

II.III. Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) countries

Fields marked with * need to be filled in before the form can be submitted to the next level.

II. Verification of compliance - context and implementation

II.III. FLEGT VPA countries – FLEGT VPAs contribution to the objectives of the EUTR (ref. EUTR Article 3 and 20(2))

This chapter gathers information on whether the FLEGT VPA processes leading to the conclusion and operation of VPAs are having beneficial effects on EUTR implementation and enforcement, e.g. because access to information on the applicable legislation, its implementation and enforcement, and on supply chains in these countries becomes more transparent in the course of negotiations and implementation of the Legality Definitions and Timber Legality Assurance Systems of the VPAs. This would be reflected in a reduced complexity of checks. Another important aspect is whether there is evidence that illegal trade from these countries is reducing, indicated by a reduction of the perceived risk of illegally harvested timber and derived products originating in these countries over time. Relevant information is also gathered in other sections of the national report and will be taken into consideration during analysis.

1 What **level of risk** does the Competent Authority assign to each of these VPA countries in their risk based planning?

| | high risk | medium risk | low risk | risk not assessed | no imports |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| * Cameroon | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Central African Republic | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Gabon | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Ghana | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Guyana | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Honduras | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Indonesia (non-FLEGT HS codes only) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| * Laos | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Liberia | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Malaysia | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| * Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| * Thailand | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| * Vietnam | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|

2 Please assess the **complexity of checks** relating to imports from below VPA countries. To do so, **compare** the average time spent on checks of these countries to the average time spent on checks relating to non-VPA countries which are considered to be of the same risk level and estimate the related **workload**:

| | More time required | Similar time required | Less time required | Unknown (please explain in comment box) |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| * Indonesia (non-FLEGT HS codes only) | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| * Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| * Thailand | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| * Vietnam | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3 Comments:

| |
|---|
| <p>Comments for Question 1: For all the countries for which 'high risk' was selected, in the CA's view the risk actually depends on the product, species, region of harvest and some other factors. Therefore, the risk can easily turn to 'medium risk'. So far, in the risk-based analyses for choosing operators for checks and during checks almost exclusively only cheap products and low-risk species are observed.</p> |
|---|

Contact

ENV-DECLARE@ec.europa.eu