momentum in 2008. Series of gaps on critical elements of the implementation of the law have exposed weaknesses within the system and highlighted the need for a more robust relevant stakeholder engagement to strengthen rule of law and improve governance in the forest sector.

Liberia has a vast forest land which harbors several rare plants and animal species some of which are endemic. Liberia's forests, almost half of West Africa's remaining forest, are one of the last refuges for rare biodiversity. It serves as habitat for large amounts of endemic flora and fauna. The forests of Liberia are faced with numerous threats including illicit mining and pit-sawing which are unregulated and posing serious damage to the habitats of wildlife which depends on these forests as refuge.

Regulation No. 26 (Blackett, et al, 2009) considered Pit sawing illegal as it does not fall under any of the operational licenses. By extension the collection of fees as Waybill by the FDA is also illegal.

Prior to the formulation of the NFRL of 2006, there was a ban placed on the export of timber from Liberia by the United Nations (2003) which was thought to be a contributing factor to fueling the Liberia civil crisis. This ban resulted in the closure of all sawmills which have previously supplied domestic markets with wood products for infrastructure development. This give rise to pit sawing activities as the only means of making woods products available to support the reconstruction process. The infiltration of the pit-sawing industry and the influx of pit-sawyers have, although have some positive impacts, it also has a lot of negative impacts which surpasses the positive ones.

Since the end of the Liberia Civil Conflict in 2003, significant steps have been made towards protecting and managing the forest and improving environmental governance. This is critical because Liberia depends heavily on its natural resource extraction for economic growth and social development.

Hence, improved environmental security and the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources are crucial. Environmental goals have to be balanced with Liberia's pressing need for development, economic growth and job creation.

The Forestry Development Authority (FDA) is Liberia's institution responsible for the management and sustainable use of Liberia's forests and the resources therein including the wildlife. The FDA

developed a regulatory framework, three (3) Cs policies (conservation, community and commercial forestry), to ensure that the forests of Liberia are managed in a more sustainable manner to benefit the people of Liberia. Unfortunately, this regulatory framework does not mention anything on pit-sawing in Liberia and the absence of any law regarding pit-sawing operations has caused increase in the number of players in the pit-sawing business thus increasing the level of threats to the environment and biodiversity therein.

Liberians now advocating for equitable benefit sharing mechanism in line with the three (3) Cs, to improve revenue to the government and community, the need has come to regulate chain sawing in Liberia. From lesson learnt, a regulatory framework must be designed with the participation of all relevant stakeholders of the forest sector.

In support to Government (FDA) initiative, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) provided funding to support the drafting of a regulatory framework to align pit sawing to existing forest polices. **The goal of the project is to contribute to improving a regulatory management of the forest sector, promoting sustainable forest management and assuring the economic benefit for the nation and the communities.**

The Rural Integrated Center Community Empowerment (RICCE), a local Non – Governmental Organization in partnership with the IUCN facilitated multi –stakeholders’ consultation in the fifteen Counties. The consultation created a platform for the voices of the rural poor, marginalized, and forest dependent groups in making an input in the development of a regulatory framework to align pit sawing activities to legality and sustainability principles. In further efforts to ensure robust and consolidated regulatory frame work that incorporates the voices of relevant stakeholders, the draft regulation was validated in the four FDA regions and at the national levels by the same stakeholders at the multi-stakeholders consultation forum. Comments gathered were incorporated into the final Draft Regulation by the Legal Specialist.

Through a thorough desk study, RICCE produced options papers from existing information on pit sawing activities in Liberia. The options were dissimilated through effective media awareness and facilitated the solicitations of views of stakeholders for the incorporation in the drafting of the regulation on pit sawing activities. Those stakeholders include the chain sawyers, forest dependent communities, marginalized communities, counties forest forum, civil society organizations, Government Authorities and private sectors.

2. OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES

Objectives

As stated by the terms of reference of this study, the main objective is to first compile the existing finding on chain sawing in Liberia through an excellent desk study and produce an options paper to be used for the multi stake holders consultation forum aimed at soliciting the view for incorporation in the drafting of a regulatory framework with inputs from multi-stakeholders views gathered during consultation workshops.

The specific objectives addressed to date are as follow:

- Use the existing chain sawing reports to develop options papers;
- Organize Multi-Stakeholders consultation workshops to gather views;
- Make available consultations report to FFI legal consultant to draft regulations on chain sawing in Liberia;
- Carry out validation process of the draft regulations to relevant stakeholders in Monrovia and the four (4) FDA regions; and
- Incorporate comments arising from vetting into the draft regulations

Expected outcome

In line with the objectives of the project, the following outcomes were to be obtained:

- A thorough desk study to be carried out in order to identify what information exist on chain sawing in Liberia;
- An option papers and necessary materials are produced to support multi-stakeholder consultations;
- Through an appropriate communication channel, option papers and materials are disseminated to announce a public dialogue;
- Workshops are organized at National and regional levels in Liberia in order to obtain consolidated inputs on issues identified and other relevant themes on chain sawing;
- A draft regulatory framework is developed that should be in compliance with legality and chain of custody elements of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement as is expected in the TSC and the FMC holders;
- The validation of the draft regulations is implemented at county, regional and national levels and comments generating from the exercise is incorporated into the draft regulations;

3. METHODOLOGY

The success of every project begins with a comprehensive work plan that takes into consideration the objective of the project. Through a thorough consultation with FDA, LMI and other NGO partners RICCE developed a SMART (simple, measure, Achievable, Realistic and Time band) work plan that enhances the implementation of the project given the time constraint. Considering the urgency of the project and the limited implementation period, division of labor was a holistic approach in meeting the objectives and timeline of the project

RICCE established partnership with the Liberia Media Initiative (LMI) and the Friends of the Forest and Environment (FEE) to share the responsibilities. RICCE entered into contract agreement with the LMI to facilitate the media component of the project given their experience and competence in media work over the years. The strategy to select LMI stands from the fact that the LMI has demonstrated excellence in the implementation of similar projects and their connection with communities radios since the projects requires mass media coverage. RICCE also collaborated with FEE and implemented a thorough desk study from which options were developed in simple English using some relevant documents produced by the IUCN and FDA. The desk study took into consideration the review of the below listed documents and went beyond making research on other documents including the NFRL 2006 and lesson learnt from other countries that are relevant to the study.

Research Documents:

- Chain sawing study (2009) - chain saw logging in Liberia. “Analysis of chain saw logging in the nature forest of Liberia towards a more sustainable production.”
- A power point presentation on the above study
- TORs for the project and the Legal Specialist
- FDA contribution to the Multi- Stakeholders (MSCs) – Proposed Regulatory Framework for chainsaw operation in Liberia
- The Summary of Chain Saw Study report compiled by IUCN .Liberia Chain sawing Summary Brief
- FDA Article on chain sawing in Liberia to the EFRN

Information dissemination and public awareness was a priority before the multi- stakeholder consultation and the validation processes. Drama and Jingles were produced and aired at radio stations across Liberia in English local dialects to inform the public on the initiative. Television and radio talk show were held for further publicity. Additionally, on the ground visitations were made at pit sawing sites and timber markets to pre- prepare the pit sawyer for the multi-stakeholders consultation forum. Prior to the launch of the multi-stakeholders consultation in the counties and region, the options papers were distributed along with the invitation to allow the participant prepare and understand and make informed inputs or suggestion during the forum. At the validation, stakeholders were provided copies of the draft and other reference documents including the section of the NFRL that was mentioned in the draft regulation for easy access.

The selection of participants to the forum was another critical issue that RICCE treated with serious caution. In counties that were assessable, RICCE did on the ground visits. RICCE worked with the government line ministries relevant to this project, civil society organizations, local authorities, UNMIL and the FDA in the identification and selection of participants. Given the politics of participants selection according to lesson learnt from projects implemented over the years, Participants were carefully scrutinized to allow the real people on board.

The consultation and the validation workshops were done through thorough review of the options papers following presentation by independent qualified Liberia facilitators. Participants at the workshop were given the opportunities to speak out freely taking into consideration the difference level of people from diverse social backgrounds. At some point in time dialects were used to provide more information and understanding to participants. Following the presentation, participants were group in four categories to review the options and other draft regulatory documents to provide their views and suggestion. During the validation of the draft regulation stakeholders were grouped in the same categories. These categories included:

- Private Sector- made up of pit sawyers, timber dealers, concession holders etc.
- Government – made up of FDA, Local authorities, EPA, and other government line ministries
- Community- made up of CFDCS, Forest forum, affected communities, marginalized group etc.
- Civil Society – made up of CBOs, NGOs, Media, and UNMIL etc.

RICCE developed questionnaires that guarded the participants in discussing the issues holistically. Participants reviewed and presented their views through a group member selected to speak on behalf of the group. Following the group presentation, there were question and answer period where issues raised were further explained for clarity. The presentations were done through power point using both visual aids to give better explanations. The views collected from the forum were passed to the legal specialist to be included in the drafting of the regulation.

Unlike the multi- stakeholders' forum, at the validation workshops stakeholders were provided the draft regulation produced by the Legal Specialist and in their various groups scrutinized sections by sections and made their comments. These comments were presented to the larger body by a representative selected by the group.

These brilliant strategies provided the platform for effective discussion and harmonization.

4. Location of the Consultation

In accordance with the strategy put into place to tackle the various Multi-Stakeholders consultations the following grouping was developed and followed for this study.

Table 1: Grouping of the counties

Number	Workshop Venue	Number of Counties	Name of Counties	Workshop date
1	Monrovia	1	Montserrado	September 16,2010
2	Gbarnga	4	Bong, Lofa, Nimba, Margibi	September 30, 2010
3	Tubmanburg	3	Bomi, Gbapolu, Cape Mount	October 2, 2010
4	Buchanan	3	Bassa, Rivercess, Sinoe	October 8, 2010
5	Zwedru	4	Grand Gedeh, Maryland, River Gee, Grand Kru	October 22, 2010

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.0 RESULTS

This portion of the report discusses the activities and findings of the multi-stakeholders consultation forum held both at national, county and regional levels. It focuses on the desk study, media publicity and multi stakeholders' consultation and the validation forum. RICCE conducted a thorough desk study and produced options paper that supported the multi stakeholders' forum. These options and other supporting document including the FDA proposed Regulatory Frame work, IUCN Draft Article on chain sawing etc. contributed to the success of the consultation. Media awareness was also key to the project, Information on chain sawing was translated in local dialects and pre informed participants. Five multi -stakeholders' consultation and three validation forum involving participants from the fifteen Counties of Liberia were held regional and national level. These forums were held in Monrovia, Gbarnga- Bong, Tubmanburg- Bomi, Buchanna- Grand Bassa, Zwedru- Grand Gedeh Counties. The forums brought together three hundred thirty seven participants from all fifteen Counties of Liberia. The profiles of these stakeholders are as follow:

- Private Sector- made up of pit sawyers, timber dealers, concession holders etc.
- Government – made up of FDA, Local authorities, EPA, and other government line ministries
- Community- made up of CFDCS, Forest forum, affected communities, marginalized group etc.
- Civil Society – made up of CBOs, NGOs, Media, and UNMIL etc.

Views and comments of the stakeholders at every workshop are group per sector as mentioned above at the different counties and regions on the below table. The views are again consolidated per sector (CSOs, Private Sector, Government and communities) across the regions on another table.

OBJECTIVE 1.

- Use the existing chain sawing reports to develop options papers;

OUTCOME 1

- A thorough desk study to be carried out in order to identify what information exist on chain sawing in Liberia;
- An option papers and necessary materials are produced to support multi-stakeholder consultations;

5 .1 Desk Study

RICCE contracted Friends of the Forest and Environment (FEE) to assist in the implementation of the desk study. FEE is a recognized Liberian consultancy organization that is concern with forest governance and community rights issues. RICCE in collaboration with FEE conducted a thorough desk study to identify what information exists on pit sawing in Liberia. An options paper was produced in simple English that Liberian with little educated background could read. The options plus the other supporting documents were printed in mass copies and distributed to participants prior to the consultation. About four hundred copies of the options paper were produced and distributed to participants. The following documents made available by IUCN and FDA supported the desk study:

- Chain sawing study (2009)- chain saw logging in Liberia. “Analysis of chain saw logging in the nature forest of Liberia towards a more sustainable production.”
- A power point presentation on the above study
- TORs for the project and the Legal Specialist
- FDA contribution to the Multi- Stakeholders (MSCs) – Proposed Regulatory Framework for chainsaw operation in Liberia
- The Summary of Chain Saw Study report compiled by IUCN .Liberia Chain sawing Summary Brief
- FDA Article on chain sawing in Liberia to the ETRN

The document provided information on chain sawing activities in Liberia through an excellent desk study. The options paper supported the multi-stakeholders consultation workshops. This additionally aimed the participant in making informed inputs in the development of a draft regulatory framework that incorporated the views of marginalized and rural poor communities in order to have a policy governing chain sawing activities in regards to social and economic values for the country and the local communities. To ensure transparency in the implementation of the project all relevant information were disseminated through the competency of Liberia Media Initiative hired by RICCE to carry out the exercise.

OBJECTIVE 2

- Organize Multi-Stakeholders consultation workshops to gather views;

OUTCOME 2

- Through an appropriate communication channel, option papers and materials are disseminated to announce a public dialogue;

5. 2 Media Awareness

Media awareness was crucial to the implementation of the consultation in the counties. The weakness in the implementation of policies and regulations in Liberia stand from the fact that laws that affect the entire public are made at the higher level and taken to bottom. This approach has created lack of interest on the part of the local in the enforcement and regard for the laws. Against this background, it is recognized that the formulation of laws to regulate pit sawing activities requires more robust and consolidated efforts to ensure ownership and sustainability. Through the IUCN funded project, a bottom to top approach was necessary to solicit the views of marginalized, poor and disadvantage, forest dependent stakeholders in the process of drafting a regulation on Pit Sawing activities in Liberia. Hence the formulation of bottom to top law required effective media awareness, an awareness that takes into consideration the level of stakeholders from diverse social background. RICCE in collaboration with the LMI developed several communication strategies including drama, jingles, spot messages, and television and radio talk show to inform the public on the multi stakeholders' forum ongoing in Liberia to regulate Pit Sawing industry. The medium of communication was also taken into consideration. RICCE and LMI identified twenty two community radio stations that are frequently used by the communities in the fifteen counties for the dissimilation of information on the activities. Four (4) dramas and jingles were produced in simple English and translated to ten (10) local spoken dialects across the fifteen counties of Liberia. The ten dialects captured the fifteen counties. The jingles and drama depicting messages on pit saw activities were play at fifteen (15) local radio stations and Monrovia as follow:

1. Radio Gberzon-----Buchanan, Gd.County
2. Radio Gee-----River Gee County
3. Rivercess Broadcasting System-----Rivercess County
4. Voice of Sasstown-----Gd.Kru County
5. Voice of Sinoe-----Sinoe County
6. Jam FM-----Maryland County
7. Radio Cape Mount-----Gd.Cape Mount County
8. Radio Bomi-----Bomi County
9. Radio Kergheamahn-----Nimba County
10. Smile FM-----Margibi County
11. Smile FM-----Gd.Gedeh County
12. Radio Life-----Lofa County
13. Human Rights Radio-----Gbarpolu County
14. Radio Gbarnga-----Bong County
15. Radio Kazza-----Lofa County

Additionally, three Television and radio talk shows were held on Power and Real TV and radio stations in Monrovia in September and October, 2010 to give more publicity to the activity. Participants on the Power TV Talk shows included: Mrs. Salome G. Gofan- Executive Director of RICCE, Joseph T. K. Ballah- Project Officer of RICCE, and the moderator Mr. Korta Dogba of the Liberian Media Initiative (LMI).

Another Television Talk Show held on Real TV with the IUCN Sponsoring Donors representative, Mr. Abdullai Barrie. The Television talk shows were played live for over hundred thousand television viewers across Liberia. The television and radio talk shows provided the audience updates on the multi-stakeholder consultations forum held in the counties with the vision of "What Next" after the consultation forum and

the overall issues that have arisen from the participants' views on the options paper discussed at each forum in the counties.

Banners depicting messages on the multi stakeholders' forum on pit sawing were produced and posted at every workshop sites. These media strategies added more publicity in the counties.

OBJECTIVE 2

- Organize Multi-Stakeholders consultation workshops to gather views;
- Make available consultations report to FFI legal consultant to draft regulations on chain sawing in Liberia

OUTCOME 3

- Workshops are organized at National and regional levels in Liberia in order to obtain consolidated inputs on issues identified and other relevant themes on chain sawing;

5.3 Multi-stakeholders Consultation

The multi stakeholders' consultation forum created the avenue for the voices of the local communities to be heard and incorporated in the drafting of a regulation to align pit sawing with sustainability and legal principle. The information gathered from the workshop allowed legal specialist access to the needed information for policy reform without compromising the interest of the masses. The consultations were held at regional, county and national levels with the participation of the fifteen counties of Liberia. A total of three hundred thirty seven (337) participants(female – 110, – male 227) from across the Fifteen Counties of Liberia including Maryland, Grand Kru, Sinoe, Grand Bassa, River Gee, Garpolu, Grand Cape Mount, Lofa, Nimba , Bong, Margibi, River Cess, Bomi , Grand Gedeh and Montserrado Counties were in attendance . These stakeholders were group per sectors and provided contribution on the options paper. These sectors include civil society organizations, communities, government authorities and the pit sawyers that make up the private sector. The Consultation started on September 16, 2010 in Monrovia with subsequent activities in the remaining Counties. See attached Annex 2.provided inputs and recommendations to support the drafting of the regulation

5.4 Views arisen from the MSCs at national and regional levels

Each of the tables is divided into the following columns:

1. **Options:** carries options that were produced in simple English to support the Multi -stakeholders Consultations.
2. **Participant views:** gives the direct point of view towards the options presented by the facilitators during the consultation workshops. This view is a consensus of the group of stakeholders working together.
3. **Justification/Recommendations:** in order to get better insight of the stakeholders' views, RICCE designed a questionnaire (Annex 3) to help understand and make inputs on the options. There are some stakeholders who rather give recommendations instead of the only justification.

- 4. Venue of the workshop:** in support of the strategy designed for the multi-stakeholders' consultations this particular column was created to indicate the area where the activity took place.

From **table 2 to 20**, detailed views are gathered for each Multi-stakeholder consultation workshop per sector (Government, Private sector, Civil Society and community representatives) and per workshop. In addition to the various participant point of views on the issues of pit sawing in the country the participants gave their reason regarding the options initially designed and presented to them by RICCE. The local government authorities in the region were very supportive to the program. In fact the initiative was embraced by the entire participants. Initially the pit sawyers were very defensive thinking that the government was trying to put them out of business, but they later recognized the importance of the regulation and the level of restriction and control it will bring to the activity. The production and market aspect was readily keen to all pit sawyers in attendance as they think that the regulation will assist to improve their skills and provide them additional market outside of Liberia. They admitted that though there are successes in the business, but they most times encountered serious problem with some stronger communities.

In Tubman burg where the third consultation where held, the exercise was carried out with the active participation of the county Superintendent of Bomi County and Grand Cape Mount Counties.

Table 21 is the consolidated views of the stakeholders deriving from all the different consultations. This gives the resume of all what was said at all the consultations. One can see that the views for the same sector at the different consultations are almost the same for that particular sector, simple reason being that, they have the same interest.

Table 22 presents the stakeholders profile per sector. It also gives the number of participants during each consultation held.

Table 2. Government views at Monrovia consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of workshop
NO CHANGE	No. There is a need for change.- Government should legalize pit sawing activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meeting up with international best practices. 2. Reduce pressure on the forest. 3. Improve revenue generation. 4. Equitable benefit sharing for stakeholders 	Monrovia
Enforcement of existing bans	FDA should continue to enforce the existing ban until a formal regulation is put into place.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promotion of socio-economic benefit. 2. Because FDA lacks the requisite human resource to monitor the forest against illegal activities. 3. To have considerable control over chain saw logging. 4. Collection of \$ 0.60 cents is contradictory to the ban. 	Monrovia
Permits to chain saw loggers	Yes. Permit should be given to chain saw loggers after regulation is put into place.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Depletion of the forest is occurring now in the absence of a permit, what will be the result if permits are given? 2. For the purpose of control-Pit sawyers should be unionized and governed by rules and regulations to qualify for the permit. 3. Strategy enabling FDA to effectively monitor pit sawing activities in line of permit types granted- types of trees, diameters, and plans for replenishment. 4. Benefit sharing mechanism needs to be developed and implemented 	Monrovia
Permits to communities	No permit to community now until regulation is put into place	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Because there is no regulation and awareness 2. Because there is a lack of capacity in sustainable forest management. 3. Community is not yet defined. 4. No strategy to ensure adequate benefit shearing and monitoring system 	Monrovia
Where should pit sawing be permitted?	By regulation pit sawing should be permitted in: community forest and TSC areas	Those are areas that have been approved and will easily be monitored by FDA.	Monrovia

Table 3. Private Sector- Timber Union views at Monrovia consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of workshop
NO CHANGE	There should be change.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Because there is no law in place on chain saw logging. 2. Union is not recognized by government therefore there is a need for recognition from government legally. 3. To avoid problems arising from the environment and the communities. 4. There is a need for an improvement in the benefit sharing system. 	Monrovia
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	There should be a change in the exiting ban	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To avoid conflict between the community and the chain saw loggers on ground that the exiting ban is saying chain saw logging is illegal. 2. Also to avoid confusion on community benefits and way bills issues by FDA. 	Monrovia
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	There should be permit to chain saw loggers.	Chain saw logging should be permitted in line with acceptable chain saw regulations	Monrovia
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	There should be a permit to community	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The community should participate in activities in chain saw milling to be able to manage their forest and get benefits due them. 2. Also to closely work with the FDA to monitor the activities of the pit sawyers in the management of the forest. 	Monrovia
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Should be carried out in TSCs and private forest areas established or recognized by the FDA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These are places that will be closely monitored by the FDA for an effective and efficient forest management. 2. Because community forests are already depleted by farmers-there is no need to pay such a fee-to avoid loss 	Monrovia

Table 4. Civil Society Organization views at Monrovia consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of workshop
NO CHANGE	No. There is a need for change by putting into place regulations on pit sawing.	If regulations are not put into place to properly manage the forest, it may lead to lot of factors as followed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of the environment, • Undermines community rights • Breeds conflicts Deny government needed revenues Also there is a need to organize community/pit-sawyer into cooperatives	Monrovia
ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING BAN	Yes, there is need to enforce the existing ban.	Enforcement of the ban will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides socio-economic benefits (jobs, income, etc) • Provide FDA the capacity to monitor forest and pit sawing activities in forested regions • Formalize a regulation that supports chain saw cooperatives. • No ban enforcement undermines FDA authority because it still exists despite the existence of the ban. 	Monrovia
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes, permit should be given to chain saw loggers only after the regulations on pit sawing are drafted to be enforced.	1. Permits should be given to recognized cooperatives and their members which are legally registered, incorporated, and accredited by the MPEA, FDA and FDA. 2. FDA should create awareness with local communities on the approved regulation on chain saw	Monrovia
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	The community should be given permit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local communities should be given preference in organizing themselves to form cooperatives FDA should support the establishment of these community cooperatives	Monrovia
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	In TSCs and private forest areas established or recognized by the FDA	It will give chance to community forest to regenerate	Monrovia

Views of Participants at the Regional Multi-stakeholder Consultation forum- which brought together representatives from 4 Counties in Gbarnga

Participants: 66 (Female: 18; Male: 48)

Table 5. Government views at Gbarnga consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of the Workshop
NO CHANGE	No. There should be change in order to regulate pit sawing activities in Liberia	This change will regulate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets and bond • Better job creation • Positive Environmental impacts • Acceptance on the international markets 	Gbarnga
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No. Pit sawing should not be banned till regulation is put into place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be lifted temporarily and regulated over a period of five years under a benefit sharing scheme. 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	In the absence of regulations and policy, the issuance of permit is not necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The permit should prohibit them from working in FMC areas. • The permit should allow them to negotiate with community dweller to establish social agreements. • The permit should allow them to bid for TSC areas 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	No permit to community now.	The community and FDA should work together to draw up the necessary regulatory framework in allowing chain sawyers to operate community forest such as TSC, PUP, and FUP.	Gbarnga
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	It should be permitted in community forest areas, and private land	The pit sawyers can organize themselves and go for the TSC. A benefit sharing mechanism could be developed for the community forest.	Gbarnga

Table 6. Pit Sawyers/ Timber union views at Gbarnga consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	There is a need for change. There be a regulation set up to govern the pit sawing activities in the country.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pit sawing should be legalized by the Government of Liberia through FDA. And pit sawyer should work with the community. 2. The activity of pit sawing should only be restricted to only Liberians 3. Also the waybill fees at US\$0.60¢ remains in place and be extended to the entire country. 4. FDA conducts formal training for pit sawyers for sustainable harvest practices.. 	Gbarnga
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No. There should be no ban enforcement. The exiting ban should be lifted	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The exiting ban should be lifted provided pit sawyers obtain permit / license from the GOL 2. Socio-economic benefits from pit sawing for the country-especially local communities. 3. Assisting the reconstruction and development of the country. 4. Pit sawyers should have access to world market (exports) to sell timber products. 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Chain saw loggers must be permitted	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chain saw loggers must be permitted by GoL (FDA) to avoid illegal sawing 2. FDA should deploy field monitors within the forest sector to work with the community people 3. Permit will help the government to generate more revenue. 4. This will bring transparency and protect Liberians from foreign pit sawyers. 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	FDA should give permit to the community.	FDA should give permit to the community to manage their forest against pit sawyers. But FDA should work closely with community to monitor chain saw loggers.	Gbarnga

WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing should be permitted to operate in areas specified by FDA: private use permit (PUP) Timber sale contract (TSC) and community forests	FDA can regulate and monitor pit sawyers in specified areas: government own forest and community areas, pit sawyers should be permitted through the government/ or with the knowledge of the community people.	Gbarnga
--	--	--	---------

Table 7. Civil Society Organization views at Gbarnga consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue for the workshop
NO CHANGE	There must be a change by grouping pit sawyers as mini-companies/ union where activities will be regulated.	There must be a change by grouping pit sawyers as mini-companies/ union where activities will be regulated to avoid the following: 1. Destruction of the environment 2. Undermining of Community rights 3. Giving rise for conflicts 4. Deny government needed revenues 5. Types of trees to be harvested	Gbarnga
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	FDA must be able to enforce the ban on sustainable forest management by collaborating with local /communities in monitoring the forest	1. Provides socio-economic benefits (jobs, income, etc) 2. It will not undermine FDA integrity and mandate 3. FDA will have the capacity to monitor 4. Illegal sawing will be control with the enforcement of existing ban 5. Formalize a regulation that support chain saw cooperatives	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes, there should be permit to chain saw loggers with the institution of regulation on pit sawing.	1. Permits should be given by FDA to recognized cooperatives which are legally registered, incorporated, and accredited by the FDA and CDA. 2. Permits should restrict pit sawyers to selling only in Liberia. 3. FDA should create awareness with local communities and train monitors on the approved regulation on chain saw 4. Benefit sharing mechanisms must be developed between pit sawyers, community and Government	Gbarnga

PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	The community should be given permits, but these permits should be guarded by FDA.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local communities should be given preference in organizing themselves to form cooperatives 2. FDA should support the establishment of these community cooperatives 3. Community having permit will help the FDA authority to train the community including pit sawyers to know what types of trees and size to cut down. 4. Set another category for pit sawyers permit lesser than the TSC 	Gbarnga
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing should take place in the National forest, TSC and Private forests only	FDA has direct oversight over these areas as part of their mandate to ensure careful monitoring and sustainable management as there are regulations governing them.	Gbarnga

Table 8. Community views at Gbarnga consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue for workshop
NO CHANGE	There is a need for change to regulate pit sawing in Liberia.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guarantee community's full representation and participation in forest management 2. Community derives socio-economic benefit from the industry through tariff on planks taken from the forest. 3. Put in mechanisms for the sustainability of the forest for future. 4. Legalization it will help in the development of acceptable benefit sharing mechanism for all actors (GOL, Community and the pit sawyers). 5. Guarantee access to market (local and international). 	Gbarnga
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	Yes, it is necessary to enforce the existing regulation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure the legalization of pit sawing. 2. For revenue generation by Government and community-raising the way bill from \$.60 cents to \$3.50 cents 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	No permit should be given to pit sawyers now until regulations be put in place.	<p>If not the same pit sawyers will continue to operate outside the law. And if GOL put into place policy to legalize pit sawing will make it difficult for the pit sawyer to obey it. This may cause confusion between the GOL & the community people with the pit sawyers</p> <p>If there is permit to chain Saw Loggers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It means pit sawyer will definitely continue to carry out more damage of the forest than before, when they were not permitted. • Already, pit sawyers are massively involved in pit sawing. It is necessary to make it legalized before any operation by pit sawyers 	Gbarnga
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Yes, permit is needed to community	<p>Community should be given permit. Community will help FDA properly monitor and manage the activities of the forest. Most communities own a forest and will like to know what is going on in their forest and would also like to benefit from their forest.</p> <p>Community permit can only be given if regulation on pit sawing and made. In the regulation it will clearly state what will be the role of the community, pit sawyers and the government FDA in the management and operation of the forest</p>	Gbarnga

WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing must be permitted in community forest and TSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pit sawing must be permitted in community forest that the community is involved with the monitoring of the pit sawyers activities in the forest. • Community should work closely with the FDA to monitor the management of the community forest. • If community forest is used for pit sawing will also help community people to benefit • FDA will then be able to work with the community who owns the forest to monitor and share cost accordingly with the pit sawyers 	Gbarnga
--	--	---	---------

MULTI-STAKEHOLDER REGIONAL CONSULTATIVE FORUM TUBMANBURG –BOMI COUNTY October 2, 2010

Participants: 68 (Female: 25; Male: 43)

Table 9. Government sector views at Tubmanburg consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue for the workshop
NO CHANGE	There should be a change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No metes and bond • DBH Cut limits • Price Control and Many fronting • Not environmental friendly • Unfair benefit shares • Fees be charged in bold foot 	Tubmanburg
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No change now	Except regulations are set and put into place	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	No permit now	This should be addressed in the proposed regulation	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	No permit to community should be given to communities now.	Because there is no regulation and awareness on Pit sawing	Tubmanburg
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	By regulation pit sawing should be permitted in: community forest and TSC areas.	These are areas that are under the control of FDA and they have the capacity to monitor	Tubmanburg

Table 10. Chain/pit sawyers group views at Tubmanburg consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	There be a regulation set up to govern the pit sawing activities in the country.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pit sawing should be business set aside only for Liberians • Also the waybill fees at US\$0.60¢ remains in place and be extended to the entire country. • That FDA conducts formal training for pit sawyers for sustainable harvest practices. 	Tubmanburg
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No, there should be no band enforcement.	Because the entire country is benefiting from pit sawing, especially the local communities with respect to reconstruction development. It also provides job opportunities for Liberians.	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes	Permit will help the government to generate more revenue. This will bring transparency and avoid illegal pit sawing by foreigners.	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	No!	Permit should only be given to pit sawyers while FDA closely works with the communities to monitor chain saw loggers.	Tubmanburg
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing should be permitted to operate in private use permit (PUP) Timber sale contract (TSC)	So that when the forest is exhausted it could be used for agricultural purposes	Tubmanburg

Table 11. Civil Society organization views at Tubmanburg consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	There must be a change	By grouping pit sawyers as mini-companies/ union activities will be regulated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pit sawing activities must be legalized in Liberia • Pit sawing must followed FDA regulation and must be monitored by FDA. 	Tubmanburg
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	FDA must be prepared to enforce existing ban	FDA must be able to enforce the laws on forest protection by collaboration with local /communities in monitoring the forest	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Pit sawyers must obtain permit from FDA.	But this permit must restrict them to selling only in Liberia.	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	The community should be given permits	These permits will be regulated by FDA who have the mandate to protect the forest.	Tubmanburg

WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	TSC and Community forests	Set another category for pit sawyers permit lesser than the TSC.	Tubmanburg
--	---------------------------	--	------------

Table 12. CFDC views at Tubmanburg consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Veune of the workshop
NO CHANGE	There is a need for change for pit sawing in Liberia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will give the community people the opportunity to have voice and control over our forest. • It will also make the community people to benefit from the pit sawing in community forest by having sawyers and GOL paying way bills for each plank produced from their forest. • The forest will be well managed and reserved for the future of the next generation to come. 	Tubmanburg
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	Yes	The existing ban needs to be enforced so as pit sawing would be legalized. And FDA should increase the will bill from 0.60C/ to at least \$3.50c/ to help GOL generate income and this will be should also benefit the community people	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	No permit should be given to pit sawyers	If not the same pit sawyers will still continue to operate outside the law. And if GOL put into place policy to legalize pit sawing will make it difficult for the pit sawyer to obey it. This may cause confusion between the GOL & the community people with the pit sawyers	Tubmanburg
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Yes community should be given permit	Community will help FDA properly monitor and manage the activities of the forest. Most communities own a forest and will like to know what is going on in their forest and would also like to benefit from their forest.	Tubmanburg
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing must be permitted in community forest.	Community should work closely with the FDA to monitor the management of the community forest. If community forest is used for pit sawing will also help community people to benefit	Tubmanburg

Views of Participants at the Regional Multi-stakeholder Consultation forum- which brought together representatives from 4 Counties in Zwedru

Participants: 88 (Female: 31; Male: 57)

Table 13. Government sector views at Zwedru consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	Yes! There should be a change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To make it Liberianized ● For proper monitoring, transparency, accountability ● To ensure sustainable forest management ● To avoid encroachment on the TSC, FMC and Protected Areas. ● The way bill charge should be based on the dimension of the planks (0.60-1.00 USD). 	Zwedru
ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING BAN	Yes	Need to enforce the existing ban till regulation is put into place	Zwedru
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Pit sawyers should be accredited and licensed by FDA	To avoid them (pit sawyers) from entering into the FMC and TSC areas which are being awarded to companies, etc. through bidding process	Zwedru
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	No, community need not to be given permit.	Community should be trained to work closely with FDA to monitor pit sawing activities	Zwedru
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawyers should be permitted to operate in community and deeded forest by and through negotiation with the community or individuals	To avoid them (pit sawyers) from entering into the FMC and TSC areas which are being awarded to companies, etc. through bidding process	Zwedru

Table 14. Chain sawyers group views at the Zwedru workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	We agree that pit sawing activities should be regulated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For maximum control on pit sawing activities ● Create access to international market ● To maximize profit 	Zwedru
ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING BAN	The Ban should be enforced	This should be under the auspice of a taskforce comprising of the FDA, Pit sawyer Union and Community.	Zwedru
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes! Permit should be issued to Liberian pit sawyers only.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For proper management of the Liberian forests by Liberians themselves ● To promote revenue generation for government. <p>Membership of the union should be opened only to Liberians.</p> <p>Only member of the pit sawyers union should be issued permit</p>	Zwedru

PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Yes! FDA should give permit to community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To help control and monitor the forest • Benefit sharing mechanism should be developed. 	Zwedru
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Should be extended to TSC	Community forest is already depleted	Zwedru

Table 15. Civil Society organization views at Zwedru consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue of the workshop
NO CHANGE	There should be change	Pit sawing should be control to allow proper forest management-	Zwedru
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No. There is no need to enforce the ban	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pit sawing business should be legalized by GOL. • FDA issue way bills and charges fees for the transportation of plank to Monrovia. • FDA and Finance Ministry should come down with a standard regulation on Tax/ revenue collection (way bill) 	Zwedru

PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Pit sawing should be done by Liberian only	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We observed that pit sawyers transport round logs to town and reproduce them in lesser dimension. ● We therefore suggest that no pit sawyer transport log to town in wholesome manner to reproduce lesser dimensions. 	Zwedru
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	No. No permit should be given to communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We suggest that permit not be given to community but instead, written agreement should be reached between pit sawyers and the community. ● A copy of this agreement should be served with FDA and any relevant stakeholders identify and monitor the species of trees to be cut down. 	Zwedru
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit sawing activities should be carried out in rural communities with forests.	Since urban cities desperately depend on these rural communities for wood produce.	Zwedru

Table 16. CFDC AND VPA views at Zwedru consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue Workshop
ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No enforcement of the ban should occur	There should be negotiation between the community and pit sawyers leading to the signing of an MoU	Zwedru
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes. Permits should be given to pit sawyers	For pit sawyers to harvest according to FDA regulated diameter of log	Zwedru

PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Communities should be given permits	This will allow for the collaboration between FDA and communities to monitor and regulate pit sawing activities. 1. Community Forest management Body (CFMB) forest forum be organized in affected community where there is no CFDC. 2. A piece of plank per waybill should be charged USD\$2.00 and community should have 50% from this proceed. This 50% should be paid directly to the community for its development purposes. 3. Community should also negotiate minimum benefit as may be prescribed by the communities.	Zwedru
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	FDA identified TSC forest for the use of pit sawing.	Because FDA will have oversight over these areas and can effectively monitor these forest.	Zwedru

Views of Participants at the Regional Multi-stakeholder Consultation forum- which brought together representatives from 4 Counties in Buchanan

Participants: 62 (Female: 22; Male: 40)

Table 17. Government views at Buchanan consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue Workshop
----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------

NO CHANGE	There is a need for change.	There should be regulation on Pit Sawing and these include: a) Contract between locals and the pit sawyers b) Rehabilitate roads and environmental impact assessment must be observed. c) Pit sawyers must be organized body for proper monitoring. d) Locals should monitor and supervise to help in the process AND e) FDA should facilitate the process.	Buchanan
ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING BAN	No. there is no ban	There is no ban on pit sawing but is not allow in the FMC, TBO, TSC and the protected areas. Pit sawing cannot be banned due to: a) Security reasons b) Political reasons c) Rehabilitation d) Reconstruction e) Minimum revenue generation.	Buchanan
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	No. Not necessary now.	The issuance of permit to pit sawyers is not necessary now in the absent of regulations and policy.	Buchanan
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	The community should be given permit	To allow pit sawing under a well established regulations and policy.	Buchanan
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	a) Private land and b) Community Forest	Because FMC and TSC processes are very costly	Buchanan

Table 18. Chain/Pit Sawyer group views at Buchanan consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue Workshop
NO CHANGE	There is a need for change.	1. Pit sawing should be legalized by the Government of Liberia through FDA. And pit sawyer should work with the community. 2. The activity of pit sawing should only be restricted to only Liberian.	Buchanan

ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	No. The existing ban should be lifted	The exiting ban should be lifted provided pit sawyers will obtain permit / or license from the GOL. Also pit sawyers must be known to the world market which means the sawyers must be able to export Timber on the World market	Buchanan
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Yes. Chain saw logging should be permitted	Chain saw loggers must be permitted as recommended before with license from the GOL to avoid illegal sawing FDA should deploy monitor within the forest sector to work with the community people.	Buchanan
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Yes. Communities should be given permits	FDA should give permit to the community to protect their forest through the government that will protect the sawyers.	Buchanan
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Community Forest, National Forest	Pit sawing should be permitted by FDA in specified areas. Pit sawyers should be permitted in government own forest . for the community areas, pit sawyers should be permitted through the government/ or with the knowledge of the community people.	Buchanan

Table 19. Civil Society organization

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue Workshop
NO CHANGE	There should be change in order for government to regulate pit-sawing activities in the country.	The following recommendations were advanced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That pit-sawing should a business set aside for only Liberians. • That the way –bill fees 0.60 remains in place and be extended throughout the country. • That there should be a formal training extended to pit-sawyers for sustainable harvest practices. 	Buchanan

ENFORCEMENT OF EXITING BAN	The ban should be lifted	Because the entire country is benefiting from pit-sawing through infrastructure development and it is also providing job opportunities for many Liberians.	Buchannan
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	Pit saw loggers should be given permits	They should be given permits in order to avoid illegal trespasses. It would assist government to generate sufficient revenue and also to avoid illegal pit-sawing by aliens.	Buchannan
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Permits should not be given to communities	FDA is the mandated agency of Government charged with the responsibility of giving permits and the monitoring for logging activities	Buchannan
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED?	Pit-sawing should be allowed in TSC and PUP	Because after the forest has been exhausted its use would alternate for agriculture, charcoal purpose.	Buchannan

Table 20. CFDC views at Buchannan consultation workshop

Options	Participants View	Justification/Recommendations	Venue Workshop
----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------

NO CHANGE	Change should be made to regulate pit sawing activities	Anything that is illegal is never organized. If pit sawing is legalized, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will help all actors (GOL, Community and the pit sawyers) to have satisfied share from the sale of plank or timbers. • Sale of plank will be increased on the world market . • Every person involved in the plank business will have legal and recognized documents without molestation or arrest. 	Buchanan
ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING BAN	Yes, provided GOL explained to the pit sawyers the existing GOL (FDA) ban.	Most people do not know if there is a ban. The existing ban has appeared to be like making pit sawing legal by the issuing of way bill from FDA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, there is a need to revisit the ban and make it in to a regulation that will be understood by all Liberian • Way bill issued by FDA should increase and form part of the regulation that is to be drafted. 	Buchanan
PERMIT TO CHAIN SAW LOGGERS	No Permit now till the regulation is put in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It means pit sawyer will definitely continue to carry out more damage of the forest then before, when they were not permitted. • Already, pit sawyers are massively involved in pit sawing. It is necessary to make it legalized before any operation by pit sawyers. 	Buchanan
PERMIT TO COMMUNITY	Should only be given to community if regulations are made and enforced	In the regulation it will clearly state what will be the role of the community, pit sawyers and the government (FDA) in the management and operation of the forest.	Buchanan
WHERE SHOULD PIT SAWING BE PERMITTED? \ 	Pit sawing should be permitted both in community forest and the TSC areas.	FDA will then be able to work with the community who owns the forest to monitor and share cost accordingly with the pit sawyers.	Buchanan

Table n°21: Consolidated views per Sector

Sector	Options				Where should Chain sawing be permitted
	No Change	Enforcement of existing ban	Permit to Chain Saw loggers	Permit to Community	
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is need of change Pit Sawing needs to be regulated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FDA should continue to enforce the existing ban There is no ban There should be collaboration between community and GOL (FDA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No permit should be given now to chain sawyers Regulation should be developed before issuing permit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No permit to community now Permit should be given to community under regulation and policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community forest TSC Private land
Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need of change There should be regulation set up There should be laws on pit sawing to avoid environmental problems and conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be change in the existing ban The existing ban should be lifted There should be no ban enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sawyers should be permitted Permit will help GOL to generate revenue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be permit to community Community should work with FDA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TSC Private forest areas Community forests
Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a regulation on pit sawing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should not be enforcement of existing ban The ban should be lifted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pit sawing should be regulated before issuance of permit Pit sawyers should be train by FDA Pit sawyers should be structure (cooperatives) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community should be permitted when FDA provides training on the type and size of tree FDA should monitor community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not to be community forests Should be in dense forests
CFDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be change Benefits should be share equally The plank business will be recognized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GOL (FDA) should explain to the sawyers the existing ban The way bill is given a legal form to the activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No permit now till the regulations in to place Permit to pit sawyers will enable them damage more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the regulations, community role should be defined Pit sawyers role should be clearly defined FDA role should be clearly defined 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community forests TSC

Table 22. Stakeholders profile

CONSULTATION FORUM							
Date	Activity	Number of Participants			venue	Participating Counties/Regions	Participants Profile
		Male	Female	Total			
Sept. 16, 2010	Launch of MSC on chain saw regulation	39	14	53	S.Trowen Nagbe Methodist Comp. 13 TH Street, Monrovia	Montserrado	GOL- FDA, MOJ, MIA, MOL, EPA, UL-Agric . Department, Agriculture student Union- UL, MOGD Traditional Council Private sector- LICSATDUN, pit sawyers UN Agency-UNMIL, CSO- FACE,SADS, SDI, FREMCOL,LDI,Daily observer, Star Radio
Sept. 30, 2010	MSC on chain saw regulation	48	18	66	Arch Diocese of Gbarnga Conference Hall, Gbarnga City	Lofa, Nimba , Bong and Margibi Counties	GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, MIA,Cuttington University- Agric.- sector, UNMIL, LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, forest forum,CSOs, Radio Bong, community youth, women and Chiefs and elders
October 2, 2010	MSC on chain saw regulation	43	25	68	Liberia National Red Cross Conference, Tubmanburg City	Gbarpolu, Cape Mount and Bomi Counties	GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, MIA,Superintendent, LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, CSOs, local media, community youth, women , traditional council and elders
October 8,2010	MSC on chain saw regulation	40	22	62	LOGOS Hall, Buchanan City	Sinoe, Rivercess and Grand Bassa Counties	GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, MIA,Superintendent, LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, forest forum,CSOs, Radio Gbezon, community youth, women , traditional council and elders
October 22, 2010	MSC on Chain Saw regulation	57	31	88	LRRC Hall Zwedru city	Grand Gedeh, River Gee, Maryland and Grand Kru.	Superintendent, MIA, GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, CSOs- LDI, Forest Cry, MAP, local media, community youth, women group , traditional council and elders
VALIDATION FORUM		M	F	TOTAL	Venue	Participating cts/R	Participants Profile
December 21, 2010	MSC Chain Saw Draft Regulation Review.	23	45	69	S.Trowen Nagbe Methodist Comp. 13 TH Street, Monrovia	Montserrado, Bomi,Cape Mount, G. Bassa, RiverCess, & Gbarpolu.	LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, CSOs, local media, community youth GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, MIA,Superintendent traditional council and elders
December 23, 2010	MSC Chain Saw Draft Regulation Review.	12	52	64	Arch Diocese of Gbarnga Conference Hall, Gbarnga City	Lofa, Margibi, Nimba & Bong	local media, community youth, women , traditional council and elders GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, MIA,Superintendent office, LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, CFDCs, CSOs
December 23, 2010	MSC Chain Saw Draft Regulation Review.	17	41	58	City Hall, Fish town, River Gee County	River Gee, Sinoe, Maryland, G. Gedeh & G. Kru	MIA, Superintendent office, LICSATDUN, Pit sawyers, GOL- FDA, EPA, MOA, CFDCs, CSOs, local media, community youth, women , traditional council and elders 33

Validation of Draft Regulation:

OBJECTIVE 3

- Carry out validation process of the draft regulations to relevant stakeholders in Monrovia and the four (4) FDA regions; and
- Incorporate comments arising from vetting into the draft regulation

OUTCOME 4

- A draft regulatory framework is developed that should be in compliance with legality and chain of custody elements of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement as is expected in the TSC and the FMC holders;

In line with the project object to ensure the full inputs of relevant stakeholders including the marginalized forest dependent communities, and other key actors in the drafting of the regulation of chain sawing in Liberia, RICCE facilitated the validation of the draft regulation a the national and four FDA regions in Liberia. The validation process commenced at the national level in Monrovia on the 21st of December 2010. Participant at the national validation forum came from six Counties including Montserrado, Gbarpolu, Grand Cape Mount, Grand Bassa, River Cess, and Bomi Counties. The participants include civil society groups, community people, forest forum members, community forest development committee, FDA, EPA, pit saw union, timber dealers and other Government line ministry. The process continues in the remaining regions with stakeholders Nimba, Lofa and Margibi Counties in Gbarnga Bong County on December 23, 2010. The other forum in the south east, Fish Town River Gee County brought together stakeholders from Maryland, Sinoe, Grand Gedeh, Grand Kru and River Gee Counties on December 23, 2010.

The purpose of the validation was to allow stakeholders' confirm the incorporation of their views given at the Multi –stakeholders' consultation forum as well as critique and make comments on the draft regulation. Hard copies of the draft regulation was distributed to Stakeholders and provided comments per sector after they view the document. These comments took into consideration definitions, specification, and procedures article by article and section by section. One comment that cut across the entire forums is the issue of restricting chain saw activities to Liberians only. The validation process was interesting and gave hope to many stakeholders especially the local communities' people who could not believe that their ideas were of worth to the drafted of regulation. The strategy of inclusion of marginalized poor community people and many other stakeholders to formulating a law created a sense of ownership among stakeholders.

The implementation of this aspect of the GFP work plan which aimed to regulate chain saw activities in Liberia may reduced pressure on Liberia forest, one of the remaining forest belt in West Africa and would also promote transparency and accountability in the forest resource management and further reduced conflicts in communities.

Participants’ inputs and comments gathered from the validation forum held in the various regions were incorporated into a final draft by the legal specialist. The validation was held at four FDA regions and at the national levels with the participation of the fifteen counties of Liberia.

Inputs and comments from participants during the validation of the draft regulation on chain saw regulation national and regional levels

Each of the tables is divided into the following columns:

1. **Section:** carries the portion under review for comments at the validation forum by the participants during the group works.
2. **Draft Regulation:** carries exactly the regulation developed by the legal specialist that was used to support the Multi -stakeholders Validation forum.
3. **Participants/ Sectors Comments:** gives the direct inputs and comments from the participants towards the draft regulation presented by the facilitators during the validation workshops. This inputs and comments are consensus of the group of stakeholders working together during the group work at the workshop.

From **table 23 - 28**, detailed all comments gathered for each Multi-stakeholder validation workshop per sector (Government, Private sector, Civil Society and community representatives) and per workshop. In addition to the various participants comments on the draft regulation on pit sawing in the country. This portion gives exactly the draft regulation that the stakeholders found necessary to comment on. Those portion in the regulation not mentioned in this column was considered understood and met the agreeable views of the participants in that group session.

Table 29 - Indicates summary of stakeholders’ comments from the validation done by RICCE.

TABLE 23 A & B – COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY AND CHAIN UION AT Monrovia validation forum

23 -A COMMUNITY COMMENTS - MONOVIA VALIDATION FORUM	23 –B Chainsaw Union comments- Monrovia Validation Forum
<p>1.) Under sec.2a 1.what will be the benefit of the community? 1. What will be the replanting methodology in order to reoccupy land areas used. 2. In case of water pollution from cutting of trees what would be done to restore our water facility. 3. What will become of affected houses and roads after pit – sawing.</p> <p>Sec. 3b 2.) Any one who fails to properly or directly register to the authority or who changes area of operations must be fined the sum of 300USD. This amount was derived at by the community to seriously break down the system of illegality.The fine must be paid to the community leader in person of town chief or as identified.the receipt will report same to the government representatives with flag receipt.</p>	<p>Sec. 2 (a) Let the specification cover TSC for there should be improvement in the business. Sec. 2(b1) We need more clarification on areas that are to be identified for commercial use. Sec 2(b2) We need an explanation in a simplest version Part 3 Sec. 3 sec.3 We need an explanation in a simplest version Education for our people. Part 3. Sec 2 (Land areas to offer) We need more eduction regarding hectares</p>

<p>3.) The use of this fine will be discussed by the community and government.</p> <p>Sec. 4. (f) Annual registration Amount</p> <p>A) What will the 200USD be used for? Will the community have any financial role to play in such financial intakes?</p> <p>Sec. 5© . Would the community participate in the investigation process and what section would The community want to know with whom will the authority within 2 years of the enactment of this regulations cooperate in under taking comparative systems of appropriate technologies to improve the quality and reduce waste from chain-saw Lumber.</p> <p>Sec. 6(2) Community people would appreciate to have copy of the Lumber harvesting rules.</p> <p>Sec. 7(A) & (B) The community would like for the authority to make feasible the fix or estimate of prices to suit the community dwellers Let there be clarification of schedule 1 of authority regulation 107-07 to the community members.</p> <p>Sec. 8(A) (B) The community in its lay-man understanding wants clarification on how classification of Timber trees by species be done and what would be the proper mechanism for monitoring that will ensure this section.be notified for clarity of this section under 5 c?</p> <p>Presentation 2 Sustainable Management Sec. 6B(1) The community would want for the individual or community to not harvest more than four (4) trees per week instead of eight(8). Added is what becomes of the monitoring and break down systems of tree felling. Sec.6B(4) Let the distance towards the water course for trees felling be made exact in feet or etc... Sec. 6(c)</p>	<p>Part 3 sec (2d) Let the authority show demication between a protected and community forest to avoid future problem</p> <p>Sec. 4 (f) Permit renewal should be in line with permit duration (2 yrs) instead of one year.</p> <p>Sec. 6. (sustainable Mngt 6-B1 Presentation 2 Sec.6 (sustainable Mngt) 6-B1 Permit holder should Harvest not more than Ten (10) Instead of Eight (8) Trees Per week. B2 We need more Education on Volume Measurement. B3 Permit holder shall not harvest less than Seven Trees per Hectare and not more than seven. 6c1 Should be addressed to have an adequate Knowledge regarding incorporation. 6c-2d The Authority shall develop local Chainsaw Lumber harvesting Rues in Collaboration with the Chainsaw Union. Sec.7 (Estimate or Market Prices) A-F ans. Yes, in consultation with the Chainsaw Union. Sec.8 (Classification of trees Spacer) Spacers Categories accepted, but Stumpage fees need Clarification. Sec.9 (Stumpage Fees) A.1-2 We need Clarification for both Markets. Sec.10 (Benefit Sharing) Also required clarification on benefit Sharing. Sec.11 (Chain of Custody) Since this sector will be legal from this point, this should be done in Consultation with the Chainsaw Union. 11B answer Yes</p>
---	---

Table 24 A & B COMMENTS FROM GOVERNMENT AND CSOS GROUPS AT Monrovia validation forum

<p>24-A GOL Group comments- Monrovia Validation Forum</p>	<p>24 - B CSOs Groups comments- Monrovia Validation Forum</p>
<p>Section (2) A-E- is understood. Section 3. (A) Not clear because no regulation of chain saw are specified therefore we suggest that each saw register with the amount of \$50 USD Section 3: B) should be removed and be replaced under penalties, therefore precisely this penalties should be 500USD pay Section 3: c) Clear Section 4) OK Section 4 (1) is not clear on the issue of Liberalization policy, therefore this should only be</p>	<p>Section 2 a. Agreed b. 1 Need clerity 2.a2. agreed 2.b.3 agreed 2.c agreed 2.d. agreed</p>

<p>restricted to Liberian own business. Section 4: 2-4 is OK But # 5 there should be an appropriate map for operational areas. Section 5: C FDA should be responsible to conduct field investigation and verification. Presentation: 2 SECTION 6: (A) Accepted but in order to ensure sustainable management, there should be a penalty section in the draft regulation for violations. SECTION 6 (B) 4 thirty (30) meters buffer towards water course. SECTION 6: (C) In collaboration with consultant to undertake comparative studies of appropriate the quality and reduce waste from chain-saw SECTION 6:B 1234+5 – Sustainable management, FDA, communities and other stakeholders should be involved in this aspect of the regulations. SECTION 15: Effective date in March 2011.</p>	<p>2.e. agreed Section 3. 3.a. agreed Twenty one(21) working days 3.b. 150 USD 3.c agreed Section 4 4.a agreed 4.1 agreed 4.2 agreed 4.3 agreed 4.4 agreed 4.5 deed 4.B.a. agreed 4.B.b agreed 4.B.c agreed 4.D. agreed (But we recommend that specification be should be made of the species and size of the tree for harvest 4.e land 2. Agreed 4.f annual renewable permit be 500USD 4.e agreed Section 5 5.A. agreed FDA expertise be included 5.B species of trees be included 5.c agreed Presentation 2 Agreed with all accept the following points Section 6: A FDA specifies endanger tree species should be avoided Section 6:4. 10 meter buffer zone from River/ Creek tree be harvested Section 6:1 Relevant stakeholder(s) 6.2 Improve the co-existing chain sawn and create awareness on chain sawn Lumber. Section 6 (Recommendation) FDA along with the community members/ individual should oversee the reforestation or put the best practices (Reforestation/ Agriculture) of the degraded land.</p>
--	---

25 A & B COMMENTS FROM COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENT AT FISH TOWN validation forum

TABLE 26 – A & B - COM MENT S FROM CSOs AND PIT SAWY ER GROUPS AT FISH TOWN VALIDATION FORUM	25 – A Community Groups comments- Fish Town Validation Forum	25 -BGOL Group comments- Fish Town Validation Forum
	<p>Points from participant presentation</p> <p>Sec. 3 (A) : those presently in possession or own commercial saw shall register it/them not later than one month. That person in possession of private saw should be excluded from FDA registration.</p> <p>Sec. 3 (B) Fine for failing to register: Vendor fine \$ 500.00USD Sawyer fine \$ 250.00 USD</p> <p>-person(s) with private saw found in the act of using said saw for commercial, saw should be confiscated and fined the amount of \$500.00USD, paid to Government revenue and obtained a flag receipt, before saw will be turn over to owner.</p> <p>Part 4: sec 4 (f) : chain saw logger(s)should pay a renewable fees of \$250.USD</p> <p>Sec. (E) A grace period of (15 days) be given for renewing of document. After the grace period, an amount of \$5.00USD will be charged per day to be added to the original amount.</p> <p>Sec. 6 (1) Harvest not more than 5 trees per week. Sec. 6 (4) Trees at water courses should be 14 meter buffer zone.</p> <p>Sec. 9(a-1) the fees for export is not stated or specified and such fees should be clearly</p>	<p>:</p> <p>Part 4 permitting Section 4(b) chain saw permit The duration of a permit shall be one (1)year and not two (2) years in order to have government generate revenue Section 4(e) (1) The basic term of the permit shall not be more than one year Section 5(C) The applicant shall along with the relevant agency conduct a field investigation to verify that the community trees to be harvested are eligible for felling and other environmental concerns are met before harvesting Section 6(b) (1) –permit holders shall harvest not more than three (3) trees per week for sustainable management purpose. Section 6(b) (4) Permit holders shall not harvest more than three (3) trees per hectare Incorporation with the EPA undertake comparative studies of appropriate technologies to improve the quality and reduce waste from chain saw lumber Part 3 Section 2(1) 1. The community forest should not be given to chain sawyer for operations because it has been identified as suitable for commercial use and it is not designated for chain sawyer operations, under section 4.4 (d) (i). In order to give a community forest to chain sawyers, the FDA has to carry on social survey, ELA, Etc Section 3(b) Anyone who fails to register a chain saw or inform Authority about any changes in the area for operation (s) should pay the five of US \$250.00</p>

26 -A CSOs comments-Fish Town Validation Forum	26-B Pit sawyers Groups Comments – Fish Town Validation Forum
<p>Section 2 Need clarity d 1 Need clarity 2.a2. b3, c,d,e,agreed</p> <p>Section 3. 3.a. agreed Twenty one(21) working days</p> <p>3.b. 200 USD 3.c agreed</p> <p>Section 4 4.a ,1,2,3,4,5,agreed 4.B.a.b,c, agreed</p> <p>4.D. agreed (But we recommend that specification be should be made of the</p>	<p>SECTION 2 A) Specification : Chain saw milling permits fees must be specified in other not to exploit saw owners. Therefore \$5000.00LD in two years time. #3 There should be specified amount to.</p> <p>SECTION 3</p>

<p>species and size of the tree for harvest 4.e land 4.2. Agreed Section 5 5.A. agreed FDA expertise be included 5.B species of trees be included 5.c agreed</p>	<p>(A) Community forest owner benefit \$ two Pieces. Per log of any pieces saw (B) Private \$ same as above Part three, section 3,B The fined from: \$200.00LD ---\$500.00LD. To avoid exploitation of saw owners Section 7(B) Estimates on the market price should not be stable because : A. No price control on us D. rate B. Transportation not stable C. Bad roads D. Gas price not stable</p>
--	---

TABLE 27 A& B - COMMENTS FROM CSOs AND GOVERNMENT AT GBARNGA VALIDATION FORUM

<p>27 –A CSOs Groups comments- Gbarnga Validation Forum</p>	<p>27-B GOL Groups comments- Gbarnga Validation Forum</p>
<p>Comment-Section (2a) All community Forests should be identifies by the Government though the FDA under the Forestry Law of the republic of Liberia. Section (2c) The FDA Should be Responsible in Collaboration with the Community Members /Officials in Identifying the Amount of hectares to each Community Forest. (CSO1) Section3b Anyone who fails to Register a Chainsaw should be Fined with the amount of USD \$500.00 Section 4(5b) Yes, the description of operational areas Supported by an appropriate map through the FAD. Section4b (a) Yes, Comm. not more than one a Year, to renew a Permit. Section6 (4) The Buffer or Distance should be one (1) mile to maintain the water course. Section9 (1a) Category A-c species to exported, percentage should be 5.2% instead of 3.5% of market price of the harvest Logs. Section14a This regulation should be effective on March 14, 2011 Notification/ Clarification Sections9-12 Is not clear to us. DBH, Stumpage Fob and Chain of Custody Recommendation We the CSOs Recommend that every trainee within this workshop should be empower by RICCE, FDA and other implementing Partners to ensure that what is taught to the trainees is spread in the various communities and Counties.</p>	<p>Part1: Definitions a. Domestic use b. Private or deeded forest Land c. Chainsaw operators/permit d. Community permit e. Importers f. Vendor g. Community Forest Agreement Section2: Land areas to offer D. such explanation by the Authority should meet the approved of the Community, Provided the area in question is not a Sacred area (Traditional area). Part3: Registration Section3 a. One Month grace period for those that are already in possession of Chainsaw b. Fined of \$100.00USD for Chainsaw operators and Suspension of License for one Month, Importers should pay the sum of \$300.00USD as fined. Outside of domestic use, \$500.00USD fined. c. Violators of such Law should pay the sum of \$200.00USD. d. Registration for domestic use shall be \$150.00USD, any changes of Location (county), the Authority should be notified. Section 6 Sustainable management 6b#4 The permit holder, whether individual or community shall not: fell tree Towards the water course and shall maintain a buffer of 50---60 meters, or shall distance as shall be set forth in the code of harvesting practices. Sec.6 c(1) The authority, within two years of enactment of this regulation shall (1) in corporation with the appropriate land ministries and agencies under take cooperative studies Sections.7---11 Needs technical consultations However, these consultations Should realistically conform</p>

To the desired needs and
Aspiration of the affected
Forest communities

TABLE 28 A & B – COMMENTS FROM PRIVATE SECTOR GROUP AND COMMUNITY AT GBARNGA VALIDATION

28 –A PRIVATE SECTOR Groups comments –Gbarnga Validation Forum	28-B Community Group – Gbarnga Forum
<p>Section 2 Agree Section Agree But any one who fails to register or notify the authority about any change of location of operation (s) shall be fined up to five thousand Liberia dollars (\$5000.00LD) Section 4 We agree upon section 4, but, there should be a grace period of ninety (90) days given to the person seeking permit, as discussed in article (e) of section 4 Section 5. © Agreed, but the government should provide training for chain sawyers . Section 6 We agree under section 6(a/b) number 1&4 that :No individual or community shall harvest any tree less than 50 CM in diameter No one shall fell trees towards the water course, and shall maintain a buffer of 25 meter from the water. For numbers 1&3 under section 6, we will say that an individual or community shall be able or allowed to harvest as much as they can, since they have to pay certain amount to the government for the development of the county and its communities. We further agree that the government shall facilitate the acquisition and training for chainsaw operator, and develop local chainsaw lumber/lumber harvesting rules Section 7 We agree upon, estimation of domestic market prices, with an amendment on section 7c, that: the development of the estimated domestic market prices of chainsaw lumber / lumber is done in consultation with pit sawyers also. Section 8 We don't agree because, the document made a reference on the classes/ categories in to which the tree species are listed but this schedule is not available Section 9 Section 10 That a sum equal to 3 percent of all stumpage fees collected be distributed to affected communities Section 11 We agree upon this section (11) Section 12 We do not have access to authority regulation 26 Section 13 It is agreed Section 14 This regulation is effective on feb. 3,2011.</p>	<p>Section 2 (a) The community group accepts community forest to be appropriate for issue permits. For all deeded forest /land the owner of said property shall return some benefit to the community for the use of roads and bridges. (b) Yes Section -3 (a) Yes Observation –the issue of who clarify the saw as been commercial or domestic should be closely observed and make clear by the authority. (b) The fine for registration for violator under section 3(b) shall not be the same for vender and pit sawyer. Vender \$500.00USD Pit sawyer \$500.00USD © (yes) registration of land eligible for chain saw milling. Section 4 (a)6, (yes) to all the rules but added that such application, a copy should be give the forest forum /FDA where the said pit sawing is going on. Section 4 (b)(yes) Both should be issued permits (community and deeded forest) and the copy of the permits should be given to the community forest forum. We suggest then year should be cut down to one (1) year as to give the community and FDA a chance the level of harvest. b. Community permits-yes and time cut down to (1) year. c. yes, depending on your forest area. d. Yes, also the forest forum should access such permits / transfer. e. (yes) they must accept all the conditions section -5 yes, the forest forum /FDA should send representatives to verify before issued and legal document. a. Yes , tree registration scheme b. (yes), apply to authority for permits Comments on the sections, on draft Regulation Section 6a a. Yes Forest Management policies and Guideline should be Adhere to by: Pit Sawyer too. B.Yes, Not more than Eight(8) trees per week 2. Yes, so as to preserve Trees for Future Generation. 3. Yes and a Buffer of \$500 FT. away from water. C1.Yes, in Cooperation with the Stake Holders</p>

<p>The authority shall announce this regulation and make it available to the public and the media.</p> <p>Guiding Questions</p> <p>5.(a) benefits sharing to communities should be 30% of stumpage fees</p>	<p>C2.Yes, Local Chain sawing/Lumber harvesting rules must be put in place.</p> <p>Section7: A.Yes, all such Review on Trees Grades and Market Price should be done with the Participation of all Stakeholders.</p> <p>A.Yes, Base all Estimate on the Market Price of Liberia.</p> <p>Section8-9: WE are Comfortable with all the Points mentioned.</p> <p>Section 10b: We accept 10(b) which is 30% on Stumpage fees, to be presented to a committee that comprise of all relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>Section 11: We accept all the provisions involvement of all stakeholders. All Technical issues should be observed by Technical Personals.</p> <p>Section 14: Should be effective as of February 2011.</p>
---	---

SUMMARY OF VALIDATION COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REGULATION ON PIT SAWING

SECTIONS	DRAFT REGULATION	PARTICIPANTS INPUTS /COMMENTS
<p>Section 2: Land Areas to offer for chain saw milling permit</p>	<p>Section 2. Land Areas to Offer for Chain Saw Milling Permits</p> <p>(a) Specification: Chain saw Milling permits milling shall be issued for operations only in the following areas: (1) Community forests and (ii) private or deeded forest land.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let the specification cover TSC for there should be improvement in the business. <p>Specification :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chain saw milling permits fees must be specified in other not to exploit saw owners. Therefore \$5000.00LD in two years time. • 1. The community forest should not be given to chain sawyer for operations because it has been identified as suitable for commercial use and it is not designated for chain sawyer operations, under section 4.4 (d) (i). In order tSection2: Land areas to offer • D. such explanation by the Authority should meet the approved of the Community, Provided the area in question is not a Sacred area (Traditional area).o give a community forest to chain sawyers, the FDA has to carry on social survey, ELA, Etc • Let the authority show demarcation between a protected areas⁴¹ and community forest to avoid future problem
<p>Section 3: . Registration</p>	<p>PART THREE: REGISTRATION Section 3.</p>	<p>Section 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (A) Not clear because no amount is specified for registration, therefore we suggest that each chain saw be registered with the amount of \$50 USD

	Registration	<p>Twenty one(21) working day Sec. 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (A): those presently in possession or own commercial saw shall register it/them not later than one month. • 3.) The use of this fine will be discussed by the community and government. • Sec. 3 (A): those presently in possession or own commercial saw shall register it/them not later than one month. • That person in possession of private saw should be excluded from FDA registration.
Section 3: . Registration	(b) Anyone who fails to register a chainsaw or inform the Authority about any change(s) in the area of operation(s) or provide the Authority with the necessary importation and registration records shall be fined up to \$____.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fined from: \$200.00LD ---\$500.00LD. To avoid exploitation of saw owners • 3.b. 150 USD <p>Sec. 3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.) Any one who fails to properly or directly register to the authority or who changes area of operations must be fined the sum of 300USD. <p>This amount was derived at by the community to seriously break down the system of illegality. The fine must be paid to the community leader in person of town chief or as identified. the recipient will report same to the government representatives with flag receipt</p> <p>Fine for failing to register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vendor fine \$ 500.00USD • Sawyer fine \$ 250.00 USD • -person(s) with private saw found in the act of using said saw for commercial, saw should be confiscated and fined the amount of \$500.00Usd, paid to Government revenue and obtained a flag receipt, before saw will be turn over to owner • Fined of \$100.00USD for Chainsaw operators and Suspension of License for one Month, • Importers should pay the sum of \$300.00USD

		<p>as fined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of domestic use, \$500.00USD fined • Violators of such Law should pay the sum of \$200.00USD.
Section 4 Chain Saw Permits	<p>(1) Name of individual, business entity, cooperative of Chain Sawyers/ Chain-sawn Lumber Traders or community.</p> <p>(5) Description of operational area supported by an appropriate map. (?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4 (1) is not clear on the issue of Liberalization. We suggest that the chain saw logging be only restricted to Liberians. • But # 5 there should be an appropriate map for operational areas to avoid confusion and encroachment.
Section 4 Chain Saw Permits	<p>(e) Each chainsaw milling permit, whether General or Community Permit, shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(1) The basic term of the permit shall not be more than two (2) years; and.</p>	<p>Section 4(e) (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basic term of the permit shall not be more than one year <p>Sec. (E)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A grace period of (15 days) is given for renewing of document. After the grace period, an amount of \$5.00USD should be charged per day to be added to the original amount.
Section 4 Chain Saw Permits	<p>(d)A community may assign or transfer its chain saw permit to an individual or business Chain Sawyer, and such assignment and transfer shall become effective and binding upon being attested to by the Authority. Where a Community chainsaw milling permit is transferred to a Chain Sawyer who works the permit, the obligation to comply with environmental and sustainable management requirements, including the Code of Harvesting Practices, shall be on the Operator.</p>	<p>4.D. agreed (But we recommend that specification should be made of the species and size of the tree for harvest</p>
	<p>(F) Chainsaw Milling permit holders shall pay an annually renewable permit fee of US\$200.00 (Two Hundred US dollars) to the Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.f annual renewable permit be 500USD • Part 4: sec 4 (f) : chain saw logger(s)should pay a renewable fees of \$250.USD

<p>Section five General and Community permits</p>	<p>(a) prepare a Tree Registration Scheme whereby the location is registered for all trees that may be logged. (b) Apply to the Authority for a permit stipulating the location, ownership, number of trees, and diameter.</p>	<p>5.A. agreed FDA expertise be included 5.B species of trees be included</p>
<p>Section five General and Community permits</p>	<p>c) Conduct a field investigation to verify that the community trees to be harvested are eligible for felling in accordance with felling rules under Section???.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5: C FDA should be responsible to conduct field investigation and verification • Sec. 5©. Would the community participate in the investigation process and what section would be notified for clarity of this section under 5 c?
<p>Section 6 Sustainable Management</p>	<p>a) No Person shall conduct chainsaw milling operations in violation of the Forest Management Guidelines or the Code of Forest Harvesting Practices that the Authority adopts under Section 8.1 of the National Forestry Reform Law.</p>	<p>SECTION 6: (A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accepted but in order to ensure sustainable management, the FDA should work with EPA to ensure quality and skillful chain saw logging activity. There should be a penalty section in the draft regulation for violators. <p>Section 6: A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FDA specified endanger tree species should be avoided
<p>Section 6 Sustainable Management</p>	<p>B 4) Fell trees towards the water course and shall maintain a buffer of ____, or such distance as shall be set as set forth in the Code of Harvesting Practices</p>	<p>SECTION 6 (B) 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirty (30) meters buffer towards water course. • Chain saw logging should take place about twenty five (25) meters away from water source • No one shall fell trees towards the water course, and shall maintain a buffer of 25 meter from the water. <p>Section 6:4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 meter buffer zone from River/ Creek tree be harvested <p>Sec. 6 (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees at water courses should be 14 meter buffer zone.

<p>Section 6 Sustainable Management</p>	<p>(b) The permit holder, whether individual or community, shall not: (1) Harvest more than eight trees per week. (2) Harvest any tree less than 50 cm in diameter. (3) Harvest more than five trees per hectare</p>	<p>SECTION 6:B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1234+5 – Sustainable management, FDA, communities and other stakeholders should be involved in this aspect of the regulations. • For numbers 1&3 under section 6, we will say that an individual or community shall be able or allowed to harvest at much as they can, since they have to pay certain amount to the government for the development of the county and its communities.
<p>Section 6 Sustainable Management</p>	<p>(1) Harvest more than eight trees per week.</p>	<p>Section 6(b) (1) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit holders shall harvest not more than three (3) trees per week for sustainable management purpose 6-B1 • Permit holder should Harvest not more than Ten (10) Instead of Eight (8) Trees Per week <p>Section 6:1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant stakeholder(s) 6.2 Improve the co-existing chain sawn and create awareness on chain sawn Lumber. <p>Sec. 6 (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harvest not more than 5 trees per week.
<p>Section 6 Sustainable Management</p>	<p>(c) The Authority, within two years of enactment of this Regulation, shall: (2) Develop local chain-sawn lumber/lumber harvesting rules.</p>	<p>6c-2d</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Authority shall develop local Chainsaw Lumber harvesting Rules in Collaboration with the Chainsaw Union. • We further agree that the government shall facilitate the acquisition and training for chainsaw operator, and develop local chainsaw lumber/lumber harvesting rules

<p>Section 7 Estimation of Domestic Market Prices</p>	<p>(a) The Authority shall develop a list of estimated domestic market prices of chain-sawn lumber/lumber derived from the tree species listed in Schedule I of Authority Regulation 107-07, to reflect the various grades of chain-sawn lumber as compiled under section d(2) above for the domestic market. The Authority shall review and revise the list where necessary at the start of each logging season and may revise the list more frequently in response to market trends.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. Yes, in consultation with the Chainsaw Union. • a. Yes, all such Review on Trees Grades and Market Price should be done with the Participation of all Stakeholders.
<p>Section 7 Estimation of Domestic Market Prices</p>	<p>(b) The Authority shall base the estimates on the actual market prices in Liberia.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • b. Yes, Base all Estimates on the Market Price of Liberia and also on the tree value. Sec. 7(A) & (B) • The community would like for the authority to make feasible the fix or estimate of prices to suit the community dwellers Let there be clarification of schedule 1 of authority regulation 107-07 to the community members
<p>Section Eight.(8)(Classification of trees Spacer)</p>	<p>For the purposes of Section 10 of this Regulation: (a) The tree species listed in Schedule I of Authority Regulation 107-07 are each classed into the category (A, B, or C) indicated in the column labeled “Class (stumpage fee)” of Schedule I. (b) Tree species not listed in Schedule I are classed into category C. (List should be attached to regulation)</p>	<p>a) Spacers Categories accepted, but Stumpage fees need Clarification Sec. 8(A) (B)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community in its lay-man understanding wants clarification on how classification of Timber trees by species be done and what would be the proper mechanism for monitoring that will ensure this section.
<p>Section Nine(9) Stumpage Fees</p>	<p>(1) For category A, B, and C species to be exported, 3.5% percent of the market price of the harvested logs, FOB Monrovia, as determined in the list approved under Section 3 of Authority Regulation 107-07. (2) For category A, B, C species to be sold on the domestic market and not for export, US\$8 per cubic meter as determined in the list approved under Section 8 of this Regulation.</p>	<p>A.1-2 We needs Clarification for both Markets.</p>
<p>Section Nine(9) Stumpage Fees</p>	<p>(1) For category A, B, and C species to be exported, 3.5% percent of the market price of the harvested</p>	<p>Section9 (1a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category A-c species to exported, percentage

	logs, FOB Monrovia, as determined in the list approved under Section 3 of Authority Regulation 107-07.	<p>should be 5.2% instead of 3.5% of market price of the harvest Logs.</p> <p>Sec. 9(a-1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the fees for export is not stated or specified and such fees should be clearly stated in this document
Section Ten (10) (Benefit Sharing)	<p>(a) In coordination with the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, the Authority shall ensure that a sum equal to US\$1.34 per cubic meter of trees harvested is distributed to Affected Communities through the National Community Benefit Sharing Trust mechanism established by Authority Regulation 106-07.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>(b) In coordination with the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, the Authority shall ensure that a sum equal to 30 percent of all stumpage fees collected is distributed to Affected Communities through the National Community Benefit Sharing Trust mechanism established by Authority Regulation 106-07.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also required clarification on benefit Sharing. <p>Section 10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That a sum equal to 30 percent of all stumpage fees collected be distributed to affected communities
Section Eleven (11) Chain of Custody	Section 11. Chain of Custody	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree upon this section (11) 11B answer Yes Sec.11 a (Chain of Custody) Since this sector will be legal from this point, this should be done in Consultation with the Chainsaw Union.
Section Twelve (12) Repeals	This Regulation repeals Authority Regulation 26.	<p>Section Twelve (12) Repeals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not have access to authority regulation 26
Section 13. Review and Amendment	This Regulation may be reviewed and amended from time to time as warranted by circumstances/development and at a time whereby the Authority deems it necessary, provided that every amendment shall be adopted in consultation with relevant stakeholders.	<p>Section Thirteen (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is agreed
Section Fourteen (14)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This regulation is effective on feb. 3,2011. The authority shall announce this regulation and

Effective Date	Section 14. Effective Date (a) This regulation is effective on x, 2011.	make it available to the public and the media. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This regulation should be effective on March 14, 2011 • Should be effective as of February 2011. • Effective date in March 2011.
----------------	--	--

DISCUSSION

Pit sawing has greatly contributed to the reconstruction of the Country after the 14 years unrest. Pit-sawyers have made substantial financial contributions to the national government. Between 2004 and 2005, the sector contributed about 50 percent of the FDA's total revenue and in 2005-2006, revenue from the pit-sawing sector allowed the FDA to relocate its offices. While the FDA has publicly praised the pit-sawyers for these contributions, a promised loan to the sector never materialized (Colee, 2009). This study has reveal that community and other relevant stakeholders have realized that with all what pit sawing did for the country, no provision was made in minimizing the impacts of the activities in terms of sustainable cutting, waste management, replenishment plan, to cite only these.

In Liberia FDA has the right to grant permits for the harvesting of trees. In this case the 2006 new forestry reform law (NFRL) made provision for only FMCs, TSCs, FUPs, and PUPs. Nothing was mentioned about chain sawing activities unless a regulation considering it as illegal while the FDA is collecting a waybill fees.

Issuing permits to chainsaw loggers is a possible approach to regulating the sector, but would require intensive enforcement and, as mentioned above, it is felt that the FDA does not have the necessary capacity or resources. An alternative would be to issue permits to communities allowing them to negotiate with chainsaw loggers for the right to harvest in traditional areas. Collaboration with communities to ensure enforcement of felling rules could increase the FDA's effectiveness and might be achieved through proper management of fees collected and equitable distribution among government, county authorities and communities (Blackett et al. August 2009).

The issue of alternative livelihood support to communities where pit sawing activities is carry out is another issue that require careful recognition. Almost all of the participants at the forum recommended the community forest to be used for pit sawing activities since pit sawyers may not be able to afford huge cost attached to the FMC and the TSC. The major concern of communities is what could be community means of survival after the communities forests are exploited by the pit sawing activities. Given the traditional background of rural communities in Liberia, agriculture farming is the major source of income, the issue of alternative livelihood support is crucial to sustainable forest management. Replenishment plans should be put into place if pit sawing activity should go on in community forest to prevent storm. Additionally, water source pollution should be controlled to avoid outbreak of diseases.

In another case, the assurance of permit to community to manage their own forest requires careful scrutinizing. This could include setting up management team to oversee communities share of the benefit accrued from the stumpage fees. Again, the huge confusion is who should be considered a community to be given the permit. Considering that majority of the forest in rural communities is owned by quarters of extended family, how could the entire community benefit from the stumpage fees? If the entire community should benefit, what could be the percentage for the land owner, government and the entire community since the impact of the pit sawing activities interns of storm, water source pollution, etc. could affect the entire community. The issuing of permit to pit sawyer at most of MSC was not agreed upon by communities and most civil society organizations in attendance. The fear is that in the absence of permit to pit sawyers, Liberia witnessed massive destruction of its remaining forests including protected and contracted areas. Therefore since the regulation allow issuing of permit to pit sawyers, careful system should be put into place for monitoring because FDA lack the capacity to monitor the activities. Hence, it would be wise for FDA to train community to assist them in monitoring pit sawing activity in community forest as well as train pit sawyers to reduce wastes and practice sustainable harvest. These issues should be highly considered to avoid confusion and ensure proper management and governance of the forest sector.

Constraints:

The implementation of the consultation stakeholders' forum in the counties to gather the views of relevant actors to the forest sector management and governance was much more challenging than it was envisaged. Major challenges in incurred during the consultation were as following:

- Time limitation – the delay in the launch of the project as stipulated in grant agreement became the first challenge for the kickoff. The difficulty in accessing fund from the donor in accordance with the time line spelled out for implementation in the term of reference could not be met. This delay in grant disbursement posed serious embarrassment for the kick off.
- Mobilization and selection of participants- participants' mobilization and selection became a challenge especially in hard to reach counties where hand to hand delivery of invitation was impossible. This was mainly observed in the South Eastern Counties where roads condition was beyond human imagination. Participants from Grand Kru, Maryland, Sinoe and River Gee could not be reached due to the deplorable roads. Therefore the mobilization was done through the UNMIL and the civil society organizations. In those counties, the selection of the right participants through a middle man was really challenging to get the relevant stakeholders to the workshop. However, with the assistance of UNMIL, RICCE was able to succeed in getting the right participants.
- Bad road condition – became a serious challenge, in that most major high-way linking the counties are very deplorable during the rainy seasons; as the result, it became difficult for mobilization team of RICCE getting to these counties. It also became difficult for invited participants to get to the forum. It further created a huge increase in transportation cost. In most cases, the participants, especially those from Lofa, Gbarpolu, Grand Kru, River Gee, Sinoe, and Maryland Counties spent two to three days on the high way before reaching the workshops.
- Reduction in grant amount – reduction in the cost of the project was another major challenge that is worth to be mentioned. The huge reduction in the cost of the project activities created setback for implementation. The delay to harmonize the budget after the signing of the agreement brought a delay in the launch of the project given the limited time for implementation.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION

The Multi-stakeholders consultations carried out at national and regional levels have given clear idea of the views of the people across the country. According to the various sector considered during the different consultations, it was discovered that regulation is needed to be put into place that could govern pit sawing activities in Liberia.

The issue of depleting of the forest and the lack of revenue generation through a proper channel has been outlined as very worrying. Following this is the numerous conflicts attached to the activity in the different counties where the chain sawing taking place. In order to attenuate the conflicts and increase in their profits, the pit sawyers preferred the activity be Liberianized.

The enforcement of the existing ban is somehow controversial in such way that many of the stakeholders do not recognize the existing of ban. To make clear to people awareness has been outlined as means of educating all parties involved in the activity about the ban. This will help to have every on the same page for better understanding of the issue.

Community people in recognition of sustainable forest management idea praise to them by civil society organizations through the implementation of projects; they remain reluctant in accepting for permit to be issued to chain sawyers. The community does know that the forests have been degraded by pit sawing activities at the point of no legal status. The same concern was raised by the superintendent of Gbarpoplu, Hon. Gertrude Lamini and said *“pit sawyers are not yet given permit and they are carrying out massive chain sawing logging in the forest, if they are given permit in the absence of confirmed pit sawing regulation, it may lead to further depletion of our forest natural resources.”*

In looking at the role pit sawing has played in the reconstruction and employment at some level in the rural areas, civil society organizations in addition to their request for lifting the ban, are also advocating for FDA to train the sawyers and structure them in to cooperatives and union.

The MSC has been a crucial opportunity to help every stakeholder to speak out about the issue of pit sawing that could make all views to be taking in to consideration for the drafting of policy means to govern chain sawing.

There is need among some policy makers, politicians, and resource managers to support the legalization and regulation of chainsaw milling, but there is also fear of increased corruption, which has already negatively impacted on the sector. There is a need to know the nature and dynamics of corruption in chainsaw milling in order to formulate appropriate interventions and standardize the industry. Weak forestry institutions currently cannot enforce policies and legislation effectively. Weak social norms lead to forest abuse that goes unpunished by other stakeholders. It is these governance and societal weaknesses that underlie the problems of corruption and illegality in the forest sector, especially with regards to chainsaw milling.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the several consultations held at national and regional levels which acknowledged the participation of the people from various sectors, the following recommendations are to be considered:

- Develop and implement an equitable benefit sharing mechanism of revenue generating from pit sawing under a clear sustainable forest management regime;
- FDA should put stop to the collection of the waybill fees and enforce the existing ban till a regulatory framework is developed with the incorporation of all stakeholders views;
- Permit should be issued to only Liberian pit sawyers union and cooperatives that are accredited or licensed by FDA;
- The union pit sawyers group on a transparency manner should have access to world market to sell their products in line with forest policy; and
- There should be provision in the law outlining a strategy enabling FDA to effectively monitor pit sawing activities in line with the permit types, trees species, diameters, and the plan for replenishment.
- The government FDA to register all pit sawyer groups/ unions in the counties as a start in building relationship as government works to develop regulations on pit sawing. This will help getting their input in the proposed regulation that is to be drafted soon.
- FDA to begin engaging foreigners who are involved in the pit sawing activities to stop till the policy regulation on pit sawing in Liberia is finalized.
- Pit sawyers should be trained to promote quality harvest without causing harm to other trees
- RICCE and IUCN program to continue her good work as they engage mainly community and marginalized group to fully participate in the formulation of laws that affect them as such on pit sawing in Liberia.

REFERENCES

Colee, Francis K. Pit-Sawing Operations in River Cess County, Liberia: Promising Models for Small-Scale Forest Enterprises. Washington: Rights and Resources Initiative, 2009.

BLACKETT HUGH, ET AL. CHAINSAW LOGGING IN LIBERIA. AN ANALYSIS OF CHAINSAW LOGGING (PIT-SAWING) IN THE NATURAL FORESTS OF LIBERIA TOWARDS A MORE SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION, 2009.

TERM OF REFERENCE – THE COMPILATION OF REGULATORY FRAMEWORK YO ALIGN CHAINSAWING ACTIVITIES WITH EXISTING FOREST POLICY

- i. Review of the Chain Sawing Study (Blackett et al, 2009) report – “Chainsaw Logging in Liberia: An Analysis of Chainsaw Logging in the Natural Forests of Liberia towards a more Sustainable Production” -and its findings to produce an options papers and the necessary electronic and print materials (in simple English) to support multi-stakeholder consultations (MSDs)
- ii. Disseminate the options papers and other relevant materials through the appropriate communication channels to announce a public dialogue on the activity. The latter materials include:
 - a. FDA’s contribution to the MSDs – “Proposed Regulatory Framework for Chain Sawing Operations in Liberia” and
 - b. the summary of the Chain Sawing study report compiled by the IUCN – “Liberia Chain Sawing – Summary Brief”
- iii. Organize multi-stakeholder consultation processes at County, Regional and National levels to obtain consolidated inputs on issues identified in the above-cited chainsaw study report as well as other relevant themes that will facilitate the drafting of an appropriate regulation for the activity including:
 - a. Areas that may be suitable for chain sawing

- b. the appropriate means of ensuring the production of chain sawn lumber in a sustainable and legal manner in Liberia - including compliance with the legality and chain of custody elements of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) as is expected of the Timber Sales Contract (TSC) and Forest management Contract (FMC) holders
 - c. how to improve marketing and production efficiencies so as to reduce waste and improve revenue
 - d. how the benefits from chain sawing should be equitable distributed
 - e. suggestions for the modalities of the involvement of the forest communities with regards to allocation of areas for chain sawing; monitoring of allocated areas/trees, and possible participation in revenue collection
 - f. appropriate and practical forms of regulation and taxation that promote a higher return and value chain, maximize employment, while ensuring revenue to the state
 - g. potential alternate livelihood schemes for especially those marginalized and vulnerable groups who mainly depend on the activity as their source of income and employment
- iv. Work closely with the local Legal Specialist to be employed by Fauna and Flora International – Liberia (FFI) through the FDA, to ensure that all essential findings during the above MSDs are incorporated into the draft regulatory framework to bring Chain sawing in compliance with existing timber harvesting laws and regulations including chain-of-custody;
- v. In conjunction with the FFI Legal Specialist, ensure the validation of the draft regulations at the County, Regional and National levels to produce a final regulation(s) on chain sawing;
The proposed activities must be harmonized with the existing development programmes in Liberia that may be supported by internal and external sources on Chain-sawing

Annex 2 Guiding questionnaire

Options:

- ✚ No Change- (activities should continue)- Pros and Cons
 1. Pro-benefits to pit sawyers, strong communities get.
 2. Con- Environmental impact- (depletion of the forest), benefit sharing mechanisms, - way forward- (reforestation), government benefits less, community benefit less, weaker communities lose
- ✚ Enforcement of existing bans- **Regulation 26**. - illegality of pit sawing
(Expectation):
 1. Socio-economic benefit associated with pit sawing
 2. Shortage of timber products on the market-to assist in reconstruction (PRS)
 3. Lack of human resource capacity (FDA) to enforce the monitoring of the forest
 4. There is a contradiction in the implementation of the law- illegality in pit sawing, its direct penalty and the collection of fees \$0.60 cents.
- ✚ Permits to chain saw loggers:
(Expectation):
 1. Who should be considered a pit sawyer- what the criteria are?
 2. How does FDA intend to monitor the activities of Pit Sawyers?
 3. What sort of Permit should be given-

4. What does it contain? - Diameters of trees, types of tree, plans for replenishment etc.
5. How the benefit sharing mechanism does stands to benefit the three parties (government, pit sawyers and communities) in terms of percentages-(30- 30-40??)

✚ Permits to communities:

(Expectation):

1. Who should be considered as community?
2. What is the criterion to declare a community forest?
3. How does a community obtain deeds?
4. Can they be empowered to grant permits to pit sawyers or any other activity?
5. How does government (FDA) monitor and benefit in the process along with communities in the case of a community forest?

✚ Where should pit sawing be permitted?

(Expectation):

1. Community forest- point: *should pit sawing be permitted in community forest-when originally the NFRL-chapter 5 section 5.c,d,f, states that any logging activity occurring in community forest should be for domestic/local use in the county and not commercial?- is there a need for repelling?*
2. TSC- but under a different type of arrangement- that pit sawyers be unionized to operate or provided requirements for the TSC are met.??

Annex 4- Participants Listing

CONSULTATION FORUM

COUNTY: Montserrado, MONROVIA

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS: 53

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	J. Voker	M	EPA	28	Daniel Fumbah Sr.	M	SOLF
2	Joseph Higgins	M	FCL	29	Moses Kollie	M	LMI
3	Therenna Reeves	F	MOJ	30	G.Osmand Gartor	M	PITSAWING
4	G.B.Sambola	M	FACE	31	Korta Dogbo	M	LMI
5	Kolee F. Gizzie	M	CAFSA	32	Albert Singbah	M	LICSAITDUN
6	Michael E.Taire	M	SADS	33	Ben Sayiyah	M	LICSAITDUN
7	Boakai Zulu	M	TRADITIONAL COUNCIL	34	Tonia Gibson	M	LMI
8	Kofi A. Ireland	M	UNMIL/CA	35	Atlen Tamba	M	LMI
9	Emmanuel Gleeka	M	EFI	36	Abdulai Barrie	M	IUCN

10	Varlee Massalay	M	MICAT	37	Edward Kamara	M	FDA
11	Osman Nyh	M	PIT-SAWING UNION	38	Lavela B. walker	M	RICCE
12	James Otto	M	SDI	39	Kormasah Yalateh	F	MOG
13	Agnes Sonkarlay	F	RICCE	40	Wender Joseph	F	MOG
14	Jeremiah Karmue	M	FDA	41	Moses G.	M	CAFLUIC
15	Joseph Ballah	M	RICCE	42	Garmonyou Lee	M	Red-light plant union
16	Dr. N.Ndam	M	FFI	43	Elizabeth Addy	F	CESP
17	Salome G.Gofan	F	RICCE	44	Edith K.Ankah	F	NAFWEA
18	Renee N.Gibson	F	RICCE	45	Marcy Flomo	F	COMM.
19	Comfort M. Kinzeh	F	MICAT	46	Morris Dehmie	M	COMM.
20	Morie Johnson	F	FDA	47	Tailey Lamah	F	CWO
21	Patrict Kinslay	M	CESP	48	Saitee Willaim	F	LICSAITDUN
22	Mathew Mortoe	M	FACE	49	Theresia Borleh	F	SADS
23	Kessei Bailay	M	UNMIL	50	Marta Jaosei	F	MICAT
24	Koita Jaimeh	M	SDI	51	Kermeh Gawui	F	CAFSA
25	Laimah Hassai	M	PIT SAWYER	52	Saysay Malley	F	MOJ
26	Nailey James	F	CWO	53	Ben Willie	M	COMM
27	Peter Mulbah	M	COMM.				

COUNTIES: Cape Mount, Gbarpolu &, Bomi Counties

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS: 68

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	Jerry Matthew	M	FDA	35	Mary Sayweh	F	COMM
2	Kolu Lacky	F	YOUTH GROUP	36	Pane T. Dus	M	FDA
3	Singbel Mawolo	M	COMM.	37	Abraham K. Grant	M	GROUP77
4	Benjamin Tuago	M	FOREST RANGE	38	Eujay W. Zoegar	M	FDA
5	Allemanue V.S Kayee	M	EDUCATION	39	James W. Quaye	M	FDA
6	Karmo Massaquoi	M	YOUTH	40	Sekou Kemoka	M	CFDC
7	Cllr. Joma P.Karnley	M	MOJ/CA	41	Moore James	M	CFDC
8	Omasco Z.Kamara	M	LOCAL AUTH	42	Sayon S.Fofana	M	ETI
9	Tenneh Seward	F	YOUTH	43	Jonathan G.Savice	M	MIA
10	Rebecca Janes	F	PIT-SAW	44	Varney Kamara	M	PIT-SAW
11	Z. Emmanuel Worlubah	M	B-N-B	45	Sallia S. Dickson	M	MIA/COM
12	Hannah L. Holmes	F	D.COMM.	46	Clarence Sackies	M	PIT -SAW

13	K. Jonathan Nyankow	M	MIA	47	Lassana Curley	M	FDA
14	Fata Maelly	F	ESPA	48	Romeo A.Varney	M	FDA
15	Nybulle Ballah	M	CFDC	49	Flomo P. Mulbah	M	FACE
16	William Gibson	M	EPA/HEAD	50	Sue K.Boley	M	FDA
17	Morris N. Waer	M	POLICE	51	William T.Mbayah	M	LICS Tadum
18	Darlington Siryon	M	LICSATION	52	Siafa S. Coleman	M	LICS
19	Uarnes O. Freeman	M	LICSATION	53	Boima Quaue	M	CFDC
20	GB.Mohammed Sheriff	M	FDA	54	Bendu Quoie	F	CFDC
21	Holti A.Sombai	M	TOWN CHIEF	55	Moses F.Yah	M	CFDC
22	Samukat Sheriff	M	LICSATION	56	Nyenkolley Ballah	M	CFDC
23	William Draper	M	FDA	57	Kawu Pusah	M	PCF
24	Momoh Senwoh	M	PARAMOUNT CHIEF	58	Joseph B. Kamara	M	NTCL
25	Benedict N.P. Sayel	M	FDA	59	Dominie Bohlen	M	CSO
26	G.Cooper Selee	M	FDA	60	Theophilus Kiah	F	Radio Bomi
27	K. Jonathan Nyankow	M	MIA	61	Peter Hagbah	M	Comm
28	Sara Gaysie	F	CBOs	62	McArthur Franklin	M	CFDC
29	Monie Hargie	F	NRWN	63	Mary woeh	F	LTA
30	Mcline Thompson	M	CFDC	64	Nelty Juwaa	F	Comm.
31	Juweo Kietiew	F	CBOs	65	Christi na Lamah	F	Comm.
32	Madona Jailita	M	LTA	66	Mose Fahnbulleh	M	Pit sawyer
33	Fahnie Naelty	F	LLA	67	Jonny Fahnbulleh	M	Pitsawyer
34	Yaita Hairy	F	Comm	68	Kotew Johnson	F	Comm.

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS : 68

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	Roosevelt W. Kamara	M	UFAR	35	Jemei Yoroko	M	PIT SAWYER
2	Martha Kun	F	CFDC	36	Patrick Niforth	M	NSA
3	Temba Bor	M	PIT-SAWYER	37	Emily Williams	F	CFDC
4	Emmet Yeene	M	CHILDRENSMILE	38	Emmanuel Williams	M	PITSAWYER
5	Grace Davis	F	CFDC	39	Elijah Woryowen	M	PIT SAWYER
6	Joseph B.Daniel	M	USDRWUL	40	Enoch G.Monuay	M	
7	Alice D Ballah	F	CHN	41	Trokon wien	M	PIT SAWYER
8	Joseph B.M.Tue	M	GOL/MIA	42	Robert F. Wallace	M	FDA
9	Abraham Kollie	M	AEL/CSO	43	WILLIAM TEAGE	M	CSO
10	Rebecca Weay	F	WIND	44	Timothy Smith	M	PIT SAWYER
11	Elijah P.Paye	M	PIT-SAWYER	45	Daniel G Wendy	M	PIT SAWYER
12	Margaret Jallah	F	FDA	46	Bay O.Tuku	M	CSO
13	Fulton Kinapoe	M	EPA	47	Joseph Garkorh	M	CSOs
14	Kou M.Queia	F	EPA	48	Jonathan Biggs	M	Nataniel timber
15	Comfort William	F	CFDC	49	Martta Sundayga	F	COMM
16	Junior Dahn	M	PIT-SAWYER	50	Mathew Gaymie	F	CFDC
17	William Tamba	M	PIT-SAWYER	51	Jaitty Paye	F	CSO
18	Morris B.Karley	M	CFDC	52	Benedick Simpson	M	Traditional leader.
19	Hon. Fayia	M	GOVERNOR	53	Solomon William	M	Comm
20	John Teah	M	MIA	54	Marrie Gayway	F	CSOs
21	George Natt	M	MIA	55	Kotty Jallowty	M	CFDC
22	James Kollie	M	MIA	56	Matenneh Jermie	F	COMM.
23	Levei Gorbor	M	CSO	57	Mathew Gar	M	LTA
24	Theresa Dennis	F	MIA	58	Theresa Gipson	F	CSOS
25	Princess Anderson	F	CFDC	59	Vartina Jaulie	F	BAWODA
26	Stanley Wilson	M	PIT SAWYER	60	Sara Multimah	F	CFDC
27	Myer Toe	M	PIT SAWYER	61	Ruth Garway	F	CSO
28	Sara Myers	F	CSOs	62	Harries Domie	M	PIT SAWYERS
29	Jessie Harries	F	PIT SAWYER	63	Jestina Payma	F	BAWODA
30	Morris Nastue	M	CFDC	64	Netty Salomon	F	COMM.

31	Yatta Garway	F	WIND	65	Alice Wiellie	F	CSO
32	Dorriis Wonnitee	F	LTA	66	Dominic Harries	M	SOLP
33	Renne Kolie	F	CSOS	68	Patrick Lamah	M	Comm.
34	Mathew Jerpah	M	MIA				

COUNTIES: LOFA, MARGIBI, NIMBA & BONG COUNTY

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS: 66

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	Joe K. Touah	M	LICSATDUN	34	Henson T. Kollie	M	LICSATDUM
2	Patience Kakia	F	GCW	35	Josephine Sackie	F	CUTHGTON
3	Wuoah D.Gbeandeh	M	LICSATDUN	36	Johnson Togbah	M	LICSATDUM
4	David O. Beaie	M	CFDC	37	James P.Smith	M	PITSAWYER
5	Jerry K.Gbaye,Sr	M	CFDC	38	Rev. Nalhaniel Smith	M	CSO
6	Austin Tomba Sr.	M	FDA	39	Lavela B.Walker	M	RICCE
7	J.Amos Gbowal	M	YOUTH	40	Morris G. Dehmie	M	COMM.
8	Zubah k .Johnson	M	PIT-SAWYER	41	Sar Taylor	M	FDA
9	Musu G.Freeman	F	FOREST FORUM	42	Rennie K. Dennis	M	LICSATUN
10	Nuakolo F.Kollies	M	CUTTINGTON	43	Kebeh Sellee	F	COMM.
11	Augustine Lafaly	M	AGRICULTURE	44	Winston S. Kelemd	M	PIT-SAWYER
12	Jeremiah F. Kim	M	COORDINATOR	45	Rose K. Sali	F	SCO
13	Nowah Kollie	M	PIT-SAWYER	46	Joseph C. Blayon	M	SOC
14	Ambrose ABC.Jamine	M	EPA	47	William B. Pewu	M	FDA
15	Esther J.S Clarke	F	NATION RURAL WOMEN	48	Philip Ndaloma	M	CSOs
16	Esther K.Asem	F	COSs	49	Joseph Ballah	M	RICCE
17	Korpo W Dorbor	F	COMM.	50	Chris Tokpah	M	YOUTH /PIT-SAWYER
18	Tshmael G.Dumah	M	PIT-SAWYER	51	Aaron Kornii	M	CSO
19	Chistina Kollie	F	EPA	52	Loupu Torkpah	M	COMM.
20	Molly O,K. Tolye	M	PIT-SAWYER	53	John Flomo	M	CSO
21	John Pherma	M	PIT-SAWYER	54	Elisbeth	F	COMM.
22	Lincoln Roberts	M	PIT-SAWYER	55	James Yalkpawolo	m	CSO
23	Rose H. Wiah	F	WIPNET	56	Henson T. Kollie	M	LICSATDUM
24	Ben K. Gorlema	M	CFDA	57	Josephine Sackie	F	CUTHGTON
25	T.Augustus F.Kwalah	M	CFDC	58	Johnson Togbah	M	LICSATDUM

26	Rufus G.Darka	M	CSO	59	Jackson D.Tarbor	M	Comm.
27	George Johnson	M	CSO	60	Michael S. Begweh	M	Comm.
28	Sara Mulbah	F	CFDC	61	Zuba kollie	M	LICSATDUM
29	Koluba Johnson	M	CSOs	62	Mary Ballawala	F	COMM
30	Musu Dorbor	F	COMM.	63	Selmah Jallah	M	CSO
31	Rose Kollie	F	WOPNET	64	Peter Dahn	M	PITSAWYERS
32	Loupu Jallah	F	CONCERN WOMEN	65	Daniel Bonah	M	TRADITIONAL LEADER
33	Morries Pewu	M	PIT SAYER	66	Patric Walker	M	COMM

COUNTIES: MARYLAND, RIVER GEE, GRAND KRU & , GRAND GEDEH COUNTY

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS :88

NO.	NAME		MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	JAMES Toe	M	VPA	45	Thomas L. Barleh	M	CFDC
2	Ben T.C Brooks	M	SMILE FM986	46	Lawrence K Williams	M	FDA
3	James Weah	M	SENTINEL NEWSPAPER	47	Soko Koryo	M	FDA
4	Charles T. Green, jr.	M	LRRRC	48	John Teah	M	PST
5	Tarley A. Dweh	M	MIA	49	Robert Tailey	M	CFDC
6	Richard S.Teh	M	MIA	50	David K.Garty	M	FDA
7	Philip K. joelwlo	M	FDA	51	Philip Grear	M	WG
8	William D.N.Kuo	M	FOREST PROTECTOR	52	Rose Johnson	M	FCL
9	Jlah sneh	M	FOREST CRY LIBERIA	53	George Tolo	M	ARKONDEH
10	Morris Wesseh	M	AMU-WULU	54	Decontee Zulu	F	FDA
11	Samuel G.Dunner, Sr.	M	CFDC/FMC-F	55	Francis K.Togba	M	FDA
12	Henry N.Karmie Sr.	M	CFDC/FMC-F	56	William Y.Glay	M	FDA
13	Otis Jolo	M	LDI	57	Alexander D.Akoi	M	SAMFU
14	Grace Tweh	F	LDI	58	William Quiwea	M	AMU-WULU
15	G. Raymond Borlee	M	GGPSA	59	Garley Marh	M	FLY
16	George P.Desuah	M	CFDC/FMC-F	60	Thomas K. Billy	M	CFDC/FMC
17	SK Sodue- Wulue	M	CFDC/FMC	61	David Pajibo	M	
18	Janet James	F	RURAL WOMEN	62	James Z. Duograye	M	MAP
19	G. Micah Gbaba Sr.	M	CFDCIGG	63	G.Tarnayson Dweh	M	GG.PIT-SAWYER
20	Emmanuel Carr	M	MIA	64	Sampson Doelue	M	GG.PIT-SAWYER

21	Stanley W.Dudah	M	MIA	65	Sam C. Dorayou Sr.	M	GG.PIT-SAWYER
22	Dlask W.Barh	M	MIA	66	Dominio W. Sayeh	M	GG.PIT-SAWYER
23	David Wah	M	MIA	67	Susannah Tarpeh	F	GG.PIT-SAWYER
24	John K. Dwana	M	FDA	68	Moses T. Menson	M	GG.PIT-SAWYER
25	Victor S. Seoh	M	PIT-SAWYER	69	Victor Torh	M	PSURG
26	J. Winston C. Johnson	M	PSRG	70	Thomas L. Barleh	M	CFDC
27	Precious Jolo	F	SABA	71	Lawrence K Williams	M	FDA
28	Sarah H. Doweh	F	SABA	72	Joseph Pyne	M	FCPC
29	Joseph Dioh	M	MAT	73	Steek Topoe	M	MIA
30	Patricia Nimely	F	Comm.	74	Jerome K. Neufville	M	CSM
31	Dominic payne	M	CFDC	75	Marrie Tomah	F	LTA
32	David Jarbeh	M	PSRG	76	Christina johnson	F	LTU
33	Lawrence Martin	M	CSOs	77	Theresa Kahmie	F	TIMBER SELLER
34	Sampson Mashel	M	PIT SAWYER	78	Woah Mannie	M	COMM
35	Otis Koerty	M	PITSAWYER	79	Hassina Bah	M	LTA
36	Susannah Mah	F	COMM	80	Vaerus Kpehe	F	Traders in chain saw l
37	Lamini Kromah	M	MIA	81	Zuba Fahineh	M	CFDC
38	Mohammeh Kromah	M	COMM	82	Festa Clement	M	COMM.
39	Harrison Doe	M	FCPC	83	Bashuru Bah	M	Timber Seller
40	Garrison Tarpeh	M	CSOs	84	Garpeh Jennie	F	LTA
41	Jerome Washington	M	COMM	85	Kouetie Willie	M	CSOs
42	Samuel Jasp	M	CSOs	86	Martin Harris	M	COMM.
43	Ruth Koisia	F	COMM	87	Netty Wymon	F	CFDC
44	Mathew Darusee	M	CFDC	88	Annita Yealu	F	COMM.

PARTICIPANT LISTING

B.) VALIDATION FORUM

COUNTIES: Montserrado, Bomi, Gbarpolu, Rivercess, Grand Bassa & Cape Mount

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: _____

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	Single Mowolo	M	CFDC	36	Theresa Dennis	F	MIA
2	Hannah L.Holmes	F	CFDC	37	Emment Greene	M	Children Smile
3	Kolu Lackay	F	FDA	38	George G. Cole	M	MIA

4	Paul Duo	M	FDA	39	Elijah Paye	M	Pit-sawyer
5	Bejamin Tuago	M	FDA	40	Morris B. Karlay	M	CFDC
6	Moses Fahnbullah	M	Pit sawyer	41	Emmanuel V. Gleeka	M	EFI
7	Tenneh Seward	F	CSO	42	Albert S. Singbah	M	LICSATDUN
8	Joseph B. Kamara	M	MIA	43	Tonia Gibson	F	
9	Cooper Selee	M	FDA	44	Mercy Flomo	F	
10	Boimah Quaue	M	PBRC	45	Osman M. Nyah	M	LICSATDUN
11	N'yqulle Balla	M	CFDC	46	Daniel Fumbai	M	SOLF
12	K. Jonathan Nyankolo	M	MIA	47	Joseph S. Higgin	M	FCL
13	Darlington Siryon	M	LICSATDUN	48	Bowen L. Sayan	M	CI
14	Kpaka Smith	M	FDA	49	Henry Smith	M	SEC
15	Moore E. James	M	CFDC	50	Arthur Karngbea	M	LICSATDUN
16	Tenneh Seward	F	CSO	51	Karcee S. Mensah	M	CSO
17	George Natt	M	MIA	52	Roosevette W. Kanwee	M	UFAR
18	Emily Williams	F	CFDC	53	Allen Tamba	M	LMI
19	Emmanuel Williams	M	Pit-sawyer	54	Moses Kollie	M	LMI
20	Timothy Smith	M	C.Smile	55	Andrew Willie	M	LMI
21	Elijah Woluyowen	M	Pit-sawyer	56	Leimu Ketter	F	YOCADS
22	Stephen Mulbah	M	FDA	57	Joseph Ballah	M	RICCE
23	Princess Anderson	F	CFDC	58	George Nyemah	M	LMI
24	Manyango Kormah	M	FDA	59	Benedict Roberts	M	COMM
25	Morris N. Waer	M	LNP	60	Korta Dogba Sr.	M	LMI
26	Lassana Curley	M	FDA	61	Patricia Scott	F	UNDP
27	James W. Quaye	M	Pit sawyer	62	Augustine K. Brown	M	COMM
28	William Gibson	M	EPA	63	Renee N. Gibson	F	RICCE
29	Benedict P.N Sayel	M	CFDC	64	Agnes Sonkarlay	F	YOCADS
30	Varney Kamara	M	LICSATDUN	65	Michael E. Taire	M	SADS
31	Bendu Quoie	F	CFDC	66	Comfort Kinzeh	F	MICAT
32	Kaluu Pusa	M	PCF	67	Chief Boakai Zulu	M	NTC
33	Margaret Jallah	F	FDA	68	Joseph Higgins	M	FCL
34	Grace Davis	F	CFDC	69	Jeremiah T. Kamo	M	FDA
35	Kou M. Queia	F	EPA				

COUNTIES: Lofa, Nimba, Margibi & Bong

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 64

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	Ambrouse ABC Jamina	M	EPA	33	James P. Smith	M	Pit sawyer
2	William B. pewu	M	FDA	34	George Johnson	m	Grass Root
3	Nowah Kollie	M	Pit sawyer	35	John Flomo	m	HHL
4	Korpo W. Dorbor	F	CFDC	36	Daniel Bonah	m	NTC
5	Esther K. Asem	M	CSO	37	Rufus G. Darka	M	Pit sawyer
6	Ben K. Gorlema	M	CFDC	38	Morris Dehmie	M	Pit sawyer
7	Jeremiah F. Kim	M	LICSATDUN	39	Sara Mulbah	F	Forest Forum
8	J. Agustus F. Kwalah	M	CFDC	40	Musu G. Freeman	F	Forest Forum
9	Rose Kollie	F	WOPNET	41	Hensen T. Kollie	M	LICSATDUN
10	Zubah Johnson	m	LICSATDUN	42	Nyamah Freeman	F	CFDC
11	Rose wiah	F	WIPNET	43	John Pherma	M	Pit sawyer
12	Musu Dorbor	F	comm	44	Lincoln Roberts	M	Pit sawyer
13	Christiana Kollie	F	youth	45	Johnson Togbah	M	LICSATDUN
14	Hensen T. Kollie	M	Pit sawyer	46	Lorpu Tokpah	f	comm
15	J.Amos Gbowah	M	Youth	47	Moley O. K. Tolye	M	Pit sawyer
16	Ishmael G.Dunnah Sr.	M	Pit sawyer	48	Winston Kelemd	m	Pit sawyer
17	Austine K.Tomba Sr	M	FDA	49	Austine Lafalay	M	MOA
18	Johnson Togbah	M	LICSATDUN	50	Chris Tokpoah	M	Pit sawyer
19	Joseph Blayon	M	LICSATDUN	51	Johnson D. Togbah	F	LICSATDUN
20	Sar Taylor	M	FDA	52	Aoran Korn	M	VOSIED
21	John Ballah	m	Pit sawyer	53	Nuakolo F. Kollie	M	CUC
22	Rennie Dennis	m	LICSATDUN	54	Josephine Sackie	F	CUC
23	Nathaniel Smith	m	comm	55	Patrick Wille	M	youth
24	Esther J.S.Clarke	F	NRW	56	Kuluba Johnson	M	CSO
25	Jerry K. Gbaye,Sr.	M	CFDC	57	James Yarkpawolo	M	CSO
26	Patience Kakia	F	Concern	58	Mary Ballawala	F	comm.
27	Joe K. Touah	M	LICSATDUN	59	Kebeh sellee	F	COMM

28	David Q. Bealie	M	CFDC	60	Elizabeth Forkpah	F	COMM
29	Selmah Jallah	M	SEC	61	Philip Ndaloma	M	CUC
30	Peter Dahn	M	LICSATDUN	62	Martha Dahn	F	Concern
31	Micheal S. Begweh	M	comm.	63	Johnny Nyan	M	CSO
32	Wuoah D. Gbeaneh	M	LICSATDUN	64	Clarence Gbana	M	CSO

COUNTIES: River Gee, Maryland, Grand Gedeh, Grand Kru & Sinoe

TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: _____

NO.	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY /INSTITUTION	NO	NAME	SEX	MINISTRY/ INSTITUTION
1	G. Raymond Borlee	M	GGPSA	35	Alex Yorlay	M	UFAR
2	philip Joekolo	M	FDA	36	Robert F.Wallace	M	CSO
3	G Micah Gbaba	M	CFDC	37	william Glay	M	Pit sawer
4	Tarley A.Dweh	M	MIA	38	Sekergepoe Nelson	M	MIA
5	Otis Jolo	M	LDI	39	Peter Jargbo	M	Pit sawer
6	Dlask W. Barh	M	MIA	40	George Tolo	M	ARKONDEH
7	Janet James	F	Rural Women	41	Decontee Zulu	F	FDA
8	Morris Wesseh	M	AMU-WULU	42	G. Tarnayson Dweh	M	Pit sawer
9	Henry N. Karmie	M	cFDC / FMC-F	43	LAMINI Kromah	M	comm
10	Stanlay Dudah	M	MIA	44	Garpeh Jennie	M	LTA
11	Netty Wymon	F	CFDC	45	william Quiwea	M	AMU-WULU
12	Thomas Barleh	M	CFDC	46	Bashuru Bah	M	Plank seller
13	Susanna Mah	M	Pit sawer	47	Richard S. The	M	MIA
14	Jlah Sneh	M	FCL	48	Lawrence Nemily	M	Pit sawer
15	Precious Jolo	F	COMM	49	Sam C. Dorayou	M	Pit sawer
16	Patricia Nimely	F	COMM	50	James Z. Duograve	M	MAP
17	JAMES Toe	M	VPA	51	Joseph Payne	M	FCPC

18	David Pajibo	M	CFDC	52	Lawrence Martin	M	VPA
19	Joseph Dioh	M		53	David Jarbeh	M	PSRG
20	Thomas K, Billy	M	CFDC	54	Samuel Jaspa	M	COMM
21	Elexander D. Akoi	M	SAMFU	55	George P. Desuah	M	CFDC
22	Rose Johnson	F	FCL	56	Michael Begweh	M	Pit sawer
23	Zubah Fahineh	M	CFDC	57	Martha Jonbo	F	COMM
24	George P. Dasuah	M	CFDC/ FMC-F	58	Aloysious Steward	M	COMM
25	Roosevelt W.Kamara	M	UFAR	59	Philip B. Cheper	M	FDA
26	Martha Kun	F	CFDC	60	Josiah Wesseh	M	Pit saywer
27	Tembo Bor	M	Pit sawer	61	Juah Tarbar	F	Pit saywer
28	Solomon Williams	M	COMM	62	J. Anthony Welleh	M	COMM
29	Fulton Kinapoe	M	EPA	63	comfort Wesseh	F	COMM
30	Comfort William	F	CFDC	64	Louise T Barley	M	Pit saywer
31	James Yorko	M	Pit sawer	65	Emmanuel Saygbechee	M	Pit saywer
32	Benedit Simpson	M	NTC	66	Bolton Chea	M	Pit saywer
33	Levei Gorbtor	M	CSO	67	Moses W.Porka	M	Pit saywer
34	Emily Willie	F	CFDC	68	Joseph M. Bannie	M	Pit saywer

PROJECT AGREEMENT

Between

**IUCN-International Union for Conservation of Nature West and Central Africa Programme
(IUCN PACO)**

Professor Aimé NIANOGO – amie.nianogo@iucn.org

and

Rural Integrated Center for Community Empowerment, Liberia (RICCE)

Salome Gongloe Gofan – ricce2004@gmail.com

For initiating Unit	Cost center:	31076-000	Project no:	88006-006	T9 Code:	ACT03
----------------------------	---------------------	-----------	--------------------	-----------	-----------------	-------

Finance use only	T6 (commitments code):	Supplier A/C no.
-------------------------	------------------------	------------------

DATE: 23th August, 2010

SUBJECT: The development of a regulatory framework in order to ensure that Chain sawing in Liberia is properly regulated and controlled in conformity with sustainability and legality principles.

The purpose of this Agreement is to set out the responsibilities of the Rural Integrated Center for Community Empowerment, Liberia (herein referred to as **RICCE**) and the IUCN PACO (herein referred to as **IUCN PACO**) with regards to the implementation of the project - “The development of a regulatory framework in order to ensure that Chain sawing is properly regulated and controlled to align the activity with sustainability and legality principles”.

1.0. Objective

The **Development Objective** (DO) of the project is that chain sawing in Liberia is undertaken in conformity with Liberia’s forest policy towards sustainable management of the forests in Liberia.

The **Specific Objective** (SO) of the project is to develop a regulatory framework so as to ensure that Chain sawing in Liberia is properly regulated and controlled to align the activity with sustainability and legality principles

The expected benefits of the project include:

- Improved environmental and biodiversity conservation through the introduction of basic forest management guidelines to ensure minimum damage to the forests by the activity
- improved legal sourcing of raw materials for the activity
- reduced poverty of the forest communities through equitable distribution of benefits and effective community participation in the management of the activity
- updated taxation system for the activity to improve its contribution to the national coffers
- minimized conflicts that will contribute to the peace building process in Liberia

IUCN is bringing its expertise to support the tasks in this contract that contribute to the goals of the project with regards to: multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD) processes biodiversity conservation and legal framework development.

2.0. Principles underlying the agreement

The agreement between the two parties is built on the following principles:

1. Both partners express willingness to learn from each other
2. Both partners respect one another's autonomy and constraints and strive to foster a climate of mutual trust in all their activities.
3. Both partners share the transparent to each other.
4. Both partners share the same visions and goals.
5. The agreement is founded on principles of equity and both partners recognize elements of responsibility and accountability that would engender a more equitable partnership.
6. The partnership is built on respect for each other's unique identity and views, trust, transparency and honesty, in which partners strive for better understanding and appreciation of one another.

3.0 Tasks to be performed.

The tasks described below will ensure the use of the most appropriate methods/tools to create awareness among all relevant chain sawing stakeholders in Liberia –including the forest communities, civil society organizations, the public and private sectors - for them to be able to make informed contributions towards the formulation of a comprehensive legal framework for effective regulation of chain sawing in Liberia.

During the four (4) months duration of the project (starting from the end of August, 2010 to the end of December, 2010), RICCE in cooperation with LMI will undertake the following tasks: According of reference, the

- vi. Review of the Chain Sawing Study (Blackett et al, 2009) report – “Chainsaw Logging in Liberia: An Analysis of Chainsaw Logging in the Natural Forests of Liberia towards a more Sustainable Production” -and its findings to produce an options papers and the necessary electronic and print materials (in simple English) to support multi-stakeholder consultations (MSDs)
- vii. Disseminate the options papers and other relevant materials through the appropriate communication channels to announce a public dialogue on the activity. The latter materials include:
 - a. FDA's contribution to the MSDs – “Proposed Regulatory Framework for Chain Sawing Operations in Liberia” and

b. the summary of the Chain Sawing study report compiled by the IUCN – “Liberia Chain Sawing – Summary Brief”

- viii. Organize multi-stakeholder consultation processes at County, Regional and National levels to obtain consolidated inputs on issues identified in the above-cited chainsaw study report as well as other relevant themes that will facilitate the drafting of an appropriate regulation for the activity including:
- h. Areas that may be suitable for chain sawing
 - i. the appropriate means of ensuring the production of chain sawn lumber in a sustainable and legal manner in Liberia - including compliance with the legality and chain of custody elements of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) as is expected of the Timber Sales Contract (TSC) and Forest management Contract (FMC) holders
 - j. how to improve marketing and production efficiencies so as to reduce waste and improve revenue
 - k. how the benefits from chain sawing should be equitable distributed
 - l. suggestions for the modalities of the involvement of the forest communities with regards to allocation of areas for chain sawing; monitoring of allocated areas/trees, and possible participation in revenue collection
 - m. appropriate and practical forms of regulation and taxation that promote a higher return and value chain, maximize employment, while ensuring revenue to the state
 - n. potential alternate livelihood schemes for especially those marginalized and vulnerable groups who mainly depend on the activity as their source of income and employment
- ix. Work closely with the local Legal Specialist to be employed by Fauna and Flora International – Liberia (FFI) through the FDA, to ensure that all essential findings during the above MSDs are incorporated into the draft regulatory framework to bring Chain sawing in compliance with existing timber harvesting laws and regulations including chain-of-custody;
- x. In conjunction with the FFI Legal Specialist, ensure the validation of the draft regulations at the County, Regional and National levels to produce a final regulation(s) on chain sawing;

The proposed activities must be harmonized with the existing development programmes in Liberia that may be supported by internal and external sources on Chain-sawing.

3.0 Outputs

- An options paper and information materials produced to support multi-stakeholder dialogue on Chain sawing
- A report on the stakeholder consultations undertaken that includes comments on the study (Blackett et al, 2009) recommendations in addition to inputs from the various stakeholders on relevant chain sawing issues including those listed under iii above
- A draft regulation on Chain sawing that is aligned to existing forest policy and includes implementation procedures, which takes into account the views expressed during the stakeholder consultations, the FDA's mandate, the on-going VPA processes in Liberia and the appropriate lessons learned from other countries with similar chain sawing experience including those being discussed in the West Africa sub-region in particular as well as elsewhere in Africa in general.
- A report on the vetting of the draft regulations to produce the final regulations

3.1. Learning, monitoring, knowledge management and information sharing

Collect and provide monitoring and lessons learnt from the implementation of the project to the IUCN project coordinator.

4. Communication

Communicate result and lessons learnt from the implementation of the project coordinator on a regular basis and provide information to be used in policy briefings, project web page and newsletters as requested by IUCN.

4.0. Reporting requirements:

As indicated above, the project must be completed within 4 months. All the activities as spelt out in the **TOR (Annex 1)** must take place from the beginning of September, 2010 to 25 December, 2010. The awareness creation materials must be ready at the beginning of September, 2010, for the multi-stakeholder consultations to take place from that September, 2010 to December, 2010. The draft legal framework – to be compiled with the Legal Specialist - must be completed by mid-November, 2010, with a final legal framework to be produced by the end of November, 2010, after a multi-stakeholder workshop in Monrovia. The vetting of the draft will continue in December, 2010 – especially with the forest dwelling and forest dependent communities.

RICCE will be responsible for presenting the financial and technical reports for the expenditures incurred and activities carried out to IUCN PACO through the IUCN Projects Coordinator, Liberia, not later than the three (3) days after 15 September, 2010, indicated in the table below. The **financial report must include original receipts** and must be in line with the agreed **budget** attached as **Annex 2** and which forms an integral part of this agreement. The relevant IUCN account codes in the budget must be used for coding the expenditure.

TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REPORTS	Date of submission
Inception report (for last week August to first week September, 2010)	15 September, 2010
Mid-Term reports on: (i) MSD and (ii)draft Legal framework (for 2 nd week September to end-November, 2010)	30 November, 2010
Draft final report (for 1 st week September, 2010 to 25December, 2010)	25 December, 2010
Final report (for 1 st week September, 2010 to 25 December, 2010)	14 January, 2011

RICCE will be responsible for providing interim technical report by **15th September, 2010**, on the plan and budget for the multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD) including the electronic and print awareness materials produced for distribution to announce the MSD, and final technical and financial reports by **14th January 2011**. The final technical report incorporating comments on the draft report shall be composed of a detailed narration report with pictures covering all that was done in the reporting period, achievements, outcomes, etc

5.0. Transport:

RICCE will be responsibility of ensuring that transport for field activities is made available for the timely completion of tasks as described in Annex 1. Failure to complete field activities according to the timeline agreed for reasons pertaining to unavailability or untimeliness of transportation may result, at IUCN's discretion, in the revision of the terms and conditions of this contract, especially the amount and/or schedule of payments hereunder.

6.0. Budget and money transfers:

Total budget for the Project: **124,370 US\$**

To be paid in three installments:

- 50% upon receipt of a signed copy of this agreement and satisfactory version of an interim technical report on 6th **September, 2010**.
- 30% upon receipt of satisfactory versions of technical and financial reports due on **30th November, 2010**.
- 20% upon receipt of satisfactory versions of technical and financial reports due on **14th January, 2011**.

7.0. Monitoring and evaluation

Both RICCE and IUCN agree to monitor and evaluate activities under this agreement on a monthly basis with the Director of RICCE or his appointed representative involved. The Director of RICCE or his appointed representative and the IUCN Project Coordinator, Liberia, will meet on a monthly basis for deliberation on issues bordering on implementation, evaluating the progress so far attained and exploring options for new interventions.

8.0. Duration of the agreement

This agreement covers the period September 2010 to 14-January 2011

Agreed:

Cleto NDIKUMAGENGE
IUCN – International Union for Conservation of nature

Date:



Salome Gorgioe - Gofan
Director, Rural Integrated Center for
Community Empowerment (RICCE),
Liberia

rest Programme Coordinator, IUCN PACO

Date: September 8, 2010

Draft Regulation:

Forestry Development Authority

Regulation No. 1??

Regulation of Pit-Sawing/Chain Saw Milling Regulations

WHEREAS, the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006 (NFRL) establishes a transparent framework for the sustainable use, management, and protection of forest resources that balances the commercial, community, and conservation priorities of the Republic.

WHEREAS, the NFRL establishes four (4) non exclusive licenses pursuant to which a person may extract forest resources in Liberia, and also authorizes the Forestry Development Authority (FDA) to issue regulations and other rules necessary to implement the law, including specifically regulations that (a) govern contracting and permitting; (b) establish standard qualifications for commercial forest operation, and (c) control any activity involving Forest Land, Forest Resources, or Forest Products;

WHEREAS, the National Forest Policy and Strategy promotes sustainable management and use of forest resources in a manner that ensure that advances the availability of these resources for future generations while at the same ensuring that said forest resources do contribute to livelihood and economic development now and onwards;

WHEREAS, chain saw logging activities have significant social contributions and also constitute a critical source of livelihood for many persons, especially vulnerable, unemployed individuals and poor communities;

WHEREAS, Government recognizes the need to formally recognize and regulate chain saw milling activities in Liberia as a means of maximizing the socio-economic benefits of chain sawing while addressing/mitigating its negative ecological and environmental impacts;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Forestry Development Authority does hereby rule and regulate as follows:

PART ONE: DEFINITIONS

Section 1. Definitions

Authority: Forestry Development Authority.

Board- Forest Development Authority Board of Directors.

Chain Saw Milling: on-site conversion of logs into boards/lumber using chainsaws

Chain Saw: any portable power saw or similar cutting device, rendered operative by an electric or internal combustion engine or similar means, that can be used for the felling of trees or the cutting of timber.

Chain Sawers: Persons engaged in chain saw milling.

Commercial Use: Any use of Forest Products or Forest Land, other than direct use for personal purposes, subsistence, or infrastructure development. Commercial Use includes uses involving Trade or any other disposition of Forest Products or Forest Land for direct or indirect financial benefits.

Community Forest: is the natural forest and/or forest plantation where rights are granted by the Authority to a community living in or near it to access, use, and manage in a sustainable manner in compliance with a Community Forest Agreement.

Community Forestry Agreement-

Diameter: the over-bark measurement of a standing tree at 1.3 meters above the floor in a relatively flat terrain or 1.3 meters on the uphill side of the standing tree on a sloping terrain.

Private land: Land owned by private individuals through a valid title traceable to a public land sale by the Republic of Liberia.

Proposed Protected Area: An area that the Authority has identified as suitable for designation as a Protected Area under Chapter 4 of the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006.

Protected Areas Ordinarily Closed to Commercial Use: Nature Reserves, National Parks, Strict Nature Reserves, and other special areas set aside for non-extractive uses under Chapter 9 of the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006.

Stumpage fees: are fees associated with the commercial harvest of Forest Resources, including fees based on the type and amount of Forest Resources harvested.

Trade: To sell, buy, barter, exchange, offer, or expose for sale Forest Products.

Other terms used in this Regulation have the meaning established in the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006, as amended.

PART TWO: PURPOSE

This Regulation sets forth a structured process by which permits are requested, granted and/or obtained for sustainable/environmentally sound commercial chain saw milling in Liberia. .

This Regulation also establishes a framework that optimizes the benefits of chain saw milling by balancing the interests of chain sawyers, communities and sustainable forest management in the Republic of Liberia.

PART THREE: PRELIMINARY MATTERS

Section 2. Land Areas to Offer for Chain Saw Milling Permits

- (a) Specification: Chain saw Milling permits shall be issued for operations only in the following areas: (1) Community forests and (ii) private or deeded forest land.
- (b) Procedural prerequisites. The Authority shall only seek to offer Chain Saw Milling Permits for the two (2) areas specified in Section 2 (a) only upon compliance with all three of the following criteria:
 - (1) The area has been identified as suitable for Commercial Use, although not specifically designated for chain saw milling operations), under Section 4.4(d)(i) of the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006;
 - (2) The Authority has validated the area locally pursuant to Section 4.5 of the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006 and any applicable regulations; and
 - (3) The permit holder has received written permission from the Authority and the Free Prior Informed Consent of the community in community forest areas or the private land owner.
- (c) The Authority shall not offer permits for areas covering more than 5,000 hectares at a time for an individual Chain Sawyer or a group of Chain Sawyers; provided, however, that a community having a community forest larger than 5,000 hectares may, in keeping with the provisions of this Regulation, apply for, obtain, and be granted multiple individual licenses each of which shall comply with the 5000 hectare limit established herein.
- d) The area excludes lands in Protected Areas Ordinarily Closed to Commercial Use or Proposed Protected Areas, unless the Authority makes a written finding explaining why the Commercial Use of such areas would be compatible with their protection status.
- (e) The Authority shall only offer Chain Saw Milling Permits on Forest Lands whose prior use, present condition, or planned future use makes them unsuitable for management under sustainable forest management principles by the Authority.

PART THREE: REGISTRATION

Section 3. Registration

(a) Registration of Chain Saws: All Persons who own or are in possession of and/or own chainsaw(s) shall register the chainsaw(s) with the Authority indicating the serial number(s) and area(s) of their intended use. All commercial Chain Sawyers shall promptly notify the Authority prior to change(s) in their areas of operation through the Authorities regional office. Those who are presently in possession of and/or own chainsaw(s) shall register it/them not later than two months of the effective date of this Regulation, while those who acquire a chain saw during the effective period of this Regulation shall register them within ten (10) working days as of the date of purchase. Without prejudice to the provision of the preceding two sentences, all importers and sellers of chainsaw(s) shall keep records of the quantity and specifications of the chainsaw(s) imported; the date of sale as well as the identity of the buyer of each chain saw. In conjunction with all buyer(s) of chainsaws, all chainsaw vendors shall complete chainsaw registration forms provided by the Authority at the time of sale and forward them to the Authority together with the records on chainsaw(s) imported within one month of the completion of such records.

(b) Anyone who fails to register a chainsaw or inform the Authority about any change(s) in the area of operation(s) or provide the Authority with the necessary importation and registration records shall be fined up to \$_____.

(c) Registration of land Eligible for Chainsaw Milling: Any person and community having/owning land that is eligible for and or desires it to be used for commercial chainsaw milling shall register the land area with the Authority. No chainsaw milling shall be permitted or license issued in respect of a land area that has no prior registration with the Authority

PART 4: PERMITTING

Section 4. Chain Saw Permits

(a) Prior to commencing any chainsaw milling operation in Liberia, each Chain Sawyer whether individual, business entity, cooperative of Chain Sawyers/Chain-sawn Lumber Traders or community, shall apply to the Authority for a permit. Each application must include the following information:

(1) Name of individual, business entity, cooperative of Chain Sawyers/ Chain-sawn Lumber Traders or community.

(2) Business Registration/proof of membership of cooperative of Chain Sawyers/Chain-sawn Lumber Traders or other recognition by a public authority.

(3) Serial number(s) of all chainsaw(s) owned.

(4) Proof of title to (or authorization to use) the land where commercial chainsaw milling is intended to take place or proof of ownership of trees to be converted to lumber; and

(5) Description of operational area supported by an appropriate map. (?)

(b) Chainsaw Milling Permits must fall under one of the following categories:

(A) General permit, which the Authority issues to an individual, business entity, or cooperative of Chain Sawyers/Chain-sawn Lumber Traders upon application that meets the requirements of this Regulation cooperative and which is limited in duration to no more than two (2) years and only in respect of private land that the owner has consented to be used for chainsaw milling.

(B) Community permit, which the Authority issues to a community that has a community forest and only in respect of/to such community forest upon application by a registered community, and which are limited in duration to no more than two (2) years.

(c) An otherwise eligible community may have more than one Community Chain saw permit.

(d) A community may assign or transfer its chain saw permit to an individual or business Chain Sawyer, and such assignment and transfer shall become effective and binding upon being attested to by the Authority. Where a Community chainsaw milling permit is transferred to a Chain Sawyer who works the permit, the obligation to comply with environmental and sustainable management requirements, including the Code of Harvesting Practices, shall be on the Operator.

(e) Each chainsaw milling permit, whether General or Community Permit, shall meet the following requirements:

(1) The basic term of the permit shall not be more than two (2) years; and

(2) The land area subject to the permit shall be no more than 5000 hectares.

(F) Chainsaw Milling permit holders shall pay an annually renewable permit fee of US\$200.00 (Two Hundred US dollars) to the Government.

(e) Fees under this Section are due on the date that the permit is issued and on each anniversary of that date. The Authority shall require proof of payment of the fee and confirmation of no infringements on the Code of harvesting as well as confinement of operations in Authority-permitted areas before issuing or renewing a permit under this Section.

Section 5. General and Community Permits

Prior to the Authority's issuance of a General and/or Community Permit in a Community Forest, the applicant shall:

- (c) prepare a Tree Registration Scheme whereby the location is registered for all trees that may be logged.
- (d) Apply to the Authority for a permit stipulating the location, ownership, number of trees, and diameter.
- (e) Conduct a field investigation to verify that the community trees to be harvested are eligible for felling in accordance with felling rules under **Section ???**.

Section 6. Sustainable Management

(a) No Person shall conduct chainsaw milling operations in violation of the Forest Management Guidelines or the Code of Forest Harvesting Practices that the Authority adopts under Section 8.1 of the National Forestry Reform Law.

(b) The permit holder, whether individual or community, shall not:

(1) Harvest more than eight trees per week.

(2) Harvest any tree less than 50 cm in diameter.

(3) Harvest more than five trees per hectare.

(4) Fell trees towards the water course and shall maintain a buffer of ____, or such distance as shall be set as set forth in the Code of Harvesting Practices.

(c) The Authority, within two years of enactment of this Regulation, shall:

(1) In cooperation with ?, undertake comparative studies of appropriate technologies to improve the quality and reduce waste from chain-sawn lumber. The Authority, upon the recommendations made from the study, shall facilitate the acquisition and training of the recommended technologies by chainsaw operators.

(2) Develop local chain-sawn lumber/lumber harvesting rules.

Section 7. Estimation of Domestic Market Prices

(a) The Authority shall develop a list of estimated domestic market prices of chain-sawn lumber/lumber derived from the tree species listed in Schedule I of Authority Regulation 107-07, to reflect the various grades of chain-sawn lumber as compiled under section d(2) above for the domestic market. The Authority shall review and revise the list where necessary at the start of each logging season and may revise the list more frequently in response to market trends.

(b) The Authority shall base the estimates on the actual market prices in Liberia.

(c) In developing the list, the Authority shall consult with the Forest Management Advisory Committee established under the National Forestry Reform Law of 2006, as amended.

(d) The Authority shall submit the list to the Board for approval.

(e) Upon approval by the Board, the list becomes the basis for calculation of stumpage fees and establishes the minimum price guidelines for the assessment of forest product?? fees under this Regulation. The list remains in force until the Board approves a replacement list following the procedure required by this Section.

(f) The Authority shall make copies of the list in force readily accessible to the public in the same manner that it makes regulations, codes, and manuals available to the public under Section 41 of Authority Regulation No. 101-07, concerning public participation.

Section 8. Classification of Timber Trees by Species

For the purposes of Section 10 of this Regulation:

(a) The tree species listed in Schedule I of Authority Regulation 107-07 are each classed into the category (A, B, or C) indicated in the column labeled “Class (stumpage fee)” of Schedule I.

(b) Tree species not listed in Schedule I are classed into category C. **(List should be attached to regulation)**

Section 9. Stumpage Fees

(a) Any person felling a tree under a chainsaw milling permit, whether an individual or community permit, shall pay to the Government a log stumpage fee, based on the harvested tree’s diameter (D.B.H), species and quality, according to the following formulas:

(1) For category A, B, and C species to be exported, 3.5% percent of the market price of the harvested logs, FOB Monrovia, as determined in the list approved under Section 3 of Authority Regulation 107-07.

(2) For category A, B, C species to be sold on the domestic market and not for export, US\$8 per cubic meter as determined in the list approved under Section 8 of this Regulation.

Section 10. Benefit Sharing

(a) In coordination with the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, the Authority shall ensure that a sum equal to US\$1.34 per cubic meter of trees harvested is distributed to Affected Communities through the National Community Benefit Sharing Trust mechanism established by Authority Regulation 106-07.

OR

(b) In coordination with the Central Bank and the Ministry of Finance, the Authority shall ensure that a sum equal to 30 percent of all stumpage fees collected is distributed to Affected Communities through the National Community Benefit Sharing Trust mechanism established by Authority Regulation 106-07.

Section 11. Chain of Custody

(a) Within one year of the effective date of this Regulation, the Authority shall design a chain of custody system for chain-sawn lumber.

(b) No person shall harvest Timber for Commercial Use without entering the Timber in the Chain of Custody System designed specifically for chain-sawn timber using forms and means established under this Part.

(c) The Authority shall establish, and from time to time revise, standard methods for assigning identification to chain-sawn Logs, and lumber, and for properly marking the Logs and lumber with this identification.

(d) The Authority shall publish a document listing the current standard methods for assigning identification and for marking Logs, and lumber with this identification.

(e) For Logs, the Chain of Custody System must assign a unique identification to each Log, and the stump must be marked with the assigned tree number.

(f) For Lumber, the Chain of Custody System must assign unique identification that links them explicitly to the log(s) from which they were produced in groups bundled together for sale or transport. Where a single identification is assigned to a group of items, the Chain of Custody System must include safeguards allowing persons to determine easily whether any items have been added to or removed from the group.

PART SIX: REPEALS, AMENDMENT AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 12. Repeals

This Regulation repeals Authority Regulation 26.

Section 13. Review and Amendment

This Regulation may be reviewed and amended from time to time as warranted by circumstances/development and at a time whereby the Authority deems it necessary, provided that every amendment shall be adopted in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

Section 14. Effective Date

(a) This regulation is effective on x, 2011.

(b) The Authority shall announce this regulation and make it available to the public and the media.

SIGNED:

Moses D. Wogbeh, Sr.

Managing Director

Forest Development Authority

Guiding Questions for Consultations

- 1) Should it be called chain saw milling or chain saw logging. What about when the logs go to the mills. Isn't chain saw milling confusing?
- 2) Should either the general or community permit be on par with an FMC/TSC and if so, will fiscal regime be the same, i.e., same taxes?
- 3) The extent to which the proposed fiscal regime under the permit system will affect profitability of chainsaw operations.
- 4) Are the stumpage fees listed acceptable? Need to have someone model this based on current profit levels. This stumpage fee schedule is based on recommendations from the Blackett report but certainly need to be further looked at by an actual forestry economist!
- 5) Benefit Sharing to communities:
 - a. Should benefit sharing be \$1.34 per cubic meter or 30% of stumpage? Again need economist. See Section 10.
 - b. Social Agreements- do chain saw loggers enter into a social agreement with communities for: 1) Individual permits and 2) Community Permits, 3) Both? Is there a limit? Communities must be aware of what is actually economically feasible for chain saw loggers and this will also depend on whether trees are for domestic market or for export and what the price is on the domestic market. Again, need an economist!
- 6) Should the FDA establish a separate set of rules for harvesting timber for chain sawing? Separate from the Code of Harvesting Practices?
- 7) Will there be an inventory that is done prior to permit being given? Same for individual and community permit?
- 8) Chain of Custody System- We assume that FDA and SGS will need to discuss how the chain of custody system will work. It would be beneficial to do this before the regulation is passed. Once this regulation is passed, can chain saw loggers legally harvest without being part of a simplified chain of custody system? If no (as it is currently written in the regulation) then chain saw logging will continue to be illegal until a system is adopted.
- 9) What capacity in relation to FDA personnel and logistical support is needed to enforce the regulation? It is important to note that Ghana, which also struggles to control chainsaw logging, employs about ten times more staff per hectare of forest.
- 10) How will this regulation be reconciled with the Community Rights Law Regulations. For example, the issue of ownership...the CRL regs state, "All land ownership issues, including lands on which there are forest resources, shall be left to be addressed by the Lands Commission and/or the Ministry of Lands, Mines and energy. Accordingly, this regulation addresses and relates to only issues of community access, management, use, and control of forest resources on lands." Also, Chapter 2, Section 2 of the draft CRL regs state that, "The establishment of a forest community shall be initiated either by a community or the Authority. Whichever option is used, the establishment of a forest community shall be activated through the submission of a written request by the Community to the Authority." Does this need to be done before a community issues a permit? This is very important to reconcile.
- 11) Note: Reason we did not use a Forest Use Permit to award chain saw permits: 1) NFRL would need to be amended and 2) procurement regulations require a competitive bidding process to be used if the resource value exceeds US\$10,000 for FUPs. Sections 5.5 (c) and (d) clearly indicate that the FUP was instituted for local timber needs and not for commercial activities. The only way round this limitation would be to set the timber value covered by permits to US\$10,000. The limitations of using the FUP would therefore be:

Balance brought forth for month ended, Nov.2010		US\$1112.00		US\$1112.00	
Second payment received December 17, 2010					US\$26990.20
Total Cash on hand for Operation					US\$28,102.20
Operating Expenses for IUCN/ RICCE Consultancy					
	<u>Operating Expenses</u>	-			
1	Consultancy	-			
1.1	facilitator			\$ 1,350.00	
1.2	rapporteur			\$ 1,150.00	
2	Multi -stakeholders Consultation				
2.1	Participants meal			\$ 11,040.00	
2.2	Participates Accommodation			\$ 7,880.00	
2.3	PA system rental			\$ 600.00	
2.4	Hall rental			\$ 750.00	
2.5	Stationeries			\$ 1,914.00	
2.6	Video coverage			\$ 1,125.00	
2.7	Participants transportation			\$ 11,505.00	
2.8	Printing of draft regulation			\$ 1,000.00	
3	Media Awareness/ Communication				
3.1	Radio talk show			\$ 300.00	
3.2	News paper publication			\$ 300.00	
3.3	Printing of invitation letters			\$ 195.00	
3.4	scratch cards			\$ 100.00	
3.5	internet service			\$ 300.00	
3.6	Television Talk show			\$ 400.00	
3.7	Jingle and Drama airing			\$ 1,000.00	
4	EQUIPMENT				
4.1	Vehicle hired			\$ 7,500.00	
4.2	Fuel			\$ 1,020.00	
5	Total expense for second phase implementation				<u>US\$49,429.00</u>
					<u>US\$-21,326.8</u>

Summary of Total Funds Received from IUCN

Total Amount received from IUCN for project Implementation		USD\$85307.20
Amount Expended for Project Implementation		USD\$106,634.00
Amount expended by RICCE as advance to complete IUCN project		<u>USD\$21,326.80</u>
Note:	Additional twenty one thousand three hundred twenty six United States dollars and eighty cents (US\$21,326.80) advance was expended for the completion of project activities.	