Draft ID: 4908c228-c77e-48f2-922a-a8656f1a9f83

Date: 09/11/2020 10:15:02

EU Timber Regulation and FLEGT Regulation Fitness Check

mandatory.

Introduction

Description

The **EU Timber Regulation (EUTR)**, laying down the obligations of operators who place timber and timber products on the EU market, and the **Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Regulation** require that the Commission, based on Member States' reporting and experience with their application, reports on their implementation and review their functioning and effectiveness. Based on the Better Regulation Guidelines, a common fitness check will, therefore, evaluate the functioning of the two regulations and assess whether these interventions are fit for purpose, by measuring their performance with respect to their common policy objectives.

This public consultation invites citizens, businesses and other organisations to contribute to the broader fitness check evaluation of the EUTR and FLEGT Regulation. The fitness check will evaluate the functioning of the two regulations and assess whether the interventions are fit for purpose, by measuring their performance with respect to their common policy objectives.

Background

Illegal logging has a devastating impact on the world's forests, including some of the most bio-diverse and valuable ones, on indigenous people and the people who depend on them and rely on the resources that forests provide.

The EU is one of the largest consumers of timber and timber products in the world and is engaged in fighting illegal logging. EU companies and governments that buy timber and timber products risk having a significant impact on illegal logging. If they buy illegal timber, they create profitable markets for illegal loggers and undermine efforts to enforce forest law in timber-exporting countries.

In 2003 the EU published the **Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) Action Plan**, setting out a range of measures available to the EU and its Member States to tackle illegal logging in the world's forests.

The **EU Timber Regulation (EUTR)**, laying down the obligations of operators who place timber and timber products on the EU market, and the **Forest Law Enforcement**, **Governance and Trade (FLEGT)**

Regulation, setting up a licensing scheme for imports of timber into the EU, are part of the EU FLEGT Action Plan. Both instruments are designed to work in a complementary way by addressing, respectively, the supply and the demand side of timber trade.

The **EU Timber Regulation** aims at fighting illegal logging by prohibiting operators in Europe from placing illegally harvested timber and timber products on the EU market. The Regulation was adopted in 2010. In 2012, the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU No 607/2012) and the Commission Delegated Regulation (EU No 363/2012) were adopted. The EUTR came into force on 3 March 2013. From that date, EU operators who place timber and timber products on the EU market for the first time are required to exercise due diligence to ensure negligible risk of illegally harvested timber is being placed on the EU market. The legislation applies to a wide range of timber and timber products (listed in an annex of the EUTR Regulation).

The EUTR is implemented by competent authorities in each EU Member State (and, since 2015 in the <u>Euro pean Economic Area</u>) and overall co-ordination is carried out by the European Commission, with the help of the EUTR/FLEGT Expert Group. For more information on the EUTR, please visit the <u>European Commission</u> website.

Timber accompanied by a valid FLEGT license or a CITES Permit (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora) is considered to comply with the EUTR.

The **FLEGT Regulation** (Regulation (EC) No 2173/2005) adopted in 2005, sets out the establishment of a licensing scheme for imports of timber and timber products into the EU and to be implemented through Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs) with timber exporting countries. In 2008, the Implementing Regulation (Commission Regulation (EC) 1024/2008) was adopted, allowing the control of the entry of timber to the EU from countries entering into bilateral FLEGT VPAs with the EU.

Once agreed, the VPAs include commitments and action from both parties to halt trade in illegal timber and timber products, notably with a licensing scheme (FLEGT licensing scheme) at the partner country and the issuance of FLEGT licences that certify the legality of timber and timber products exported to the EU. To issue FLEGT licences, a VPA partner country must implement a timber legality assurance system (TLAS) and other measures specified in the VPA. When fully operational, a TLAS includes effective supply chain controls, mechanisms for verifying compliance and is subject to independent audits. After more than 15 years of negotiations with 15 countries, Indonesia is still the only country issuing FLEGT licences (since 15 November 2016). VPAs have been ratified with Ghana, Republic of Congo, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Liberia and Vietnam; however, none of these countries is ready to start issuing FLEGT licences. The EU has concluded negotiations and initialled the VPA with Honduras and Guyana. Negotiations are ongoing with the Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Laos, Malaysia and Thailand.

For more information on the FLEGT Regulation, please visit the European Commission website.

Overview of the survey and survey guidelines

This public consultation consists of some introductory questions related to the respondent's profile, followed by a questionnaire split into two parts.

Please note that you can choose to fill in only one part of the questionnaire. Also, not all questions need to be answered. All questions include an "I do not know/not relevant" that you can use if appropriate.

The **first part of the questionnaire** aims to gather views and information from all citizens and organisations interested in the topic of illegal logging and related EU Regulations.

The **second part of the questionnaire** is more technical and focuses on citizens and organisations with indepth knowledge about the EUTR and FLEGT Regulation.

At the end of the questionnaire, you are invited to provide any additional comments or elaborate on relevant issues that have not been addressed by the questions, as well as, to provide any general feedback that you may have on the survey itself.

You are invited to respond to the best of your abilities or knowledge of the topic. Please use open fields only if there is information to be added that is strictly relevant to the related question.

The results of the questionnaire will be published online. Please read the specific privacy statement attached to this consultation informing on how personal data and contributions will be dealt with.

In the interest of transparency, if you are replying on behalf of an organisation, please register with the register of interest representatives if you have not already done so. Registering commits you to comply with a Code of Conduct. If you do not wish to register, your organisation's contribution will be treated and published together with those received from individuals.

The survey will be available online for 15 weeks. The results will be aggregated and published on the consultation page.

Your opinion matters to us! Thank you very much for taking the time to contribute to this consultation.

About you

French

German

*Language of my contribution		
Bulgarian		
Croatian		
Czech		
Danish		
Dutch		
English		
Estonian		
Finnish		

0	Hungarian				
	Italian				
	Latvian				
	Lithuanian				
	Maltese				
	Polish				
	Portuguese				
	Romanian				
	Slovak				
	Slovenian				
	Spanish				
0	Swedish				
* l am	airina my contribu	ution oo			
	giving my contribu				
	Academic/research				
0	Dusiness association				
0	Company/business organisation				
	Consumer organi	sation			
	EU citizen				
	Environmental or	ganisation			
0	Non-EU citizen	al averagination (NCO	`		
0		al organisation (NGO)		
0	Public authority				
0	Trade union				
	Other				
*Cour	itry of origin				
Please	e add your country of origin, o		♠ 1.1.	O cial Manija	
	Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin	
	Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre	
0	Albania	Dominican	Lithuania	and Miquelon Saint Vincent	
	Albania	Republic	Littiuania	and the	
		Γισρασίιο		Grenadines	
0	Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa	
	9	_03.440.		2300	

Greek

AmericanSamoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	MarshallIslands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon
			Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar	Svalbard and
		/Burma	Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden
	Guadeloupe	Nauru	Switzerland

	Bonaire Saint			
	Eustatius and			
	Saba			
0	Bosnia and	Guam	Nepal	Syria
	Herzegovina			
0	Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands	Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
	Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand	Tanzania
	British Indian	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
	Ocean Territory			
	British Virgin	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
	Islands			
0	Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria	Heard Island	Niue	Togo
		and McDonald		
		Islands		
0	Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
	Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	Tonga
			Mariana Islands	
0	Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad and
				Tobago
0	Cameroon	Iceland	North	Tunisia
			Macedonia	
0	Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
0	Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
0	Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
				Caicos Islands
0	Central African	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
	Republic			
	Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
	Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
0	China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
			Guinea	Emirates
0	Christmas	Italy	Paraguay	United
	Island			Kingdom

Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands			Minor Outlying
			Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin
			Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna
Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda	Western
			Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	Saint	Yemen
		Barthélemy	
Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena	Zambia
		Ascension and	
		Tristan da	
		Cunha	
Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
Republic of the		Nevis	
Congo			
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	
First name			
Alexis			
Surname			
Kuhl			
_			
Email (this won't be pu	ıblished)		
alexis.kuhl@europanels.c	org		

*Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

European Panel Federation

*Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-

572064811767-22

F

Pleas	se indicate the ma	in l	ocation of your or	gar	nisation:		
If you o	do not wish to specify the mai	in loc	cation of your organisation, ple	ease	select "I prefer not to say".		
0	Afghanistan	0	Djibouti	0	Liberia	0	Saint Lucia
	Åland Islands	0	Dominica		Libya	0	Saint Martin
	Albania		Dominican		Liechtenstein		Saint Pierre
			Republic				and Miquelon
	Algeria		Ecuador		Lithuania		Saint Vincent
							and the
							Grenadines
	American		Egypt		Luxembourg		Samoa
	Samoa						
	Andorra		El Salvador		Macau		San Marino
	Angola		Equatorial		Madagascar		São Tomé and
			Guinea				Príncipe
	Anguilla		Eritrea		Malawi		Saudi Arabia
	Antarctica		Estonia		Malaysia		Senegal
	Antigua and		Eswatini		Maldives		Serbia
	Barbuda						
0	Argentina		Ethiopia		Mali		Seychelles
	Armenia		Falkland Islands		Malta		Sierra Leone
		0		0		0	

Aruba	Faroe Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Australia	Fiji	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Austria	Finland	Mauritania	Slovakia
Azerbaijan	France	Mauritius	Slovenia
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mayotte	Solomon
			Islands
Bahrain	French	Mexico	Somalia
	Polynesia		
Bangladesh	French	Micronesia	South Africa
	Southern and		
	Antarctic Lands		
Barbados	Gabon	Moldova	South Georgia
			and the South
			Sandwich Islands
Belarus	© Goorgia	Monaco	South Korea
	Georgia		South Sudan
BelgiumBelize	GermanyGhana	MongoliaMontenegro	Spain Sudain
Benin	Gibraltar	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Bermuda	Greece	Morocco	Sudan
Bhutan	Greenland	Mozambique	Suriname
Bolivia	Grenada	Myanmar	Svalbard and
Dolivia	arenada	/Burma	Jan Mayen
Bonaire Saint	Guadeloupe	Namibia	Sweden
Eustatius and	Gaaasisaps	ramora	omodon.
Saba			
Bosnia and	Guam	Nauru	Switzerland
Herzegovina			
Botswana	Guatemala	Nepal	Syria
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	Netherlands	Taiwan
Brazil	Guinea	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
British Indian	© Guinea-Bissau	New Zealand	Tanzania
Ocean Territory			
	Guyana	Nicaragua	Thailand

	British Virgin Islands						
0	Brunei	0	Haiti	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
0	Bulgaria	0	Heard Island and McDonald	0	Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
			Islands				
0	Burkina Faso	0	Honduras	0	Niue	0	Togo
0	Burundi	0	Hong Kong	0	Norfolk Island	0	Tokelau
0	Cambodia	0	Hungary	0	Northern	0	Tonga
					Mariana Islands		
0	Cameroon		Iceland		North Korea		Trinidad and
							Tobago
	Canada		India		North		Tunisia
					Macedonia		
	Cape Verde		Indonesia		Norway		Turkey
	Cayman Islands		I prefer not to		Oman		Turkmenistan
			say				
0	Central African	0	Iran	0	Pakistan		Turks and
	Republic						Caicos Islands
	Chad	0	Iraq	0	Palau		Tuvalu
	Chile		Ireland		Palestine		Uganda
	China		Isle of Man		Panama		Ukraine
	Christmas		Israel		Papua New		United Arab
	Island				Guinea		Emirates
	Clipperton		Italy		Paraguay		United
							Kingdom
	Cocos (Keeling)		Jamaica		Peru		United States
	Islands						
	Colombia		Japan		Philippines		United States
							Minor Outlying
							Islands
0	Comoros	0	Jersey	0	Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Congo		Jordan		Poland		US Virgin
							Islands
0	Cook Islands		Kazakhstan		Portugal	0	Uzbekistan

Costa Rica	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Côte d'Ivoire	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Croatia	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Cuba	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Curação	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna
Cyprus	Laos	Rwanda	Western
			Sahara
Czechia	Latvia	Saint	Yemen
		Barthélemy	
Democratic	Lebanon	Saint Helena	Zambia
Republic of the		Ascension and	
Congo		Tristan da	
		Cunha	
Denmark	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
		Nevis	

Please indicate the secondary location(s) of your organisation, if applicable:

If you do not wish to specify the secondary location(s) of your organisation, please select "I prefer not to say".

Afghanistan	Djibouti	Libya	Saint Martin
Åland Islands	Dominica	Liechtenstein	Saint Pierre and
			Miquelon
Albania	Dominican	Lithuania	Saint Vincent
	Republic		and the
			Grenadines
Algeria	Ecuador	Luxembourg	Samoa
American Samoa	Egypt	Macau	San Marino
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and
			Príncipe
Angola	Equatorial Guinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Barbuda			
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore

Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern	Moldova	South Georgia
	and Antarctic		and the South
	Lands		Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar/Burma	Svalbard and
			Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden
Bonaire Saint	Guadeloupe	Nauru	Switzerland
Eustatius and			
Saba			
Bosnia and	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Herzegovina	Overte media	Ni atla aula o ala	Tairre
Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands	Taiwan
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand	Tanzania
British Indian	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
Ocean Territory	Guyana	Nigor	The Gambia
British Virgin Islands	Guyana	Niger	THE Gambia
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island and	Niue	Togo
Daigana	McDonald Islands	. 1100	1090
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	North Korea	Tonga
_ 	9		

Cambodia	Hungary	North Macedonia	Trinidad and Tobago
Cameroon	Iceland	Northern Mariana Islands	Tunisia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
			Caicos Islands
Central African Republic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New	United Arab
		Guinea	Emirates
Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	United Kingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands			Minor Outlying
			Islands
Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna
Curaçao	Laos	Rwanda	Western Sahara
Cyprus	Latvia	Saint Barthélemy	Yemen
Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena	Zambia
		Ascension and	
		Tristan da Cunha	
	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and	Zimbabwe
		Nevis	

_	Democratic			
_	Republic of the			
	Congo			
	Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	I prefer not to say
ls yc	our organisation ac	tive in a timbe	er or timber products rela	ated sector?
•	Yes			
0	No			
If so	, please specify yo	our area of inte	erest/activity:	
You	can select more than one area			
	,	ompanies, log	ging operators, forest s	ervices)
	Forest owners			
V	Wood-processing other roundwood		vmill industry, wood-bas dustries, etc.)	ed panel industry,
V	Wood manufactu	ring industry (wood construction indus	stry, furniture industry,
	wood-other wood	l manufacturin	g industry, etc.)	
V	'Operator' as defi	ned by the EL	JTR (i.e. placing timber	and timber products
	on the EU marke	t for the first ti	me)	
V	'Trader' as define	ed by the EUTI	R	
√	Import and Trade	(wood, solid l	oiofuel, etc.)	
	Retail			
	Transportation ar	nd Logistics (e	.g. transporter/handler	of internationally
	traded goods)			
	Pulp and paper in	ndustry		
	Other wood-base	d industry (e.ç	g. wood energy use)	
	Non-timber forest	t products (NT	FPs) and services	
	Environmental No	GOs		
	Consumers' asso	ciations		
	Ecotourism opera	ators		
	Forest- or wood-r	elated instituti	ons in the EU or EFTA	(e.g. government
	agencies, regiona		,	
			ons in the VPA partner	Countries
		_	l or local institutions)	
			ons in other third (non \	/PA) countries
	(government age	ncies, regiona	l or local institutions)	

Competent Authorities designated by EUTR Member States (EUTR and
FLEGT Regulation)
Monitoring organisation (EUTR)
EU Customs
Concession holders (mining, agriculture, hydropower, etc.)
Research and Educational Institutions
Other (please specify)

If you are [an operator as defined by the EUTR] / [if you are responsible for placing timber and timber products on the EU market for the first time], when did you implement a due diligence system?

- Before 3 March 2013
- After 3 March 2013
- I do not know
- Due diligence system has not been implemented

What is the (average) number of suppliers of timber or timber products you rely on?

- More than 50
- ⁰ 11-50
- ⁰ 1-20
- I do not know

Indicate the country of harvest of your timber and timber products supply:

Respond only to those countries that apply.

	1-20% of supply	21-40% of supply	41-60% of supply	61-80% of supply	81-100% of supply	Not my supply source	l do not know
EU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
China	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United States of America	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ukraine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Serbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belarus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Canada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uruguay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cameroon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central African Republic	•	0	©	0	0	0	0
Ghana	©	0	0	0	0	©	0
Liberia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Republic of the Congo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guyana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Côte d'Ivoire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gabon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laos	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thailand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malaysia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Myanmar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
United Kingdom	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other (please specify)	0	0	•	0	•	•	0

How do you rate your level of knowledge of the following?

	Excellent knowledge/ understanding	Good knowledge/ understanding	Some knowledge/ understanding	Little knowledge/ understanding	None
Illegal logging and associated trade	0	•	•	•	0
EUTR	0	•	0	0	0
FLEGT Regulation	0	•	0	0	0

*Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Part I: General public questionnaire

This section of the questionnaire is for all respondents who would like to express their opinion in regard to the EUTR and FLEGT Regulations. This section is intended for response by anyone, covering both those who are and are not actively involved in the implementation of these Regulations.

1. Illegal logging and related trade is the harvesting, processing, transporting, buying or selling of timber in contravention of national and international laws. To what extent, in your opinion, have the implementation of the EUTR and FLEGT Regulation contributed to reducing illegal logging and associated trade? Please provide an assessment of their performance both separately and working in combination.

	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Negative impact	I do not know
EUTR	0	0	•	0	0	0	0
FLEGT Regulation	0	0	•	0	0	0	0
EUTR and FLEGT combined	0	0	•	0	0	0	0

2. To what degree do you agre	e that illegal logging continues to be a problem
requiring EU action?	
Strongly agree	
Somewhat agree	

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

I do not know

3. In your opinion, to what extent has the implementation of the regulations (both separately and in combination) contributed to minimising the risk of illegally harvested timber and timber products being placed on the EU market?

	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	I do not know
EUTR	0	0	•	0	0	0
FLEGT Regulation	0	0	•	0	0	0
EUTR and FLEGT Regulation combined	0	0	•	0	0	0

4. In your opinion, to what extent have the EUTR and the FLEGT Regulation contributed to improvements in the following areas?

	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	l do not know
Traceability of timber and timber products	0	•	0	0	0	0
Co-operation and information exchange between the Member States and the European Commission around the legality of timber and timber products	•	•	•	•	•	•
Consumer confidence in the EU timber market	0	0	0	0	•	0
Governance and enforcement of forest law in countries exporting to the EU	0	0	•	0	0	0

Cooperation with civil society				
and the private sector in		_		
countries exporting to the EU				

5. In your opinion, to what extent have the below listed issues been a challenge for the implementation and enforcement of the EUTR?

	Very significant	Significant	Moderate	Slight	Not at all	I do not know
Incomplete scope of timber products covered	•	0	0	0	0	0
Unclear or incomplete definitions (e. g. lack of a definition for 'recycled' inputs to products, use of the term 'timber' instead of 'wood')	0	0	0	0	•	0
Difficulties in identifying, checking compliance and undertaking enforcement actions on operators based outside the EU	•	0	0	0	0	0
Ineffective implementation and enforcement by Member States	•	0	0	0	0	0
Insufficiently dissuasive enforcement measures (e.g. level of fines, penalties, ability to seize goods etc), as set in national legislation	0	•	0	0	0	•
Elements of the Regulations have not been appropriately transposed into Member States' national legislation	0	0	0	0	0	•
Lack of resources at the Competent Authorities to undertake compliance checks and/or follow- up on enforcement actions	0	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of knowledge and sufficient skills among the relevant authorities to undertake compliance checks and/or follow-up on enforcement actions	0	•	•	0	0	0
Lack of checks on traders	0	0	0	•	0	0
Changes in operator identity (change in company name, owner and/or creation of a new company to evade enforcement actions)	0	0	0	0	0	•

Difficulties in achieving successful prosecutions where enforcement actions have not been complied with (low number of successful court cases; inoperability of the due diligence concept in national legal systems)	•	©	©	©	0	•
Low awareness of EUTR due diligence requirements among operators	•	0	0	0	0	0
Due diligence requirements on operators are unclear or ambiguous	•	0	0	0	0	0
Information and documents necessary to fulfil due diligence requirements are difficult, expensive or not possible to collect (e.g. to identify species or region of origin)	©	•	0	0	0	0
Where information is available, it is of varying quality and open to the influence of corruption. Verification of the validity of information is difficult	©	•	•	0	0	©
The consequence and what action to take in the case of non-negligible risk is unclear	0	•	0	0	0	0
No willingness by operators to change from risk suppliers and high-risk countries.	0	0	•	0	0	0
Actions to mitigate non-negligible risk are prohibitively expensive	0	0	•	0	0	0
Lack of coordination or sharing of information between entities in different EU Member States' national governments	0	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of coordination or sharing of information between authorities, customs, police, etc within Member States	0	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of information for competent authorities on traders and operators acting within their Member State	0	•	0	0	0	0

Lack of consistency between Member States in terms of severity of enforcement measures (e.g. levels of fines, etc)	•	•	0	0	0	0
Monitoring organisations are not operating as intended	0	•	0	0	0	0
Lack of clarity on which Member State is responsible for checks and enforcement in case of indirect trade routes (where trade destined for one Member State enters the EU via another Member State)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Making the role and obligations of traders and transporters more explicit (e.g. existing wording not strong enough to address known issues like operators continuing to trade in non-negligible risk timber by becoming a trader rather than an operator)	©	•	•	•	•	•
The role of certification schemes and third-party verification in contributing to Due Diligence Systems	•	0	0	0	0	0
Other (please specify)	•	0	0	0	0	©

If other, please specify

300 character(s) maximum

There is a distinction to be made between companies that import large volumes who usually have a better DDS in place and smaller companies that often don't have the resources to set up and maintain a good DDS. However, the smaller the volumes the less likely they are to be controlled.

6. In your opinion, to what extent have the below listed issues been a positive consequence of the EUTR?

	Very significant	Significant	Moderate	Slight	Not at all	l do not know
Increased awareness of the problem of illegal logging	0	•	0	0	0	0
Other main consumer countries followed the EU example	0	0	0	•	0	0
Increased investment in clean and transparent supply chains	0	•	0	0	0	0

Producing countries increased reforms to achieve higher levels of transparency	0	•	©	0	0	0
Tackling illegal logging within the EU was strengthened	0	0	•	0	0	0

7. In your opinion, to what extent have the below listed issues been a challenge for the implementation and enforcement of the FLEGT Regulation?

	Very significant	Significant	Moderate	Slight	Not at all	l do not know
Main EU trade partners not covered by Voluntary Partnership Agreements (VPAs)	•	0	0	0	0	0
Only one VPA country with a functioning system after more than 15 years of negotiation	•	0	0	0	0	0
Time and cost required to negotiate VPAs	•	0	0	0	0	0
Time and cost required to establish and implement the FLEGT Regulation within the EU, considering the proportion of imported timber covered by the licencing scheme	©	©	•	•	0	•
Demand-led approach to negotiating VPAs	0	0	0	0	0	•
VPA Timber Legality Assurance Systems (TLASs) are too complex for producing countries with weak institutions	0	•	0	0	0	0
VPA TLASs contribute to EUTR compliance only once FLEGT licencing starts (before that, the EUTR compliance of VPA countries is not different from other countries of the same risk category)	•	©	0	©	0	0
Ineffective implementation and / or enforcement of FLEGT procedures in VPA partner countries	0	0	©	0	0	•
Level of corruption in VPA countries	0	•	0	0	0	0

Lack of co-operation between FLEGT Regulation competent authorities and customs	0	•	0	0	0	0
Ineffective procedures in partner countries to challenge problematic licencing cases	•	•	0	0	0	•
Different interpretation of HS codes between EU and partner countries	•	0	0	0	0	©
Lack of use of the FLEGIT /TRACES system	0	0	•	0	0	©
Lack of coherence between obligations under the FLEGT Regulation and the EUTR	•	•	0	0	•	•
Lack of complete, correct, timely reporting on the FLEGT Regulation implementation by EU Member States	0	•	0	0	•	0
Other (please specify)	•	0	0	0	0	0

If other, please specify

300 character(s) maximum

There is a need to enhance promotion of FLEGT by the Commission and national authorities.

8. In your opinion, to what extent have the below listed issues been a positive consequence of the FLEGT Regulation?

	Very significant	Significant		Slight	Not at all	I do not know
Increased awareness of the problem of illegal logging	0	•	0	0	0	0
Producing countries increased reforms to achieve higher levels of transparency	©	•	0	0	0	0
Other main consumer countries followed the EU example	0	0	0	•	0	0
Considerable proportion of EU timber and timber product imports is covered by FLEGT licences	0	0	•	0	0	0
Increased investment in clean supply chains	0	•	0	0	0	0

Stakeholders participation in			
reforms and decision-making			0
processes in producing country			
increased			

9. To what extent do you agree that the costs of implementation of the FLEGT Regulation and the EUTR vary for businesses and authorities across the Member States?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	l do not know
EUTR - businesses	•	0	0	0	0	0
EUTR - authorities	0	•	0	0	0	0
FLEGT Regulation - businesses	0	0	•	0	0	0
FLEGT Regulation - authorities	0	0	•	0	0	0

10. To what extent do you agree that the costs of implementation of the FLEGT Regulation and the EUTR are high for businesses and authorities in third countries?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	l do not know
EUTR - businesses	•	0	0	0	0	0
EUTR - authorities	0	0	0	•	0	0
FLEGT Regulation - businesses	0	0	0	0	0	•
FLEGT Regulation - authorities	0	0	0	0	0	•

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	l do not know
FLEGT licences reduce the costs associated with due diligence requirements under the EUTR for EU operators	•	0	•	•	•	0
FLEGT licences increase the costs to comply with a functioning Timber Legality Assurance System	0	0	0	0	0	•

(TLAS) for exporters from VPA licencing countries						
For the time being, FLEGT licences cover EU imports from only one VPA country. This does not reduce the costs associated with due diligence requirements under the EUTR for EU operators as regards imports of timber and timber products from all other countries	•	•	•	•	©	•

12. To what extent do you consider that the implementation of these regulations impose a different level of administrative burden on different types of businesses? Please rank the administrative burden imposed on different business types.

According to CEPS (2013), 'administrative burdens' are those costs borne by businesses, citizens, civil society organizations and public authorities as a result of administrative activities performed to comply with information obligations included in legal rules. More specifically, administrative burdens are the part of administrative costs which is caused by regulatory requirements: accordingly, they do not include so-called "BAU costs", i.e. costs that would emerge also in absence of regulation.

	High level of burden due to EUTR	Low level of burden due to EUTR	High level of burden due to FLEGT Regulation	Low level of burden due to FLEGT Regulation
EU micro businesses	V			V
EU small businesses	V			V
EU medium businesses	V			V
EU large businesses	V			V
Non-EU businesses	V			

13. In your opinion, to what extent has the EUTR impacted the administrative burden?

	Did not change (0- 5%)	Increased by >50%	Increase by 25- 50%	Increased by 10- 25%	Increased by 5- 10%	Reduced	l do not know
EU micro businesses	©	•	0	0	©	0	0
EU small businesses	0	•	0	0	0	0	0
EU medium businesses	0	•	0	0	0	0	0
EU large businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-EU businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

14. In your opinion, to what extent has the FLEGT Regulation impacted the administrative burden?

	Did not change (0- 5%)	Increased by >50%	Increase by 25- 50%	Increased by 10- 25%	Increased by 5- 10%	Reduced	l do not know
EU micro businesses	0	0	0	0	•	0	0
EU small businesses	0	0	0	0	•	0	0
EU medium businesses	0	0	0	0	•	0	0
EU large businesses	0	0	0	0	•	0	0
Non-EU micro businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Non-EU small businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Non-EU medium businesses	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
Non-EU large businesses	0	©	0	0	0	0	(0)

15. Are there any elements of the Regulations that create an unnecessary
administrative burden? What changes could be made to reduce this burden without
compromising the achievement of the objectives of the Regulations?

350 character(s) maximum	
ood dharadich (5) maximum	

EDET "		1161			
EPF believes	that 3rd part	y certification :	systems sno	ould be favored.	

16. In your opinion, to what extent are the EUTR and the FLEGT Regulation coherent with other EU policy in the following areas?

	No coherence	Low	Moderate coherence	High coherence	I do not know
European Green Deal Objectives	0	0	0	•	0
Biodiversity policy	0	0	0	•	0
Forestry policy	0	0	0	•	0
Agriculture policy	0	0	0	0	•
Circular economy policy	0	0	0	•	0
Climate change policy	0	0	0	•	0
Trade policy	0	0	0	•	0
Wildlife trade policy	0	0	0	•	0
Environmental crime	0	0	0	•	0
Energy policy	0	0	•	0	0
Investment policy (particularly the EU Taxonomy for Green Investments)	0	0	0	0	•
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0

17. In your opinion, to what extent are the EUTR and the FLEGT Regulation coherent with international laws and policy objectives?

	No coherence	Low	Moderate coherence	High coherence	I do not know
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	0	0	0	•	0
International standardisation	0	0	0	0	•
Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)	0	0	0	0	•

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	0	0	0	0	•
UNFCCC REDD+ (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation)	0	0	0	•	0
World Trade Organisation	0	•	0	0	0
Potential progress towards a non- legally binding instrument on forests via the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF).	0	0	•	0	•
Developments relating to the post- 2020 global biodiversity framework	0	0	•	0	0
World monitoring for SDGs	0	0	0	•	0
Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0

18. To what extent do you agree that action to tackle illegal logging and reduce the presence of illegal timber in the EU needs to be taken at EU level (i.e. the issue cannot sufficiently be solved by action at individual Member State level)?

0	I strong	ylg	agr	ee

- I somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- I somewhat disagree
- I strongly disagree
- I do not know

19. To what extent do you agree that a FLEGT license:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	I do not know
Is easier to obtain compared to private sector certification and verification (such as FSC, PEFC, etc.)?	0	•	•	•	•	0
Is less costly to obtain compared to private sector certification and verification?	0	•	0	0	0	0

Is more credible in ensuring timber legality compared to private sector certification and verification?	©	0	•	©	©	0
Results in more positive consumer perception than private sector certification and verification?	•	0	0	•	•	0

20	. Do you	wish to	complete	Part II o	f the q	uestionna	aire with	more t	technical
qu	estions?								

Yes

No

Part III: Final questions (for both EUTR and FLEGT Regulation)

58. If you wish to expand on any of your answers or if you wish to add comments or information on anything else, which is relevant to the Fitness Check please do so in the box below.

550 character(s) maximum						

59. If there are materials/publications available online that should be considered in relation to this evaluation exercise please feel free to describe them (title and author) in the box below and include any relevant links.

5	550 character(s) maximum						

60. If you wish to attach a file with relevant evidence, a position paper or other material to your submission, please upload your file here.

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

Contact Form