

UK Bushmeat Working Group

30th March 2010

14:00-17:00

Bartlett Room, Zoological Society of London

Meeting Report

Attendees

Noëlle Kümpel – Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
Juliet Wright – Lebialem Hunters' Beekeeping Initiative
Marcus Rowcliffe – ZSL Institute of Zoology
Björn Schulte-Herbrüggen - ZSL Institute of Zoology (IoZ) and University College London (UCL)
Sharon Brooks - Cambridge University
Paul De Ornellas - ZSL
Christopher Stewart- Proforest
David Gill - Imperial College London
Chris Wright – Born Free Foundation
Cath Lawson – Save the Rhino
Ruth Malleson - Forests and livelihood consultant
Ellen Brown - WCS Congo/UCL
Luke Parry - Lancaster University
Chris Ransom - ZSL
Sofie Tind-Nielsen - Proforest
Matthew Hatchwell – Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
Julia Young – WWF-UK Global Forest and Trade Network (GFTN)
James McNamara – Imperial College London-IoZ
Helga Rainer – Arcus Foundation
Lydia Hall - independent
Murray Collins – London School of Economics-IoZ
Jacquie Teera - Uganda Conservation Foundation
Marcus Rowcliffe - IoZ
Eric Arnhem - ZSL
Justice Eshun – Samartex Timber & Plywood Company (Ghana)
Nico Dauphiné - ZSL
Chris Cox - Timbmet
Jose Ochoa-Quintero – Cambridge University
Ana Nuno – Imperial College London

The Chair, **Noëlle Kümpel**, outlined the purpose of the UK Bushmeat Working Group (UKBWG) as a forum for discussion on bushmeat-related research and policy amongst government, industry, NGOs and academia. ZSL took over secretariat responsibilities of the UKBWG from the Tropical Forest Forum in 2006 and is funded by DEFRA. Noëlle welcomed the attendees and briefly outlined the focus of the meeting, namely

to discuss how wildlife management within timber concessions can impact upon bushmeat consumption and trade. This afternoon meeting was planned to tie in with a ZSL Special Wildlife Conservation Meeting to be held in that evening entitled 'Using timber certification as a tool for wildlife management: experiences from West and Central Africa'. Having welcomed the attendees, the Chair drew attention to the agenda.

Sofie Tind Nielsen - Central Point of Expertise on Timber Procurement (CPET)
***The potential role of the UK Government's timber
procurement policy to drive sustainable forest management***

Sofie began by outlining CPET's role as an organisation, funded by Defra and operated by ProForest with the task of providing information on the UK Government's timber procurement policy requirements. They offer advice on how public sector buyers and their suppliers can meet the requirements outlined in government policy. They carry out this work using a number of methods: Hosting a phone helpline, carrying out training and raising awareness, a website, conducting evidence assessments and a publishing a CPET update.

Sofie went on to outline the importance of the UK as a market, being the 4th largest importer of wood products after the USA, China and Japan. The vast majority of these products originate in Europe (89% according to the UK Timber Trade Federation website, 2009) but the threat of illegal timber is significant and growing (WWF estimate that 16-19% of timber imports into the EU are estimated to derive from illegal or suspicious sources). In attempting to address this, the European Commission agreed in 2003 on an Action Plan on 'Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade' or FLEGT. FLEGT was created to stop the importation of illegal timber to the EU by addressing illegal logging, through linking good governance in developing countries with the legal trade instruments and influence offered by the EU's internal market. The FLEGT process has a number of key components:

1. Support for improved governance and capacity building in timber producing countries
2. Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) with timber-producing countries that wish to eliminate illegal timber from their trade with the EU which are in effect, Legality Assurance Systems
3. Public timber procurement policies
4. Private sector Initiatives e.g. TTAP
5. Investment safeguards
6. Additional options for legislation
7. Conflict timber

As present, Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPA) have been signed by

- Ghana (September 2008) – FLEGT licensed timber expected available end 2010
- The Republic of Congo (May 2009) – FLEGT licensed timber expected available 2011

Negotiations for future agreements are currently being conducted with Cameroon, Liberia, Malaysia, Indonesia, Gabon, Vietnam, and the Central African Republic. Another facet of the FLEGT process is addressing public timber procurement policies and within the EU a number of countries already have these in place: UK, Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands and Denmark, which have all defined what they mean by sustainably sourced timber. Although all 6 countries insist that timber must be legal, only the UK and Denmark have defined what this means. Both nations are leading the drive for harmonisation across the EU. New Zealand, Japan, Australia and Norway all have timber procurement policies

Focusing on the UK, timber procurement policy supports delivery of a range of policies: combating climate change, reducing illegal/non-sustainable logging (addressing environmental, economic and social impacts), protection of biodiversity and sustainable procurement through the UK government buying standards. This policy was announced in 2000 following a commitment made at the G8 meeting; to actively seek to procure legal timber and preferably sustainable timber. A stepwise commitment was made such that by 2009 all publically procured timber and wood-derived products must be from independently verifiable legal and sustainable sources or FLEGT-licensed. Ultimately by 2015 all sourced timber must be sustainable. For the purposes of the policy, timber is defined as: all wood and wood derived products including paper, furniture, wood for construction, wood fuel and wood composite products.

The policy is mandatory for all central government departments, executive agencies as well as non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs). Autonomous organisations such as universities and local authorities that receive public funding are encouraged to adopt the policy. The policy is enforced under contract clauses whereby the purchase of legal and sustainable timber is a policy rather than a law – breach of contract is, however, illegal. The UK government defines legal timber as it relates to forest management. Producers should:

1. Have legal use rights to the forest
2. Comply with all local and national laws relevant to forest operation, environment, labour, health and safety and tenure rights
3. Pay all relevant royalties and taxes
4. Respect CITES requirements.

The UK government requires that a locally applicable definition of sustainability is developed which conforms to specific requirements both in terms of the process by which it was agreed (e.g. by multistakeholder processes) and how the forest management is implemented. Management must: minimise harm to ecosystems, maintain forest productivity, ensure forest ecosystem health and vitality and maintain biodiversity as well as address a range of social criteria. Dutch and Danish criteria are nearly identical to those of the UK.

Sofie went on to discuss what types of evidence are deemed appropriate to demonstrate that timber conforms to the policy. These include forestry certification

schemes (category A under CPET) and category B evidence which is equivalent to category A and must show traceability through the supply chain (chain of custody), and compliance with legality and sustainability criteria. A framework exists for assessing category B to ensure a sustainable source and legality through the entire chain of supply and production, where the supplier is not certified to end use or there is no certificate. Criteria for evaluating certification schemes (category A evidence) include: assessing the forest standard in terms both of its legality and sustainability and the standard-setting process, and the various steps involved in certification, accreditation, verification of the chain of custody and the national level application. Certification schemes are assessed bi-annually and in 2008 PEFC and FSC were accepted for compliance with the criteria, making up 32% and 52% respectively of UK timber products (UK Timber Trade Federation, 2009). Compliance can be checked via checking of the certificate number online and the invoice/delivery note at delivery.

Sofie mentioned a recent Tropenbos International study of 67 well-managed vs conventionally-managed forests, which concluded that forest certification schemes are associated with a positive impact on biodiversity. In summing up, Sofie stated that timber procurement policies drive and create an incentive for sustainable forest management by creating a market and by excluding illegal and non-sustainable timber. The assessment processes of the forest certification schemes are identifying shortcomings and driving improvements – they are seen as the ‘Highest court’ and a force for positive change.

Noëlle thanked Sofie for her presentation and invited questions from the floor. Matthew Hatchwell enquired about a possible Lacey Act for the UK. Sofie replied that the EU was introducing a ‘due diligence’ requirement to reduce illegal timber imports. Julia Young stated that most timber in the UK comes from elsewhere in the EU anyway; Sofie suggested that if governance is too weak in many countries to prosecute under the due diligence measure, the UK may try to introduce stronger legislation.

Ruth Malleson enquired whether it might be possible to educate buyers to purchase particular types rather than species of wood. Sofie replied that the Environment Agency was issuing guidance to raise awareness of the sustainability of lesser-known species.

Julia Young – GFTN-UK/WWF-UK
Global markets for forest products from responsibly managed forests

Julia started by introducing WWF as an organisation; giving a brief overview of its mission and work across the globe. She then went on to discuss WWF’s work with particular reference to forests. They focus on a selection of priority places with the key ones being the Amazon, Borneo and Congo Basin. They work not only with forest managers and dependent communities but focus attention on the drivers that affect

the future of these forests. These include: forest degradation, conversion, illegal logging and illegal trade in forest products as well as how government policy impacts upon them. The main tools they use to seek to influence these drivers and management of forests are certification and product focused 'roundtables' (soy & palm).

To this end, the Global Forest and Trade Network (GFTN) is WWF's main mechanism for engagement with the forest products industry through which WWF uses the market to try and improve management practices in their priority places. GFTN works with 300 companies worldwide in around 34 countries, across the supply chain from the buyers who want to know the provenance of their products, their legality and whether it is sustainable; through to the producers who want to be able to satisfactorily answer the buyers' questions and achieve FSC in their forests. GFTN fits in with WWF's working with business programme in which it 'sees a future in which companies make a net positive contribution to the wellbeing of society and the planet'. WWF feel that companies are starting to recognise the need to mainstream environmental and social issues into core business activities, but often struggle with how to adapt their behaviour in light of this new corporate reality.

On the supply side GFTN works in many of the major timber producing nations including Ghana, Cameroon, CAR, DR Congo, Rep Congo, Gabon, Bolivia, Peru, Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia, Laos, Vietnam, China and Russia, working mainly in natural forests but also plantations. They assist producers in meeting certification standards, providing technical support in areas such as HCV assessment, community engagement, management planning and reduced impact logging, and providing a linkage to customers and markets. A number of challenges exist often relating to the starting point; in certain areas there is a major gap between where producers are initially and the standard needed to certify. Another worry identified by producers is the ultimate cost of production; this can be substantially more in tropical forest and so they have concerns that consumers will pay more for the end product,

In processing countries such as Ghana, Cameroon, CAR, DR Congo, Rep Congo, Gabon, Bolivia, Peru, Brazil, Indonesia, Malaysia, Laos, Vietnam, China, Russia and Sweden much of the work focuses on ensuring responsible sourcing of raw timber, clear chain of custody and promoting use of certified timber that meets customers' needs. Here a different set of challenges are faced and change / level of commitment is reliant on a number of factors - the cost and ease of obtaining suitable timber, additional costs of processing and the existence of customers willing to purchase the products, particularly during the transition period.

Finally, at the end of the supply chain, GFTN works in Brazil, China, Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, UK, USA, and Australia helping suppliers of furniture, plywood, veneer, flooring, joinery, sawn wood, paper and pulp source responsibly and trying to ensure a cleaner supply chain. Similar issues relating to cost, capacity and market forces (i.e. how much pressure the company is under from customers, legislators, shareholders, NGOs, media or

Government) are faced at the end of the supply chain as by producers and processors.

Julia emphasised that a clear message from markets in support of credible certification was essential at all levels of the supply chain to drive these initiatives. THE WWF UK FTN was originally set up in 1991 with a vision to ensure that timber and paper supplies came from well-managed forests and did not contribute to forest destruction and illegal logging practices. Currently they work with 38 companies responsible for approximately 40% of the forest products imported into the UK and seek to use this as leverage to secure improved forest management in priority ecoregions. An example of this would be the Green Heart of Africa initiative focusing on the forests and people of the Congo Basin-African Rift Lakes region, which includes a bushmeat strategy and has as its goals:

- 1: **Biodiversity** – By 2020, 15 million hectares of new protected areas are gazetted which are all effectively managed and sustainably funded in priority landscapes
- 2: **Biodiversity** – By 2020, the rate of net deforestation and associated CO² emissions are reduced to zero, and bushmeat trade and wildlife off-take are reduced to sustainable levels from priority landscapes
- 3: **Footprint** - By 2020, at least 50% of logging concessions (estimated at 25 million ha) are credibly certified, and all major oil and gas, mining, hydropower, agro-industries and associated infrastructure projects which impact priority landscapes implement social and environmental standards that minimise their direct and indirect impacts (on biodiversity and livelihoods).

To achieve these goals they have outlined four transformational strategies which revolve around:

- Securing sustainable and innovative financing,
- Engaging local people as active managers of resources
- Working with the private sector to implement to secure sustainable management
- Securing the highest political commitment for conservation and sustainable management.

GFTN-Central Africa provides services for companies which are aiming for FSC certification in Cameroon, Central Africa Republic, DR Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and the Republic of Congo.

Following her presentation, a question was raised regarding the stalling of GFTN members in Ghana following the signing of their FLEGT VPA (Voluntary Partnership Agreement), as the VPA only requires legality rather than full FSC certification. Julia suggested that lack of capacity on the ground and financial support for the GFTN may also be a factor.

Dr Christopher Stewart – HCV Resource Network
FSC forest certification and the conservation of biodiversity in the Congo Basin

While other certification systems exist, only FSC has so far taken off in the Congo Basin, with FSC certified concessions in Cameroon, Congo- Brazzaville and Gabon. The FSC has two main principles relating directly to conservation and environmental issues:

Principal 6: Environmental impact

- Reduction of environmental impacts of logging activities, maintenance of the ecological functions and integrity of the forest

Principal 9: High Conservation Value Forests

- Maintenance of High Conservation Value Forests (i.e. with outstanding environmental and social values).

Christopher went on to illustrate a case study of FSC certification in a huge concession in Congo-Brazzaville – the Ngombe UFA (forest management unit) next to Odzala-Kokua National Park. Some of the particular issues relating to biodiversity in the region were discussed. An area of exceptional species richness, with emblematic species (gorilla, elephant, chimpanzee etc.) and complex patterns at a range of scales in terms of ecosystem characteristics, coupled with serious data deficiencies and lack of capacity to identify and monitor species. This makes biodiversity indicators of great importance. A complex social context also exists within the Congo Basin with a range of stakeholders including forest communities, indigenous peoples, timber company workers and the broader regional community who might be affected by timber company activities.

The implementation of operational activities that address these issues (e.g. detailed inventories, reduced width roads, anti-poaching patrols and skid trail planning) satisfied the auditors, but the question of whether or not biodiversity will be maintained as a result of management actions is hard to measure, and will require regular audits with the scope for continuous improvement.

How do we build towards an integrated site level planning process to improve performance and meet FSC certification requirements in the Congo Basin forests?

Relevant criteria for principle 6 are:

- **P6.1:** Environmental Impact Assessment
- **P6.2:** Protection of rare, threatened and endemic (RTE) species and habitats, conservation areas, control of hunting and fishing
- **P6.3:** Maintenance of ecological processes and values (regeneration, biodiversity, natural cycles)
- **P6.4:** Representative samples of natural ecosystems conserved in their natural state.

With regards to principle 9, decisions regarding high conservation value forests should always be considered in the context of a precautionary approach. In effect this should involve a consultative approach that identifies management approaches that can be both effectively implemented and monitored. Six specific high conservation values (HCV) have been identified:

HCV1 - Significant concentrations of biodiversity values (rare/threatened, endemic, migratory species etc)
HCV2 – Large, landscape level forests/areas where most species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance
HCV3 - Rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems
HCV4 - Basic ecosystem services in critical situations
HCV5 - Basic needs of local communities
HCV6 - Local communities' traditional cultural identity.

Definitions of HCVs are generic and universal, so on a more practical level, local interpretations of these HCVs are needed. This make take the form of definitions and guidance via 'HCV Toolkits' and a national/expert process which will identify categories of HCVs, thresholds of 'HCV significance' and assessment of these at the site level.

Having already mentioned some of the particular issues relating to biodiversity in the Congo Basin, how are the requirements of principles 6 and 9 relating to it to be met 'on-the-ground'? Protection of RTE species and ecological processes might involve suppression of poaching and hunting controls (P6.2, P9 - HVC 1) and Reduced Impact Logging (RIL) across forest management units (P6.2, P6.3, HVC 1, 2, 3).

Representative samples can be set aside as protected areas to combine the requirement of PC6.4 and HCVs 1 and 3. The selection process would be highly data intensive and involve a number of different levels:

- Forest stratification which itself would need inventory data and a suite of ecosystem indicators (e.g. topography, geology, soils) and would include HVC3 (rare/threatened ecosystems) where recognised
- An understanding of the needs of major faunal species (especially apes and elephants)
- Isolation of these HCVs from present and future risks.

This still leaves many questions unanswered about what constitutes a representative sample. How many samples should a given UFA contain? And how big should these be? As of yet this has not been specified by FSC at the global level except in relation to intensity and scale of operations and the uniqueness of the affected resources. More detailed refinement for implementation has to be done at the national and/or regional level. Several national FSC standards recommend 5-10% of total area whilst balancing representation with risks (in large FMUs): lower risk might be several (5-6) samples of moderate size while higher risk would be 1 or 2 large samples.

This is also potentially a separate issue relating to P6.2: Protection of RTE species *and their habitat*. Here there is a need to identify critical resources such as nesting areas, salt licks and, for the great apes, concentrations of fruiting trees and core range (e.g. high nest density). Again, guidance on how many, and how big, is less detailed, but for example 2-5 harvest parcels per annual cut are suggested, which should be complementary to the 'representative samples' e.g. providing connectivity or alternate resources.

Following Christopher's presentation, Eric Arnhem asked whether timber companies shouldn't be exempt from paying taxes for the HCV set-aside areas in their concessions. Christopher replied that this was a common question and that companies claim that this puts them at a competitive disadvantage, but this is part of certification requirements and in fact often a 'series de conservation' (conservation zone) is a legal requirement for all concessions, so it only has to be ensured that this is put in HCV areas.

Dr Luke Parry - Lancaster Environment Centre
Impacts of socio-economic change on the distribution of rural people and hunted wildlife in Amazonia

Luke presented the findings of his PhD work in Amazonia. His studies focused on the Amazonia district of the Amazon basin, an area that is facing a range of pressures on its forest resources at the same time as shifts in human populations as rural populations shift to urban areas. The focus of the study was how the distribution of people and hunted wildlife in this region was impacted by socio-economic change and he also touched on how projected changes in land use/forest management might relate to these processes.

Luke aimed to find out three things: (1) the distribution of the rural pop (and growth), (2) the drivers of migration (policy linkages) and (3) the conservation impacts (i.e. hunted wildlife). His study involved household surveys of all households along the banks of 8 selected sub-tributaries of the Amazon – following the river as far as the final household (representing an urban-rural gradient). This information could be used alongside detailed census data for the region from 2007 which shows that the majority of rural people live close to an urban centre.

At the same time however a phenomenon of rural-urban migration was noted, in particular an abandonment of more remote headwater homesteads. A cost-benefit analysis of distance from urban centres revealed a number of factors. On the benefit side, proximity to wildlife for hunting and the chance of finding unclaimed land in remote areas was noted but this was weighed against distance from healthcare, access to education, electricity, commodities and government subsidies.

To investigate the impacts of hunters on wildlife, Luke carried out hunter surveys and measured their perceptions of time to reach specific species to gain an understanding of depletion distances around geographical features. Thus, it was found that a negative relationship existed between encounter distance for the favoured larger species and distance from urban centres. Using hierarchical partitioning methods, three key predictors were identified to model the numbers of hunted species: human population density, distance to city and percentage of unflooded forest. Much of this information is available on the regional scale allowing large scale predictive models to be applied based on simple interview data that give

an indication of hunting pressure/depletion of hunted species for monitoring purposes.

Following Luke's presentation, Noëlle Kümpel asked if hunting was likely to decrease in remote areas with the rural exodus. Luke explained that it wouldn't, due to commercial extraction up to 500km from inhabited areas – for example, a large turtle is worth \$50 in the urban market. Noëlle asked if logging was a driver of this; Luke replied that not where this was mainly clear-felling for alternative land use (in his study area to the south-west of the Amazon).

Dr Matthew Hatchwell - WCS Europe
Improving wildlife management in timber concessions
in Northern Congo: an update

Matthew reported on WCS's work in timber concessions within the Sangha TriNational Landscape located around Nouabale Ndoke National Park in the Republic of Congo. Here they have been collaborating with CIB in Kabo and Pokola concessions since 1999 through PROGEPP, with Kabo achieving FSC certification in 2006 and Pokola in 2008. In addition to this they have an MOU with Danzer to work in their Ifo concession since 2008.

He then went on to detail some of the issues that arise when a logging company moves into an area, opening up previously inaccessible areas of forest whilst attracting high levels of immigration, increasing incomes and a demand for bushmeat on a commercial scale, which ultimately leads to changes in traditional land use practices. As a company CIB have taken a number of measures to try and address these issues, including; hunting restrictions (bans on hunting protected species and using wire or nylon snares, and licensing of hunters and firearms), rules banning drivers on concession land to try and limit access for unlicensed hunters and transport of bushmeat and facilitate enforcement (drivers requiring written authorisation to drive at night and being stopped and searched at control posts), use of land zoning (with conservation zones off limits to hunting) and the prohibition of export of wild meat outside the zone where it was captured. Hunting zones have been set aside within the concessions to control and limit hunting impacts.

Recently the situation has changed with a more precarious financial environment meaning that hundreds of workers have been laid off and Kabo sawmill closed down (600 workers). Sawmill operations are being transferred to Loundougou (17 km from the park boundary) with worrying implications for pressure on natural resources there and an increase in snare hunting by economic migrants from DRC has been noted. As a result the company has taken a number of steps. The anti-poaching strategy has been revised and they have increased patrol/law enforcement effort roughly six-fold. In 2009 approximately 22,000 snares were confiscated along with 191 shotguns, 28 AK47s, 38 poachers arrested and 42 tusks confiscated. WCS is

currently in the process of introducing MIST software for wildlife and law enforcement monitoring.

Following Matthew's presentation, Murray Collins asked what people were eating before the sawmill closed. Matthew cited a 50:50 split between fish and bushmeat, which was sustainably hunted (e.g. blue duiker from permitted hunting zones). Luke Parry suggested that if apparently 'sustainable' species are appearing in the market, it usually indicates that hunting is not sustainable. Matthew suggested that if areas are zoned properly, hunting can be sustainable.

Noëlle asked who did the anti-poaching patrols – government, the company or WCS? Matthew thought that they were probably mixed patrols, composed of WCS with government guards, as only the latter have powers of arrest. When asked if the findings of the project would be made available, Matthew said that the findings were in the process of being written up. Ruth Malleson asked about the involvement of local communities; Matthew replied that the idea of community hunting zones was to enable them to get involved in long-term management, and the Sangha Trin-National Foundation, established a few years ago, was aiming to raise \$35 million for protected area management and community development programme.

Dr Eric Arnhem/Dr Nico Dauphiné, Zoological Society of London (ZSL)
Overview of ZSL's Wildlife Wood Project and report back from regional workshops on 'Wildlife management and monitoring methods in timber production forests', hosted by ZSL in Yaounde, Cameroon, March 2010, and Accra, Ghana, March 2010

Eric informed the group that as time was running short, both he and Nico would be presenting the work of ZSL's Wildlife Wood Project at the ZSL Special Wildlife Conservation Meeting that evening ('Using timber certification as a tool for wildlife management – experiences from West and Central Africa'), and urged UKBWG attendees to come along.

Discussion of issues arising from the presentation and on wildlife management in timber concessions in general

Noëlle invited comments from the attendees. Ruth Malleson asked whether hunter interviews could be used as an easier way of monitoring wildlife? Luke Parry and Noëlle replied that Janna Rist and Noëlle herself had looked at this during their respective PhDs, and Richard Bodmer *et al* had done this in Peru; Noëlle suggested that this can be very effective where there is little law enforcement effort but harder where this exists.

Regarding community management of hunting zones, Eric Arnhem mentioned the difficulty of including all members of the community as often it is only the more

important members who get involved in such initiatives – lessons can be learnt from failed community forestry initiatives where communities do not have a strong traditional management structure. Lydia Hall countered that the problem was often not due to the communities but because these initiatives often come from high-level government giving directives that don't work on the ground. Jacqui Teera suggested establishing a working group to manage community hunting and Eric said he would like to try this at local level. Marcus asked whether there wasn't a need to do this at large-scale, but Eric said there was a need to test first and then scale up. Jacqui cited an example of community-managed fisheries in Uganda to demonstrate that this can work. Christopher Stewart understood it can work, but can take a long time – for example, COB Precious Woods in Gabon have perhaps gone furthest on this, but when the company asked the local people to point out sacred trees with the intention of protecting them, because they didn't explain what this was for, the local people chopped them down before the company could get to them.

Julia Young suggested that we perhaps need to look at whose responsibility it is for sustainable forest management – companies are going under but communities and governments all believe that the other should do more. Noëlle asked if donor funds via FLEGT, REDD, etc couldn't drive improvements in governance to support company and community efforts towards sustainable forest management. Sofie thought that increased capacity was still needed. When Noëlle asked if the UK government was doing enough, Sofie replied that it was doing most of all the EU/international community – but perhaps this was still not enough. Julia noted that ultimately it comes down to changing consumer behaviour. When Noëlle asked whether this was best done by subsidies, taxation or raising awareness, both Sofie and Julia agreed raising awareness was probably most important.

As there was no other business, Noëlle thanked attendees for the lively discussions and, acknowledging the fact that funds from Defra made these meetings of the UK Bushmeat Working Group possible, she invited the group to continue discussions over some refreshments before the ZSL evening meeting on **'Using timber certification as a tool for wildlife management – experiences from West and Central Africa'** began at 6pm.

Many thanks to all who attended