



**Report on the  
Pre-Congress Training Workshop on  
"Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest  
Policy"**

**In conjunction with the XIII WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS**

Organised by  
IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC)  
In cooperation with the  
Tropical Agriculture and Higher Education Center (CATIE), Costa Rica, the German  
Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), and IUFRO's Special Project on "World Forests,  
Society and Environment" (IUFRO-WFSE)

With support by  
USDA Forest Service, FORMIN (Finland),  
BMZ/GTZ (Germany), and Korea Forest Research Institute (R.o.Korea)

**Duomi Hotel, Buenos Aires, 16 and 17 October 2009**



## Table of Contents

<b>1. Background and Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background and rationale.....	1
1.2. Objectives and target groups.....	1
1.3. Contents and methodology.....	2
1.4. Participants .....	3
<b>2. Day 1: International and National Forest Policy Processes .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1. Introduction: IUFRO-SPDC Initiative on Science and Policy Interface .....	3
2.2. International forest policy processes and agreements – challenges for science and research .....	4
2.3. IUFRO’s Special Project on World Forests, Society and Environment.....	4
2.4. CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology – Global Forest Expert Panel on “Adaptation of Forests to Climate Change” .....	5
2.5. National forest programmes .....	6
2.6. IUFRO Guidelines on science-policy interface.....	7
<b>3. Day 2: Working on the science policy interface.....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. Group work on science-policy interface .....	8
3.2. Presentation of group work: Model research projects and science-policy interface.....	8
3.3. Evaluation .....	10
3.4. Closing .....	10

### Annex:

1. Workshop Programme
2. List of Participants

### Note:

*Presentations and supporting documents as well as results of group work are provided separately in electronic version.*

## **Abbreviations**

BMZ	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORMIN	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
FORNESSA	Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
GTZ/IWP	GTZ/International Forest Policy (sectoral project)
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre (former International Centre for Research on Agroforestry)
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
ITTA	International Tropical Timber Agreement
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature – The World Conservation Union
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organisations
IUFRO-SPDC	IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
nfp	National forest programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NLBI	Non-legally binding instrument on all types of forests
PES	Payment for environmental services
REDD	Reducing emissions from deforestation (and forest degradation) in developing countries
TFAP	Tropical Forestry Action Plan / Tropical Forests Action Programme
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCHE	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
WB	World Bank
WFSE	World Forests, Society and Environment (IUFRO Special Project)
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

# **1. Background and Introduction**

## **1.1. Background and rationale**

The need for sound scientific information in the development of public environmental and forest-related policies at the local, national and international levels has grown significantly in recent years. So too has the need for such information within the private forestry sector and among non-governmental organizations, whose role in the development, sustainable management and conservation of forest resources in all regions of the world is steadily increasing in importance. Although it is commonly accepted that scientific information is indispensable for policy and management, linking substantive knowledge and authoritative political decision making is a chronically difficult task.

Also, often research is planned and conducted before giving adequate thought to exactly how the results will be transformed into usable information. In order to generate value for society, research results should be used by someone – policy-makers, forestry practitioners, landowners, educators and other researchers. The science-policy interface is all about utilising scientific knowledge more effectively.

## **1.2. Objectives and target groups**

The IUFRO Training Workshop on "Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy" took place in conjunction with the XIII World Forestry Congress at Duomi Hotel, Buenos Aires, 16 and 17 October 2009.

The Workshop was jointly organised by IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC) in cooperation with the Tropical Agriculture and Higher Education Center (CATIE), Costa Rica, the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ), and IUFRO's Special Project on "World Forests, Society and Environment" (IUFRO-WFSE) with support by USDA Forest Service, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (FORMIN), the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), and the Korea Forest Research Institute.

The training workshop aimed at:

- Providing concepts and methods to researchers on how to plan, conduct, and organise research activities so that research results can more quickly and easily be transformed into usable information for problem-solving and policy-making;
- Explaining key aspects of science-policy interactions, and best practices for work at the science-policy interface in the context of international, national and local policy processes with special emphasis on the incorporation of traditional forest knowledge;

- Presenting a wide range of case studies mainly dealing with forest-related forest management issues in Africa, Asia and Latin America;
- Conducting hands-on exercises in working groups with focus on the formulation of research processes that adequately incorporate elements of science-policy interfacing.

Although not all research is specifically focused on policy-relevant questions, best practices in transforming research results into usable information can increase the impact of science on forest policy and improve the practice of forestry, thereby creating more value for society from forest and tree-related research. Towards this end, the training workshop specifically aimed at improving the understanding of policy- and decision-making and the roles scientists can play in informing such processes.

### **1.3. Contents and methodology**

The two-day training workshop was designed to provide latest thinking on concepts and tools for the improvement of the interface of forest science and policy. The training was based on the work of international experts convened by IUFRO in its Task Force on the Science-Policy Interface. In addition, resource persons from various national and international research institutions shared their experiences with working on science-policy interactions. Results of similar IUFRO-SPDC science-policy workshops held in various regions over the past four years were also used.

The workshop content built on a “best practices guide” for working effectively at the interface of forest science and forest policy. These guidelines have been developed and published by the IUFRO Task Force on Science Policy Interface (IUFRO Occasional Paper No. 17, 2005, <http://www.iufro.org/publications/series/occasional-papers/en/>).

The training specifically focused on the following issues:

- Selecting research questions that are relevant to policy issues;
- Conducting research in a communicative and collaborative manner;
- Understanding, serving and engaging in policy processes;
- Creating organisational capacity and culture that enables and encourages work at the science-policy interface; and
- Demonstrating – with the help of case studies – the interaction between scientists and policy makers.

Science-policy interactions and best practices were explained against various backgrounds and contexts. These included (a) international policy processes, (b) national forest programmes; and (c) policies and management practices at the local levels.

Emphasis in the training workshop was placed on interactive sessions and group work so that participants could obtain significant insights in the complex nature of issues to be addressed in the science-policy interface. Towards this end, participants provided examples

of research work from their own countries with linkages to policy- and decision-making, serving as basis for analysis and discussions.

The workshop programme is presented in Annex 1. All presentations given during the workshop by trainers and resource persons together with the results of group work and supporting material have been provided to the participants in electronic version at the end of the workshop.

#### **1.4. Participants**

The workshop brought together a number of 19 participants and resource persons from 19 countries. The training was facilitated by trainers/resource persons from GTZ, CATIE and IUFRO. The list of participants is presented in Annex 2.

## **2. Day 1: International and National Forest Policy Processes**

### **2.1. Introduction: IUFRO-SPDC Initiative on Science and Policy Interface**

The training workshop was opened by Richard Guldin, Head of IUFRO Task Force on Science-Policy Interface, who explained the history of the IUFRO Science-Policy initiative since 1999, and the various efforts and processes to bring together scientists from all over the world. Based on case studies specific guidelines have been developed that were presented first at the IUFRO Congress in 2005. Then the decision was taken to disseminate the guidelines in a continuous learning process. A series of training events had been held since then, and the training modules have been constantly further developed.

After introduction of participants and presentation of the workshop objectives and the programme, Michael Kleine, Coordinator IUFRO-SPDC, gave an overview on IUFRO and the IUFRO-SPDC Training Initiative on the Science-Policy Interface. In his presentation he outlined the specific tasks and challenges of linking science to policy and outlined various aspects on how to address policy issues with scientific instruments.

He emphasised that the gaps between science and policy processes can be bridged by using specific tools to enhance the involvement of scientists in policy processes. Scientists need to recognise the policy relevance of their research and to address policy issues with scientific instruments. In this context the interaction with policy makers is important for setting a research agenda that also accommodates the concerns of policy makers and takes into account public attention cycles.

## **2.2. International forest policy processes and agreements – challenges for science and research**

As a starting point for discussion on the science-policy interface, Bernd-Markus Liss, AGEConsultants eG, on behalf of the GTZ International Forest Policy Project IWP, presented an overview on international forest-related policy processes and agreements and the involvement of research and science. He outlined processes on sustainable development, the forest policy dialogue under the Intergovernmental Panel and Forum on Forests IPF and IFF, and the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), and highlighted the commitments and obligations that derive from the so-called international forest regime, including the non-legally binding instrument (NLBI) on all types of forests adopted by UNFF-7 in April 2007 and endorsed by the UN General Assembly in October 2007. He also outlined the forest-related commitments from multilateral environmental conventions such as the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC. Finally, his presentation made reference on how the contribution of science is addressed in the forest policy processes and in different multilateral environmental agreements.

The discussion focussed on the role of science in international forest policy processes and their implementation, the involvement of individual participants, their contributions and impacts achieved, and opportunities and challenges for the science community in this context.

Participants stated that they were involved in preparation of technical papers and country positions for international meetings of UNCCD, UNFCCC, and UNFF, as well as in negotiations and regional preparatory meetings. At the national level, participants were part of ministerial teams or country committees, task forces for the formulation of national action programmes under UNCCD, in national forest programmes, or in the context of implementation of REDD pilot projects as well as in research on CDM. Results of the international policy dialogue were used in the development of strategic plans, e.g. for dryland rehabilitation, or of agroforestry programmes. Other opportunities were the involvement of scientists in the preparation of policies with regard to natural resources management and conservation or on land tenure.

## **2.3. IUFRO's Special Project on World Forests, Society and Environment**

Gerardo Mery, METLA, presented IUFRO's Special Project on World Forests, Society and Environment (IUFRO-WFSE) focusing on developing regional forest policy briefs. He explained the interaction of science and policy in this process by using examples from Latin America and Africa, highlighting that developing regional forest policy briefs can be a powerful tool to promote mutual understanding. He also made clear that a policy brief is not a document for experts, but needs to address concerns of policy makers dealing with problems of today. A policy brief thus serves as a document for advocacy providing an impetus for action.

During the discussions participants raised issues of tactics and technical aspects how to best address policy makers. They outlined the importance of the media and that a combi-

nation of various approaches may be needed to get the message across to policy makers. A policy brief is not enough, but can be an important ingredient.

#### **2.4.CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology – Global Forest Expert Panel on “Adaptation of Forests to Climate Change”**

As a next input to the discussion, Bastiaan Louman, CATIE, presented the IUFRO-led CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology as an effort to provide scientifically sound information to the UNFF process and other global forest-related policy agreements. The CPF had offered this initiative to support inter-governmental processes and conventions by assessing available scientific information in a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, objective, open and transparent way, and producing reports on issues of high concern, including emerging issues.

UNFF members had chosen ‘Adaptation of forests to climate change’ as the priority topic to be elaborated under this initiative. The process included the establishment of a Global Forest Expert Panel (GFEP) on “Adaptation of Forests to Climate Change”, a review of existing research by the Expert Panel and the elaboration of a report for policy-makers for UNFF-8 in April 2009 to be used also by UNFCCC and CBD. The task of the Expert Panel was to provide a sector-specific assessment of available knowledge about impacts and vulnerabilities of forests and people and adaptation options, recognizing various spatial and temporal scales involved, and making best use of information provided by the IPCC, and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. The work of the GFEP was made possible by voluntary in-kind contributions by CPF members and financial contributions from Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom and Germany.

The subsequent interactive session revealed that scientists from tropical countries had been underrepresented in the GFEP, but it nevertheless had implications on the work of scientists there. The Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa FORNESSA had taken up the issue and identified the topic ‘forests and climate change’ as a priority area for its Work Plan. As an offshoot of the GFEP process, FORNESSA now produces a policy brief on Africa in a networking process of regional experts, to be completed by beginning 2010. In order to enhance capacities of scientists they need to be involved in specific policy events, such as UNFF sessions or UNFCCC COP-15. If they do not participate they miss the opportunity to shape policy discussions. In the Philippines, an inter-agency working group participates in a process to bring knowledge of various ODA projects together. The issue of climate change has received a high priority with the President following up regularly. Participants also discussed the problem of discontinuity, which often prevents substantive contribution of scientists and experts to international policy discussions. Therefore it was recommended to institutionalise such processes and to put more emphasis on effective knowledge transfer.

## 2.5. National forest programmes

In his presentation on national forest programmes (nfp) Bernd-Markus Liss outlined the concept of national forest programmes as an inclusive country-specific process for forest policy formulation and implementation towards sustainable forest management, based on multi-stakeholder consultation, communication and capacity building. He highlighted the nfp principles and the approach, and emphasised that nfp processes should be embedded in sustainable development policies and address a wide range of issues at the micro- and macro-levels, taking into account cross-sectoral linkages. He further explained that nfps do not confine to central policy planning but also include sub-national and local level policy-making and implementation. Beside, nfps include also the positioning towards the international forest policy dialogue and integrate the implementation of international forest-related agreements and commitments according to country priorities and specific conditions. They can provide an effective framework for collaboration and partnership at all levels and for donor coordination. The role of different actors was explained with specific focus on the role of science and research and related challenges.

The following discussion included questions on how scientists can contribute to policy processes at national level and respond to new challenges, such as adaptation to climate change or REDD, and what are key issues, opportunities and constraints for science involvement in forest policy.

Participants reported examples from different countries:

- In Costa Rica, scientists did research on how payment for environmental services (PES) had improved forest services. A policy brief was produced and discussed with decision makers, even presented in Congress. However, there was little influence, because other actors were more powerful.
- In the Philippines, there is a discussion on using PES for watershed conservation services. Despite studies proved that PES would be also economically advantageous, for political reasons it took years before it was incorporated into water rates. Scientists now play an important role in monitoring of the impacts of the PES policy and explaining them to policy makers.
- Vietnam had introduced a benefit-sharing scheme in protection forests, but the Government can not sustain the payments for forest protection. Now, a PES policy is been piloted based on scientific studies.
- In Cameroon, the economic and ecological differences between North and South of the country require different approaches for reforestation programmes and fuelwood supply. Scientific studies revealed that land tenure and access rights were key issues to be addressed. The results of the study were presented to Parliament and had an impact on re-shaping policies on access rights for more successful reforestation programmes.
- In Kenya, science produced good data for participatory forest management approaches. Resource assessments in coastal areas / mangroves provided a basis for improved forest protection and management by local community associations,

including eco-tourism activities and introduction of new technologies. Government took up results to develop a new policy on revenue-sharing and the approach was extended also to other districts.

- In Latin America, scientists are involved in various processes for policy changes. Studies on forest functions and legal provisions in different countries resulted in a review of existing law, like in Ecuador, where protection of environmental functions was even made part of the Constitution. In Colombia, research also provide inputs to the national forest programme, whereas there is a need to expand research topics beyond technical issues, especially on studies how to make policies and programmes more realistic.

## **2.6. IUFRO Guidelines on science-policy interface**

As a last point on the first day's agenda, Bastiaan Louman presented the "IUFRO Guidelines for Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy - Guidance for Scientists and Research Organizations" that had been elaborated by the IUFRO Task Force on the Forest Science-Policy Interface. He highlighted the process how the Guidelines were elaborated and key aspects of the Guidelines with regard to the involvement of scientists in policy processes. In this context it is important to formulate research questions that are of relevance to policymakers, to communicate results adequately and to build partnerships. Further, he emphasised the need to build organisational capacity that allows proper interaction of researchers with policy makers, and the importance for science to get engaged in policy processes, but still to maintain independence which is a precondition for credibility.

Michael Kleine presented a case study from sub-Saharan Africa as an example for adherence to best science-policy interfacing practices, including putting focus on values and needs, conducting research in a communicative and collaborative manner, understanding policy processes and their requirements and engaging in policy processes in order to provide best services for decision-makers.

Participants realised that the best practice guidelines are a good tool for better engagement of science in policy processes. They highlighted the importance of good communication, and that scientists need to listen to policy-makers to enhance the relevance of research to policy. But they also raised the question how scientists can make policy-makers listen. Various strategies were outlined, such as using influential people with access to policy makers, going through formal and informal channels of communication, and to address the various audiences with different approaches according to their needs and respective communication culture. Building alliances and highlighting clear facts and figures can facilitate to get the message across and to convince policy makers.

## **3. Day 2: Working on the science policy interface**

The day started with a summary on the previous day by Bernd-Markus Liss, highlighting the key issues discussed with regard to international policy processes and national implementation, and summarising the contributions of participants concerning the practical application of the science-policy interface.

### **3.1. Group work on science-policy interface**

Participants then split into three groups to work on improving science-policy interfacing on the basis of concrete examples of their own research projects. For this purpose the groups were asked to fulfil the following tasks:

- Evaluate specific research projects against the IUFRO best practices guidelines;
- Present research projects to the group members explaining the process on how the research has been conducted;
- Discuss the project based on the following guiding questions:
  - Which of the elements in the best practices guide have been implemented?
  - Have these practices helped to make the project more useful for policy-making? If yes, how?
  - Should additional elements given in the best practices guide be included into the project? If yes, which ones?
- Select one project and develop the research process explaining the elements of the best practices guide that you would apply to make this particular project a role model for science-policy interfacing.

### **3.2. Presentation of group work: Model research projects and science-policy interface**

In the afternoon participants presented and discussed the results of the group work on research projects with regard to the application of the IUFRO guidelines on science-policy interfacing.

**Group 1 (Latin America)** had chosen a project on the Environmental and Economic Accounting System of Guatemala that was felt by the Group to be representative for a regional issue. The relevance to policy issues was that currently goods and services provided by natural resources have only a partial value in national accounting systems. To make the project more in line with the IUFRO guidelines the group recommended to add traditional knowledge, to build a monitoring phase to maintain diffusion and information of results, and to standardise the evaluation methodology.

The discussion on the case addressed the need to develop a communication strategy, methodologies for valuating environmental services, and how local communities can have

access to research results, given the fact that the scope of research is nation wide, but needs to benefit local people. Unclear land tenure and access rights were mentioned as problems preventing such benefits.

With regard to the Guidelines, it was felt that Section No. III is partly repetitive and redundant, but also recognised that it addressed different parts of the research process. Participants also claimed that the guide should also be made available in Spanish.

**Group 2 (Africa)** worked on a project called Growing Eucalyptus Species in Kenya Landscape – a Policy Paper. The project was chosen because it was research based, represented a subject common for Africa, involved a multidisciplinary research process with all steps, and results were presented to policy makers. In order to make this project a role model for science-policy interfacing, the group recommended to bridge the gap between science and traditional knowledge, to strengthen communication strategies with policy makers, and to increase understanding of the role of scientists in policy making processes.

In the discussion participants asked whether there were also other species included in the study except Eucalyptus. The group explained that Eucalyptus is the most important one due to economic advantages. The key problem that triggered the study was that policy makers wanted to eradicate Eucalyptus because of critical discussion on its environmental impacts, especially on water resources. The study matched the interest of key stakeholders and sharpened understanding for the species' relevance for farmers. It was an example how stakeholders were involved to define the research topic.

With regard to the Guidelines, the group also felt that some aspects were repetitive, but also acknowledged that it can help to create better understanding between scientists and policy makers.

**Group 3 (Asia)** dealt with a case study on an integrated approach on mitigating forest offences in Malaysia. It was chosen because of the many policy issues it addressed and its importance for all countries of the region. The Group explained the recommendations of the study with regard to prevention measures, upgrading of forest legislation, organisational development, upgrading of enforcement and investigation personnel, cooperation with other relevant agencies beyond forest administration and improved data recording.

The following discussion emphasised that the human factor is very important; therefore stakeholder involvement is necessary at all levels from local communities to the ministry in charge. Research could contribute to better recognise the nature of the problem and how measures affect local people. Alternatives to increased law enforcement for mitigation of forest offences would be the introduction of community forestry projects with legal access to natural resources in order not to compromise people's livelihoods.

The group also recommended that the Guidelines should already be used in drafting of research proposals, in designing research projects, but also during the process and after finalising them. Results have to be communicated well through appropriate channels in

order to influence policy makers. Round tables could be used as communication platforms. Also a specialised communication unit could be established in research institutions. A chapter on monitoring and evaluation of research impacts should be included in the guidelines.

### **3.3. Evaluation**

In a final round, participants thanked IUFRO-SPDC for its initiative and the excellent organisation and implementation of the workshop. They appreciated the clear presentations and facilitation by highly competent resource persons and trainers, contributing to enhancing knowledge and competencies. The training was found to be very interesting and useful for scientists in developing their skills and getting results of their research better integrated in policy processes. Participants stated that the training motivated them to get more involved in policy processes and to improve their research approaches and projects. The guidelines were felt to be a good practical tool to this end, helping to focus research processes and to better communicate results.

All in all, participants enjoyed the opportunity for more exchange and joint learning with colleagues from other countries. They highlighted the added value of the event for their work and called upon IUFRO and supporting donors to continue with this important capacity building initiative to enhance the impact of science for better informed policy making in developing countries.

### **3.4. Closing**

The workshop was concluded by commending all participants for their active contribution and the good energy during the workshop. Participants then received their certificates of attendance along with the documentation of the workshop on a GFIS-IUFRO memory stick.

## ANNEX 1

### IUFRO-SPDC Training Workshop

#### *Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy*

Buenos Aires, Argentina, 16 to 17 October 2009

### Workshop Programme

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Thursday, 15 October	Whole day 20:00	Arrival of participants Dinner and Icebreaker	
Friday 16 October	08:30 – 09:00	Registration	M. Kleine
	09:00 – 09:10	Welcome address and opening of the workshop	R.W. Guldin
	09:10 - 09:30	Introduction of participants: experiences and expectations Workshop objectives and programme	M. Kleine, B. Louman; B. Liss, Participants
	09:30 – 10:00	What is the Science-Policy Interface? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IUFRO’s Task Force</li> <li>• IUFRO-SPDC Training</li> </ul>	M. Kleine
	10:00 – 10:30	International Policy Frameworks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processes</li> <li>• Issues and challenges</li> </ul>	B. Liss
	10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	11:00 – 11:30	Interactive Session: Science contributions to international processes: Participants’ experiences	B. Liss/B. Louman/G. Mery/M. Kleine
	11:30 – 12:30	IUFRO-WFSE: Developing Regional Forest Policy Briefs: Examples from Latin America and Africa	G. Mery
	12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 14:00	Global Forest Expert Panels (GFEP): “Adaptation of Forests to Climate Change”	B. Louman
	14:00 – 14:30	Interactive Session: Discussions on science contributions at the international level	B. Liss/B. Louman/G. Mery/M. Kleine
14:30 – 15:30	National Forest Programmes	B. Liss	

Table continued

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
<b>Friday 16 October</b>	15:30 – 16:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	16:00 – 16:30	Interactive Session: Discussions on science contributions at the national level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples from Africa, Asia and Latin America</li> <li>• Discussions</li> </ul>	B. Liss/B. Louman/G. Mery/M. Kleine
	16:30 – 17:00	Best Practices Guide: Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy	B.Louman/M. Kleine
	17:00 – 18:00	Interactive Session: Application of science-policy interfacing tools within the research process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples from past science-policy training workshops</li> <li>• Discussions</li> </ul>	B.Louman/M. Kleine
<b>Saturday 17 October</b>	08:30 – 08:45	Summary of results obtained on previous day	B. Liss
	08:45 – 09:15	Preparations for Group Work: Tasks and expected results	B. Liss/B. Louman
	09:15 – 12:30	Group Work: Evaluation of research projects based on best practices guidelines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groups discuss individual case studies</li> <li>• Developing a role model for science-policy interfacing</li> </ul>	Participants
	In between	Coffee/Tea Break	
	12:30 – 13:30	Lunch	
	13:30 – 15:00	Group Work continues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describing the role model for science-policy interfacing</li> <li>• Compilation of group presentations</li> </ul>	Participants
	15:00 – 15:30	Coffee/Tea Break	
	15:30 – 17:00	Presentation of group work Discussions	Participants B. Louman, B. Liss
17:00 – 17:30	Closing of Workshop and Handing-over of Certificates	B. Liss/B. Louman/M. Kleine	

## ANNEX 2

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name		Country	Email Address
Ms. Alejandra HERNANDEZ GUZMAN	Instituto de Incidencia Ambiental	GUATEMALA	<a href="mailto:ale716@hotmail.com">ale716@hotmail.com</a>
Mr. Fernando FERNANDEZ MENDEZ	Biodiversidad y Dinamica	COLOMBIA	<a href="mailto:fmendez@ut.edu.co">fmendez@ut.edu.co</a>
Mr. Estanislao SALAZAR QUIROZ	Universidad Católica del trópico Seco de Estelí (UCATSE)	NICARAGUA	<a href="mailto:stanislaosalazar@yahoo.com.mx">stanislaosalazar@yahoo.com.mx</a>
Ms. Maria Cristina PUENTE SALINAS	Quito	ECUADOR	<a href="mailto:makifti@yahoo.com">makifti@yahoo.com</a>
Ms. Mercedes Teresa DISLA PENA	Calle Primera No.24, Nordesa II, Santo Domingo	DOM.REP	<a href="mailto:tedisla@gmail.com">tedisla@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Ros-sy.Sanchez@medioambiente.gob.do">Ros-sy.Sanchez@medioambiente.gob.do</a>
Ms. Carolina Alejandra CORDOVA MOLINA	Universidad Católica de Chile	CHILE	<a href="mailto:cordova.carolina@gmail.com">cordova.carolina@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Vo Dai HAI	Forest Science Institute of Vietnam	VIETNAM	<a href="mailto:haivodai@gmail.com">haivodai@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Walter LINTANGAH	School of International Tropical Forestry, University Malaysia Sabah	MALAYSIA	<a href="mailto:walterj@ums.edu.my">walterj@ums.edu.my</a>
Mr. Chanhsumone PHONGGOU DOME	Forestry Research Centre, National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	LAO PDR	<a href="mailto:chanhsamone@yahoo.com">chanhsamone@yahoo.com</a>
Ms. Zuraida TARMUZI	Center for Plantation Forest Research and Development, Forest Research Development Agency, Ministry of Forestry	INDONESIA	<a href="mailto:zuraidaus21@gmail.com">zuraidaus21@gmail.com</a>
Mr. Marlo MENDOZA	Forest Management Bureau DENR	PHILIPPINES	<a href="mailto:marlobk@yahoo.com">marlobk@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Ahmadou BOUBA	IRAD	CAMEROUN	<a href="mailto:ahmadou20032001@yahoo.fr">ahmadou20032001@yahoo.fr</a>

Mr. Ernest FOLI	FORIG	GHANA	<a href="mailto:efoli@csir-forig.org.gh">efoli@csir-forig.org.gh</a> ; <a href="mailto:efoli@hotmail.com">efoli@hotmail.com</a>
Mr. Paulos MWALE	FRIM	MALAWI	<a href="mailto:paulos.mwale@yahoo.com">paulos.mwale@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Jackson MULATYA	KEFRI, Nairobi	KENYA	<a href="mailto:jmulatya@kefri.org">jmulatya@kefri.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:jackmulatya@yahoo.com">jackmulatya@yahoo.com</a>
Mr. Bastiaan LOUMAN	CATIE, Turrialba	COSTA RICA	<a href="mailto:blouman@catie.ac.cr">blouman@catie.ac.cr</a>
Mr. Bernd-Markus LISS	AGEG Consultants eG	GERMANY	<a href="mailto:bm.liss@ageg.de">bm.liss@ageg.de</a>
Mr. Gerardo MERY	METLA	FINLAND	<a href="mailto:gerardo.mery@metla.fi">gerardo.mery@metla.fi</a>
Mr. Michael KLEINE	IUFRO-SPDC	AUSTRIA	<a href="mailto:Kleine@iufro.org">Kleine@iufro.org</a>