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REFORD assembly meeting
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Zabljak - Montenegro
July 02-05, 2016
Agenda MNE Event:

02 July 2016 Saturday
16.00-18.00 Arrival of participants
19.00 – 20.00 Coordination meeting of REFORD
20.00 – Diner

03 July 2016 Sunday
07.30 – 08.30 Breakfast
08.30 – 10.30 REFORD Assembly meeting (all REFORD members)
10.30 – 11.00 Coffee break
11.00 – 12.30 Conclusions & closing of REFORD Assembly meeting
12.30 – 13.30 Lunch
13.30 – 15.30 Workshop and presentations on Rural Development programmes and developments in respective countries (ALL REFORD members)
15.30 – 16.00 Coffee break
16.00 – 17.00 Presentations on Planning processes in forestry, including private forestry (MK, AL, KS, MNE)
17.00 – 20.00 Recreational visit of Black lake in Zabljak
20.00 – Diner (somewhere outside)

04 July 2016 Monday
07.30 – 08.30 Breakfast
08.30 – 10.30 Workshop on NTFP’s and sharing experiences on producer groups
10.30 – 11.30 Coffee break & preparation for field visit
11.30 – 18.00 Field visit & lunch on field, including presentation of local products and visit place in the field where some NTFP’s are collected/processed.
20.00 – Diner

05 July 2016 Tuesday
07.30 - 08.30 Breakfast
08.30 – Departure of participants
Participants

1. Vojo Sokolovski, NAPFO Macedonia
2. Borce Bojcovski, NAPFO Macedonia
3. Viktorija Neshovska, ZEGIN Macedonia
4. Peter Kampen, CNVP Foundation
5. Natasha Dokovska, CNVP Foundation
6. Ross Bull, CNVP Foundation
7. Voislav Todorov, CNVP Macedonia
8. Blerina Hoxha, NAPFO Kosovo
9. Agron Nikqi, NAPFO Kosovo
10. Ardita Dinaj, CNVP Kosovo
11. Fitore Avdijaj, “Agroproduct” Kosovo
12. Mensura Nuhodzic, CNVP Montenegro
13. Marko Hajdukovic, NAPFO Montenegro
14. Dejan Zejak, NAPFO Montenegro
15. Kenan Pepić, NAPFO Montenegro
16. Božidar Šutović, NAPFO Montenegro
17. Arjol Lila, NAPFO Albania
18. Xhelal Shuti, NAPFO Albania
19. Sheza Tomcini, CNVP Albania
20. Iztok Vrščaj, NAPFO Slovenia
21. Rajko Stefanić, NAPFO Slovenia
22. Miljenko Županić, NAPFO Croatia
23. Tomislav Nikolić, NAPFO Croatia
24. Stanojka Joksimovic, Non timber forest producer Montenegro
25. Dušan Joksimović, Non timber forest producer Montenegro
1. **Introduction**

As part of the FLED and SSPDF projects and the regional activities, CNVP has organised a regional workshop with participation of REFORM and its members. Host was NAPFO Montenegro in cooperation with CNVP and REFORM. This workshop took place in Zabljak, Montenegro from 2-5 July 2016. The programme focused on rural development aspects:

i) Rural development programs

ii) Producer groups and Non-timber forest products (NTFP’s)

iii) Planning in forestry and planning in private/communal forests

The event included the official REFORM General Assembly meeting, presentation of rural development programmes/developments and presentation of planning process in forestry and field visit to local company in order to see and discuss about Producer groups and NTFP’s as possibility for development in rural areas.

In order to better understanding of the situation in individual countries and the exchange knowledge and experiences as well as to define the final conclusions, representatives from Family Forests (Communal and Private Forest Owners) Associations from Kosovo, Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Croatia, Slovenia and CNVP representatives from Macedonia, Kosovo, Albania and Montenegro, took active participation throughout the event.

2. **REFORM Assembly meeting**

The six General Assembly meeting (GA) of the Regional Centre for Forestry and Rural Development (REFORM) was organised in Zabljak, Montenegro on the 3rd of July 2016, at Hotel Ski in Zabljak, Montenegro. The REFORM Assembly meeting took place within the broader programme of the regional event and study tour organised by CNVP Foundation in frame of SSPDF and FLED projects. Majority of REFORM members were present during the Assembly meeting except for the representatives from R.Srpska (BiH) and Bulgaria. Their absence was announced prior the event and it was from objective reasons.
The purpose of the meeting was to review the developments in REFORM and to discuss the challenges in Communal/Private Forestry in the Balkan Region. The objective of the meeting was to improve the organizational functioning of REFORM as network organisation to be an efficient service to its members.

During the assembly meeting presentations on activities in the past period and financial report of REFORM were presented by Mr. Miljenko Zupancic, acting as President of REFORM. The first point of discussion was acceptance of new members in REFORM. New applications (two from Montenegro and one from Slovenia) were presented and discussed by the delegates. After the discussion the voting for acceptance of new members started, and one association from Montenegro (Union of Private forest owners associations of Montenegro) and the one from Slovenia (Union of forest owners Slovenia) were accepted as equal members in REFORM.

The second part of the assembly meeting was on internal issues of REFORM, discussing on the statute and different internal procedures. Also changing the REFORM main registration was discussed, and it was agreed that REFORM registration will be changed from Macedonia to Albania. Association from Albania is responsible to start and guide the process of transfer of the registration. The purpose for this change was due to the announcement of CNVP Foundation that is no longer possible to run the REFORM Secretariat, and REFORM is obliged to find proper replacement. In the discussions before and based on the earlier submitted proposal by NAPFO Albania it was decided that Association from Albania has the capacity to perform this role in the future. On the meeting also changes in the statute were discussed, but it was decided to be left for the period when transition of the registration will be done.

One of the point on the meeting was also election of new Management Board (MB) members. Each organisation delegated one person to take part in the MB of REFORM. On the meeting 6 new board members were elected, missing the two from Bulgaria and R.Srpska, which will be elected on the next meeting when the associations will officially submit their MB member proposals. President of REFORM also presented future and planned activities of the organisation, as well as the new project opportunities where REFORM will be engaged.

For more information see report and minutes from REFORM Assembly meeting in Annex 1.
3. **Rural development programs and developments in the region**

In the frame of FLED and SSPDF projects, associations as members of REFOED needed to investigate and present the current situation with the Rural development programmes, inclusion of forestry measures in the program and new developments in the respective countries. On the second day of the event, presentations from the representatives of Associations were conducted, presenting the RD programmes/measures and processes.

From the presentations it was evident that situation in the region differs by countries. Starting from Slovenia and Croatia as members of EU, where RD programmes are in full implementation, also with substantially incorporated forestry measures. In Montenegro, the EU Rural development program (2014-2020) had been adopted and is going to be implemented from 2017 onwards, but unfortunately it does not contain any of the key forestry measures. In Albania and Kosovo the Rural development programmes are still in development or have been developed, but actual operational programmes were not published yet, and due to this fact the funds are not available for private/communal forest owners/users. The situation in Macedonia is somewhere in between the RD program is existing, as well as measures for forestry, the operational program has been published and available for applications in 2015, but the process was too difficult to cope with by the forest owners, so due to this a low number of applications have been submitted.
The general conclusions were that in all the countries there are opportunities and challenges to be addressed, and that sharing on joint events of different practices and experiences is of great value for all participants. Joint lobbying and advocacy measures were also identified and once more confirmed as useful tool, for imposing solutions in front of national governments.

More in details about the presentations and content can be found in Annex 3.

4. Planning processes in Forestry, including private/communal forestry

In the frame of FLED and SSPDF projects, the associations needed to investigate and present also the current forest management planning situation and developments in their countries. On the second day of the event, presentations by representatives of associations from Albania, Macedonia, Kosovo and Montenegro were conducted.

From the presentations it was evident again that the situation differs by country to country. In Macedonia, the forest management plans (above 30 hectares) or programmes (above 10 – 30 hectares) for private forest holdings are obligatory and shall be assured by respective forest owners and approved by responsible minister. In Montenegro, the forest management plans for private forest holdings shall be made (for holdings larger than 5 hectares) and assured by the Forest Administration, if required so by the forest owners or their associations, and are thus not obligatory any more. The system is however
new and there is no any experiences in elaboration of such plans. In Albania, only the annual operational forest management plan for communal forest (of larger areas, averagely 3000 hectares), which shall be approved by the respective commune/municipality council, exist. There is no any plan foreseen for private forest holdings. In Kosovo the forest planning is done by the state, recent developments and project activities are testing modality of joint forest planning between local communities/municipalities and the state forestry agency.

The general conclusions were that there are specific challenges (e.g. in terms of preparation of the plans, participation of forest owners, needs, usefulness and implementation of the plans) to be addressed, and that sharing on joint events of the experiences is of great value for all participants. It has been concluded, among others, that development of certain pilot forest management plans for private and communal forest holdings under the FLED / SSPDF projects would be very useful for all countries.

More in details about the presentations and conclusions made can be found in Annex 2 & Annex 4.

5. Study tour on Producer groups and NTFP’s

On the second day also presentation was conducted by CNVP Albania about the experiences of Albania with producer groups, their way of organisation/ institutionalisation, support and capacity development.

The experiences shared from Albania were a valuable input for discussion on the developments in the other countries in the region concerning producer groups and their formal and non-formal organisations.

It was emphasized that in Slovenia and Croatia, although both EU members, do not have a well-governed system in terms of public use of NTFPs. It was stressed that the rights of the owners must be in the first place and that is for their full implementation should constantly strive. In other countries, this segment is also fairly undeveloped and producers are largely unorganized as formal associations, except some positive examples in Albania and Kosovo.

The possibility that the forest associations would, among other activities, include greater cooperation with producers of NTFPs has also been considered, including also more activities on joint promotion and sale of wood products and NTFPs. The possibility that REFORD as a regional organization could create the opportunity for economic sustainability through such activities, has also been discussed. A very good example exist in Slovenia where one of the associations (actually cooperatives) is steadily organizing the selling of most valuable wood assortments through auctions with international participation.

Overall it was concluded that in all the countries in the region, this sector is not well regulated and that there is much room for lobbying and changes in order to protect the rights of owners primarily in the terms of public use of all types of NTFPs.

On the same topic the third day, a study tour was organized in Mojkovac in factory “Flores”. The production facility is producing different sorts of tea and essential oils from medicinal and aromatic herbs mainly comes from Durmitor-Sinjajevina region. The factory „Flores” was established in 1992 as a core business of the production of teas and essential oils. All raw materials for production comes from country, mainly the northern part of Montenegro. Medicinal plants for their needs collecting local beggars, where they during the season must be engaged at least 200. The products are mainly sold on
the domestic market, but also exported to countries in the region such as Serbia, Bosnia, Macedonia and some EU countries as Slovenia and mainly Belgium for essential oil. They collects around 45 kinds of different medicinal herbs, among which the most; bay leaves, sage, bearberry, thyme and so on.

After the visit of tea factory “Flores” in Mojkovac the group continued traveling through Tara canyon to the National Park (NP) “Biogradska gora”. The protection of NP “Biogradska gora” dates back to 1878. The most significant natural value of this national park is the virgin forest “Biogradska Gora”, which occupies an area of 1600 hectares and is a strictly protected nature reserve.

The entire area of northern Montenegro, including three national parks Durmitor, Biogradska Gora and Prokletije are an area with significant forest resources and the reserves of all types of NTFPs. Within the National Park participants from different countries (MK, AL, KS & MNE) presented their local products, mainly harvested and produced from the forests in the respective countries. Different NTFP producers presented different products, starting from different herbal tea, forest fruits, berries, mushrooms, honey and different medical products derived from forests and nature. It could be noted that in addition to raw products derived from nature such as forest fruits and medicinal herbs, a significant number of producers creates added value to the individual products by making various medicinal products, cosmetics and so on. However it can be also concluded that this are still small producers with limited production.

In Montenegro and other countries in general, NTFP producers mainly work independently in the entire chain of production (collection, processing) and sales and promotion.

More in details about the presentations and content can be found in Annex 5.
Pictures: factory “Flores”, stands of producers from Biogradska Gora, lunch and discussions
6. Annexes

Annex 1: Report from RE福RD Assembly meeting

GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING OF RE福RD
3rd July 2016, Zabljak, Montenegro

MINUTES OF THE ASSEMBLY MEETING

Miljenko: Welcoming speech and presentation briefly of the agenda.

Official opening of the assembly meeting.

A special thanks to the present delegate by the President of RE福RD, and highlighting the importance of acknowledging the present delegates from each country member of RE福RD, since new participants are attending the meeting.

- Presentation of all participants.
  1. Vojo Sokolovski, NAPFO Macedonia
  2. Borce Bojcovski, NAPFO Macedonia
  3. Blerina Hoxha, NAPFO Kosovo
  4. Agron Nikqi, NAPFO Kosovo
  5. Marko Hajdukovic, NAPFO Montenegro
  6. Dejan Zejak, NAPFO Montenegro
  7. Kenan Pepić, NAPFO Montenegro
  8. Božidar Šutović, NAPFO Montenegro
  9. Arjol Lila, NAPFO Albania
  10. Xhelal Shuti, NAPFO Albania
  11. Iztok Vrščaj, NAPFO Slovenia
  12. Rajko Stefanić, NAPFO Slovenia
  13. Miljenko Županić, NAPFO Croatia
  14. Tomislav Nikolić, NAPFO Croatia

Majority of RE福RD members were present during the Assembly meeting except for the representatives from R.Srpska (BiH) and Bulgaria. Their absence was announced prior the event and it was from objective reasons.

Miljenko – From the number of participants can be concluded that there are over 50% of delegates from RE福RD member countries and the quorum is reached.

Presentation of the agenda and Miljenko proposes that after election of the board members to be elected even the supervisory committee. It is stated in the statute and it has never been elected the committee and for this reason, it is reasonable to be elected the supervisory committee members. Even if
it is not elected today, it should be elected in the other meetings. He added also the finance report for activities for the period since he was elected as president of REFORD 2015-2016.

Rajko Stefanic – Proposal for the agenda, since we participate for the first time in this meeting, I see it reasonable that the agenda to have even a questionnaire which gives information to the owners.

Miljenko – Slovenia and Croatia have prepared a questionnaire in cooperation with CEPF and we would like that even the other members of REFORD who are not part of the EU to fill in this questionnaire, but its importance will be clarified later on.

VOTING
Approval of the agenda by participants.

POINT I – ACCEPTANCE OF NEW MEMBERS
Miljenko – I want to inform you that I have received three requests for membership from Montenegro (Marko Hajdukovic and Bato Bakic) and Slovenia (Rajko Stefanic). According the statute, it is allowed that as member of REFORD can be more than one association per country. These three associations that have submitted their request meet the criteria for acceptance.

Dejan Zejac (MNE) – Discussion about internal problems and proposing that the request submitted by other associations from Montenegro represented by Bato Bakic to not be approved by the assembly.

Miljenko – We see that the situation in Montenegro is complicated, but I am based on the statute. Regrettfully Mr. Bakic is not here to express his opinions. We will vote for each association requested to be member of REFORD.

Arjol – Since there are some uncertainties related to situation in Montenegro, concretely with the association represented by Mr. Bakic, and due to his absence I propose that we can delay voting for the acceptance of his association for the next assembly meeting.

Rajko Stefanic – I think that both associations from Montenegro work for the benefit of private forest owners, and also it is normal to have even conflicts. I propose that you solve these internal conflicts. REFORD has a statute and the president is obliged to decide based on it.

Miljenko – REFORD cannot solve the internal problem of Montenegro, the statute allows the acceptance of more than one member per country.

VOTING
Proposal for voting related to acceptance of association from Slovenia, Zveza lasnikov Gozdov Slovenija (ZLGS) / Union of forest owners Slovenia in REFORD.

ALL PRESENT DELEGATES VOTED PRO FOR SLOVENIA.

Proposal for voting related to acceptance of the Union of private forest owners association (UPFOA) from Montenegro in REFORD (represented by Mr. Marko Hajdukovic)

ALL PRESENT DELEGATES VOTED PRO FOR MONTENEGRO.

DISCUSSIONS
Arjol – I propose the voting for acceptance of the other association from Montenegro to be delayed for the next assembly meeting, where Mr. Bakic to be present and provide his explanations.

Vojo – This point of the agenda showed us in what situation can fall REFORD, in one hand we have the president of REFORD who enforces the rules of the statute, and in the other hand we have a situation which is not foreseen in the statute and we as assembly members should take the decision. In the last meeting in Berovo we have discussed that the current statute allows the membership of other associations which submit their request to be member of REFORD. Which of the local associations has the right to be member when we have not set the criteria? For this we have to debate now on. Rules are
clear that each country has two votes in the general assembly. But, what if we have requests for a broader membership, what will we do? The aim of REFORD is to protect the owners’ rights.

POINT II – DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF THE REFORD STATUTE AMENDMENTS AND INTERNAL REGULATION

Xhelal – Regarding the statute, as it is written, it should contain the criteria to be meet for the new associations which want to be members of REFORD and they should submit the request for membership, as well as we have to define the criteria for leaving REFORD, the notification time, or if it is not present in the assembly meetings three times in a row, it is automatically excluded. Related to Bato, I don’t know what decision is taken and by whom to exclude him from REFORD.

Miljenko – The association in Montenegro was not legal anymore due to expiration of the re-registration deadline. The law foresees that associations should be re-registered in a certain time, but Bato didn’t do that, therefore it is not legal. Now Bato is registered as a new association and he comes as a new member in REFORD. REFORD is not like CEPF, it accepts more members, whereas CEPF accepts only one association per country. REFORD is a network which seeks to have more members for a better work. It can be even from rural development, not only from forestry. The proposal is that for acceptance of this association to be delayed until the next assembly meeting, when Bato is present. The decision for acceptance is taken by the assembly.

VOTING

Approved by vote that membership of the association represented by Bato to be delayed the next assembly meeting.

POINT III – DECISION ON CHANGES OF THE TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT

DISCUSSIONS

Miljenko – from the last meeting in Berovo, it was agreed and decided that one of REFORD members to take over the responsibilities of the technical secretariat that so far this responsibility has been upon CNVP-Macedonia. It is proposed that these changes to take place by statute. The technical secretariat can hire employed but REFORD has not budget for this. According me, this could be an option. The essence is that to be taken over the leadership of the technical aspects by REFORD members and not from CNVP. The member, who takes over the technical secretariat, takes even the financial obligations and must be responsible to the law.

Miljenko – This is a proposal by the management board; do we need to hire people? What are the advantages, what could we benefit from this? The association which will take over the secretariat will have expenditures.

Arjol – From the last meeting in Berovo it was agreed that each member association to review their own resources and come up with a proposal for taking over the responsibility of the technical secretariat. As far as I know, Albania has made the proposal, I am not aware if other associations have proposed also.

Miljenko – In Berovo the proposal was that we should take the decision related to the secretariat. I asked to all member associations to review their own resources and make the proposal for taking over the responsibility for the technical secretariat. The only association which expressed the interest was Albania and now we have to vote if we agree that Albania to take over the Technical Secretariat. We must see what we need to change in the statute; these changes will take time and cannot be done quickly. We have to see if it is according the rules and laws of the state and after the assembly to be clear what to do, in order that country to take over the secretariat.
Blerina – The proposal is to vote whether we agree for Albania and after completion of the documentation the secretariat to be established in Albania.

Miljenko – Today we can give the right to start procedures and the next assembly to be decided.

Vojo (asking Arjol) – How did you come up to this decision to make the proposal for the secretariat?

Miljenko – REFORD is not interested how they came up to that decision for wanting to take over the secretariat. That is decision of Albania and it is ok for us. Each association has the authorized person for signing documents and it is different for each state. We as assembly should take the decision, to start officially the process and this is important. We should agree and set deadlines, where the others should apply as well.

Vojo – At this moment we have to open the process on procedures. REFORD has to have criteria about the budget. Each application should have specifics about the budget, spaces etc.

Miljenko – Let’s continue, do we agree to vote for Albania or we leave it for the next assembly?

Important is that the country which wants to take over the secretariat to see if is willing, if there is something not legal, then to be reviewed.

Mensura – I propose to be voted if we are pro or against Albania.

Miljenko – We should vote for these changes. CNVP will not deal anymore with the technical secretariat of REFORD. CNVP should be passive already until to be decided who will take over the secretariat.

VOTING
- Who is for these changes?
- It is decided by vote for changes related to the technical secretariat, that CNVP has no responsibility over the technical secretariat anymore.

COFFEE BREAK

DISCUSSIONS
Miljenko – Now we have taken the decision for the change. In the management board meeting we discussed that each association to review the possibility to apply for taking over the responsibility of the technical secretariat and the only proposal has come from Albania. At the same time we have gotten the approval by CNVP that they are willing to support financially the Federation in Albania to take over the secretariat. For now my request is to approve the decision that Albania to take over the technical secretariat and in the next assembly to discuss on procedures, meanwhile in Macedonia to start procedures of deregistration. I also want to ask the colleagues from Albania, are you willing to accept and are you aware of the responsibilities, in order that we can set the changes in the statute?

Arjol – After the meeting in Berovo, we have discussed with the chairperson of the NFCFP Albania (Rexhep) and we have reviewed our human, financial and logistic resources and came up to the conclusion that we can take over this responsibility. We are working since a long time already and we have a stable office, proper logistic means and so far sustainable financial resources, adequate human resources as well. We do apply often in response to call for proposals made by various donors and I can say that we have been successful so far. But, I am not the one who can do the final assessment about me if I am competent; it is you who can do that. The situation is that we have all the needed resources and we are willing to work and make REFORD more functioning and strengthen in all aspects. These are the main points I wanted to express.

Vojo – What is important at this moment is that, first it should be seen how it will go and how much will cost deregistration of REFORD in Macedonia and re-registration in Albania. What is more important is where the headquarters of REFORD will be and what results will provide? Yes to talk about results it’s
needed time. Today we can accept, our colleagues from Albania should guarantee us that for a certain time to fulfill all obligations we are talking about. I don’t know how long these procedures will last and what time will take. For sure we will be informed during the process, we should have a clear overview on how it will work and all uncertainties are to be solved jointly.

Arjol – Regarding the expenditures, CNVP will cover all the costs for deregistration and re-registration. We take this responsibility on voluntary basis. The benefits of the secretariat can show up in a later time. We should be able to prepare projects and apply to various donors. We know that at the beginning is not easy at all, but if we don’t start we will never know how it will go. Step by step, we should decide if the technical secretariat should be registered in Albania or not. We have consulted with a legal expert about the procedures of registration and he is also reviewing the statute. The law on NGOs in Albania allows registration of REFORD as an international organization. We are prepared in advance and now we are just waiting the decision of the assembly.

VOTING

Miljenko – Does the assembly accept the request that the technical secretariat of REFORD to be registered in Albania and in the next meeting to continue with the other issues? My proposal is to support this request.

All present delegates voted for the Technical Secretariat to be registered in Albania

POINT IV– CHANGES IN THE STATUTE

Arjol – Once we go back to Albania will start preparation of changes in the statute and procedures for re-registration. For this we have hired a legal expert.

Montenegro – Before registration in Tirana, we can communicate via email and to conclude procedures.

Miljenko – Since we have to re-register REFORD we have make changes in the statute, but we will not enter into details of the statute now. But we can discuss related the secretariat and general headlines of the statute. Currently we have in the statute the function of the Manager, will we keep this and how it will be? The Manager is part of the secretariat/leader of the secretariat?

Arjol – He/she can be the responsible person of the technical secretariat. When the final draft of the statute is prepared it will be shared and we can give suggestions on it.

Miljenko – If in the future, REFORD will have financial resources to pay the manager, then the management board of REFORD can decide who is going to be that person who will get paid. At this moment when it is a voluntary position you are free to appoint the manager.

Arjol – In both cases, voluntary or paid position, the management board will decide.

Miljenko – What shall be the duration of secretariat in the respective country?

Arjol – It should be decided by the assembly, but I think it cannot be written in the statute.

Miljenko – 5 years should be mandatory and 1 year should be the transitory period until passing to the other country.

Vojo – Changes in the secretariat, who appoints it and what are the responsibilities of the secretariat should be part of the statute. Certainly, in the statute should be written the period and responsibilities. These changes should be defined in the statute to know what is the secretariat and the financial reporting should be once a year.

Miljenko – What I propose is that these details to be written on the internal regulation. In the statute can be defined who appoints the manager, whereas in the regulation should be specified all details. Since we are talking about the statute, we have the Supervisory Committee, do we want to remain this body? If this is not a legal obligation for the country where is to be registered we can omit it, but we can leave this decision for another time.
Vojo – In Macedonia it is a legal obligation to have a Supervisory Committee.

Miljenko – I propose that today to not add or change anything in the statute, but in the next meeting.

The secretariat to be under an active association and should be guaranteed the logistic and human resources. The minimum duration of secretariat to be for 5 years and if the association resign from secretariat, it should notify one year earlier.

Peter – it is important that deregistration of REFORM in Macedonia and re-registration in Albania to be in continuity and it should be finalized until the next assembly. Arjol should prepare the documents for registration and deregistration in Macedonia to be simultaneously in order to not have discontinuity.

Point V – Election of MB members

Miljenko – The next point of the meetings is election of the management board members. I have already the names of candidates and I invite you to vote for them.

The candidates’ names for each member association are:

- Montenegro – Dejan Zajak
- Macedonia – Vojo Sokolovski
- Kosovo – Agron Nikqi
- Albania – Arjol Lila
- Slovenia – Rajko Stefanic
- Croatia – Miljenko Zupanic
- Bulgaria and BiH – are not present and in the next meeting MB members from their associations will be elected.

VOTING

All proposed candidates for the Management Board members are unanimously voted.

REPORTING OF ACTIVITIES FROM NOVEMBER 2015 UP TO NOW

Miljenko – REFORM has been conducted activities supported by two projects FLED and SSPDF and three miniprojects have taken place also under this support. We have prepared the project “Support of family scale forest” and it is approved by PFC and later on we will explain in detail.

Arjol – Since we are at this point, I kindly ask to associations (especially to Albania, Montenegro, Kosovo and Macedonia) to deliver their reports of activities within 10 days from now, in order I can prepare the overall report and after to proceed with the second installment.

FINANCIAL REPORTING

Miljenko - Presents the finances of REFORM (...financial data needed)

- The next assembly meeting will be held before the end of this year.
- Activity for the future is the project with CEPF. The project is financed by FAO, and it is prepared by colleagues from Macedonia. The budget of this project is 58,000 CHF. 20,000 CHF are for REFORM, 8,000 CHF for CNVP and 29,000 CHF for PEFC. The project goal is increase of capacities and support for forest certification of forest owners at small scale. Through this project will be initiated forest certifications. Regional meetings are foreseen and support toward forest certification. REFORM will take part in these meetings and will hand over a questionnaire. For these activities are foreseen financial means, about 120 LCB days. The regional meeting will be held in Tirana where will be invited all REFORM members. This project is very important for REFORM though it hasn’t started yet. But of course we have the also support from CNVP.
Slovenia is certified by CEPF. The interest for forest certification is increased, but for the moment it is not rewarded.

POINT VI - QUESTIONNAIRE

Rajko Stefanic- Forest owners’ rights within the EU are not equal; therefore we have prepared a questionnaire which doesn’t take too long to be filled in. When we will make the presentations, Miljenko will briefly present you the questionnaire. It will be presented by the Federation of the EU, but our wish is that this questionnaire to be expanded even in non EU member countries. The idea is to be acknowledged the situation of forest owners. You know that countries of former Yugoslavia are deprived from the ownership rights. It is discussed many times in REFORM and it is good to take the results from this questionnaire and to present to the European Union. The ownership is important. I will send you the link so you will have the possibility to fill it in. This initiative is supported by CEPF and European Parliament and we have been promised that by the end of this year it will be presented in the European Parliament. In the joint meeting we have accepted 5 requests; since we are member of the EU we are expecting to be treated with equal ownership rights as in other EU countries. Important is the point 5, in this point, the owner must be allowed to be free to act on his property, such as recreational activities, hunting etc. All these activities should be through an agreement with the owner. Ownership in Slovenia’s forests is mostly limited. E.g. If the owner has over 10 or 20 ha has the right to hunt, if less, hunting is not allowed. Of a high interest in forestry are the NTFPs but about it is not talked much. TFPs prices are decreasing, there is climate change, diseases also contribute negatively, and therefore it is important to be paid more attention to NTFPs.

DIFFERENT DISCUSSIONS

Miljenko – Since we have discussed and decided already for a series of issues, I declare this assembly meeting closed.

Minutes prepared by: Blerina Hoxha
Annex 2: Conclusions and recommendations from REFORD members

After all presentation and discussions of the rural development programmes and development and planning process in the region the general conclusions were adopted:

• support the fact that forest are basis for development of rural areas
• forest in SEE represent possibilities for investments and employment in rural areas
• rural development measures should improve development of forest areas and viability of forests
• rural development measures should improve forest management with aim to achieve sustainability in use wood and non-wood forest products
• private forest owners as well as forest experts should participate in preparation and adoption of priorities and measures in rural development programs
• anticipate that ownership rights, which are base and guaranteed in modern democratic systems, are not acknowledged and private forest owners are enforced to a variety of administrative barriers
• current situation in the region shows that property rights for private forest owners are over regulated and controlled which hinders rural development and sustainable forest management of small forest holders
• support participation of private forest owners in planning process in forestry and other decision making processes related to forestry and rural development

Annex 3: Presentations on Rural Development

Albania – presentation on Rural Development
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TOKA, PYLLI DHE ZVILLIMI RURAL

Tirane 2/7/2016
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Pozicioni gjeografik i Shqiperise,
siperfaqja dhe popullsia

- Republika e Shqipërisë shtrihet në Europën Juglindore, në perëndim të Gadishullit Balkanik.
- Laget nga detet Adriatik dhe Jon.
- Siperfaqja e Shqipërisë është 28,748 km².
- Popullsia 3.03 million (2015).
- Qeverisja vendore; Ndahet në 12 qarqe, 61 bashki (reforma 2015)
- Popullsia rurale përbën 45% të popullsisë së përgjithshme nga kjo, 71% e popullsisë rurale është e vete-punësuar në aktivitete bujqësore, përfshirë edhe pyjet dhe kullotat.
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Perdorimi i tokes

- Fondi pyjor e kullosor dhe siperfaqet e tjera 2,179 mije ha.
- Toka bujqesore 696 mije ha.
- Pjesa tjeter jane siperfaqe te zhveshura inproduktive, siperfaqe ujore, etj.
Gjendja aktuale

- Toka bujqësore eshte privatizuar krejtisht me reformat pas ndryshimeve demokratike.
- Megjithate, 123,000 ha toke bujqësore janë ende toka të pandara apo të refuzuara.
- Aktualisht, në Shqipëri 82% e tokës bujqësore është e mjellë. Fermeret menaxhojnë njëkohësisht tokën bujqësore dhe token pyjore, sipas disa sistemeve tipike tradicional dhe moderne.
- Bujqësia, me rrëth 350,000 ferma bujqësore me sip. mesatare me pak se 2 ha, punesohet mbi 50% te krahut te punes, Kontribuon rrith 1/5 ne PPB dhe ka rrithje te qëndrueshme te prodhimit bujqesor me rrith 3% ne vit, gjate viteve te fundit.
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Zhvillimi Rural sipas BE
Objektivat e Kombetë të Bashkuara (UNFF) per pyjet dhe zhvillimin rural

1: Rikthimi i humbjeve të mbulesës pyjore përëmës menaxhimit të qëndrueshëm të pyjeve, duke përfshirë mbrojtjen, përmirësimet, pyllëzimet dhe ripyllëzimet dhe rrëthjen e përpykjeve për parandalimin e degradimit të pyjeve.
2: Rritja e përfitimeve ekonomike, sociale dhe mjedisore nga pyjet, duke përfshirë përmirësimin e kushteve të jetës së njerëzve të varur nga pyjet.
3: Rritja e Qëndrueshmisë së Pyjeve të Menaxhuar, duke përfshirë pyjet e mbrojtur, dhe rrithja e raportit të produktive pyjore të prodhuara nga pyjet e menaxhuar në mënyrë të qëndrueshme.
4: Ndalja e rënies së asistencës zyrtare të zhvillimit për menaxhimin e qëndrueshëm të pyjeve dhe rrithja ndjeshëm e mobilizimit të buriimeve të reja financiare nga të gjitha buriimet për implementimin e menaxhimit të qëndrueshëm të pyjeve.
I. Shëndeti i pyjeve; Pyjet kanë nevojë të menaxhohen, kështu që rreziqet dhe impaktet e fenomeneve të padësiruara minimizohen.

II. Funksionet social-ekonomike, kontributet e burimeve pyjore për ekonominë në përgjithshëm, p.sh. nëpërmjet punësimit, vlerave të gjenëruara për shumë përpunimit dhe marketingut të produktave pyjore dhe energjisë, tregtisë dhe investimeve në sektorin e pyjeve.

III. MENAXHIMI I QËNDRUESHËM I PYJEVE, synon të sigurojë që mallrat dhe shërbimet e marra nga pyjet të përmbushin nevojat e tanishme dhe njëkohësisht sigurojnë vazhdimësinë e disponueshmërisë dhe kontributin e tyre në zhvillimin afat-gjatë.

IV. Kuadri ligeor, politik dhe institucional. Kjo temë përfshin rregullimet ligjore, politike dhe institucionale të domosdoshme për të mbështetur menaxhimin e qëndrueshëm të pyjeve, duke përfshirë venddëshmarin me pjesëmarrje, qeverisjen dhe zhvillimin e ligjit dhe monitorimin dhe vlerësimin e progresit.

Pyjet dhe zhvillimi rural sipas BE (objektivat)

- Mbrojtja e mjedisit në linje me standartet e BE.
- Pyjet te rendesishme per te siguruar sherbime me te zgjeruara (biodiversiteti, stabilizimi i tokës dhe konzervimi, rekreacioni dhe turizmi).
- Zhvillimi dhe shfrytëzimi i tokës duke perfshirë ndonjë herë token pyjore.
- Sistemet Agro pyjore në tokë bujqësore.
- Konssolidimi i grupeve prodhuese, bashkepunimi dhe inovacioni per mjellen e zinxhirit të vlerave të pyjeve dhe nenprodukteve të tij;
Pyjet dhe zhvillimi Rural ne Shqiperi

Situata:
- Zhvillimi Rural, fokus rajonalizimi i prodhimit sipas prioriteteve per bujqesi dhe pyje.
- Programi nga Banka Botore, me skema te integruara sipas BE dhe me fokus kryesore pyjet,(Pjesemarja dhe fuqizimi i grupev prodhuase (grate) objektiv specifik).
- Shoqeria kerkon prodhime dhe sherbime te ndryshme nga sektori i pyjeve.
- Sektori i pyjeve shpesh here operon i pavarur nga sektoret e tjerë, dhe kjo ka përgjithëse intregimin e skemave te subvensioneve per pyjet;

Vizioni;
- Pylltaria per rikthim në traditat më të mira të qeverisjes së pyjeve e kullotave nga vetë komunitetet rurale.
- Mbrojtjen e ekosistemeve pyjore për të përmirësuar nivelin e jetësës të familjeve të përdoruesve e pronarëve të pyjeve e kullotave, nëpërmjet zbatimit të parimeve të menaxhimit të qëndrueshëm e perdoirimt shumëfunksional të burimeve natyrore.
Kontributore të zhvillimit rural në Shqipëri

- Projektet e Bankes Boterore (Vitet 1996-2016) (Projekte per zhvillimin e sektorit të pyjeve)
- Skemat mbështetese nga qeveria ne formen e subvensioneve per arroret, frutoret dhe uillinjte
- Iniciativa private. Perdorimi i tokes ne funksion te zhvillimit dhe punesimit te zonave rurale.
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Aktivitete e Projektit te BB

- Sekuestrimi të Karbonit, me 450 mije USD, në permiresimin e 4000 ha pyje, jane perfitues si pjese e skemes, 20 SHPPK, të shtrire në një periudhe 20 vjecare.
- Rrallimet në pyjet shtetore dhe komunale 17000 ha
- Pyllezimet në pyjet komunale 787 ha
- Kontrolli i erozionit (mure/gardhe) 6267 m3.
- Permireshëm në kullotë 352 ha
- Lera te reja 82 cope.
- Rehabilitimi leras 35 cope
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**Aktivitete PZHBN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Licenca i aktivitet</th>
<th>Njëra</th>
<th>Baze e këshillit</th>
<th>Vlera e investimeve për prandit 1000</th>
<th>Vlera e investimeve për prandit 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mungoani</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>3 970</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pashqën të cilën</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>209 939</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mungoani</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>209 939</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zemërverdienen ne objekt arsimor</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dëshmitë kulturale ne dëshmitë arsimor</td>
<td>Kopshe të pranishëm</td>
<td>203 350</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Phëllmësia</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lëhejët e bërtë</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lëhejët e bërtë</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lëhejët e bërtë</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lëhejët e bërtë</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lëhejët e bërtë</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Shërbejët</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Xhëripërja e dëshmitës</td>
<td>Ha</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
<td>2 603 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nëntëpërja e dëshmitës</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nëntëpërja e dëshmitës</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Punime - PZHBN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kryesisht</th>
<th>Kopshe (Rënie)</th>
<th>Kopshe (Rënie)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kryesuesi</td>
<td>72 049</td>
<td>8 540 059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mjekja e parë</td>
<td>19 730</td>
<td>1 542 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndërtesa e ndërkombëtare</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dëshmitë e këshillat</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kryesuesi e mbretër</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>12 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njëritë e shëtitës</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Njëritë e shëtitës</td>
<td>Kopshe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rënie e parë rënie</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>12 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rënie e parë rënie</td>
<td>m²</td>
<td>12 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopshe e parë rënie</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>179 577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopshe e parë rënie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>638 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kg</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>126 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projecti i Sherbimeve Mjedisore 2015

Projektini i ri i Sherbimeve Mjedisore.
Objektivi i përkthshëm;
- Ruaja dhe përmirësimi i ekosistemeve malore, duke përmirësuar bujqësinë dhe pylltarinë.
Forma e mbeshtetjes; Grante konkuruese.
- Thirrja Publike, filloi në 1 Qershor 2016, dhe afati i fundit për dorëzimin e aplikimeve do të jetë deri në 1 Gusht 2016.
- Fondi për zbatimin e Skemës së Granteve IPARD-like do te jete rreth 3.6 million EURO.

Konkluzione

- Ulje e varferise 15-20 % ne zonat rurale.
- Forcim kapacitetesh SHPPK, per menaxhimin e pyjeve.
- Investimet; ne pylezime,permiresim pyjesh dhe kontrollin e erozionit, kane ndikuar ne nukjen e pyjeve dhe perfiltmeve te te ardhurave te komuniteteve rurale.
- Permiresimi ne mundesine me te mira per kullodje, sigurimin e ushqimit per bageti, Qendrueshmeri ne prodhimin e druve te zjarrit dhe vlerhe me e larte e drurit komercial.
Perfituesit/Aktivitete

Përfituesi do të jetë **SHOQATA** ose **Individ**

Projektete mbeshtetese;
- Pyllëzime / Ripyllëzime ose nxitja e rregjenerimit natyror.
- Përmirësim pyjesh që përfsion: pastrim pyjesh, rrallim pyjesh, ricungim pyjesh, krasitje, ndërhyrje sanitare.
- Ndërtim / Rindërtim i pritave malore.
- Ndërtim / Rindërtim i lerave të ujit, hauzeve, koritave.
- Luftim mekanik kundër insekteve të ndryshme.
- Luftim biologjik kundër insekteve të ndryshme.
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Aktivitetet

- Aktivitete të tjera që lidhen me hortikulturën **Mbjellja e pemëve frutore**
- Ndërtim/ Rindërtim i një vend-depozitimi për materialin e fituar si rezultat i aktiviteve të ndryshme (aktivitete të përmirësimit të pyjeve, mbledhjen e bimëve mjekësore, etj).
- Aktivitete për përmirësimin e kullotave (të tilla si pastrimi i kullotës nga gurët, barërat e këqija).
- Kriimi i kullotave duke mbjellë (konvertimin e tokës së punueshme ose atë djerr).
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SHPPK/AKTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Qyteti (shq.)</th>
<th>Nr. toti i SHPPKK</th>
<th>Aktive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dikër</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tiranë</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Durrës</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kukës</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elbasan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gjirokastër</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Berat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shkodër</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vlorë</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pukë</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Korçë</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lezhë</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Forcimi i kapacitetit te SHPPKK

- Nga 250 SHPPK kane rishikuar statutin 30 te tilla;
- Perfajesimi i grave dhe vajzave ne borde ne 25 SHPPKK, ne masen 30%;
- 110 Shoqata jane te gatshme te aplikojne ne skemen e granteve per SH.M.
- 20 Shoqata kan marre ekper te pjese (ing.) marreveshje.
- Po punohet per nje riorganizimi te ri te Shoqatave te pjese pas daljes se ligijit te ri ne kushteta e reja te krijuar;
- 12 Federata aktive ne 12 Qarqe te Shqiperise.
  6 prej tyre mbeshteten nga FLED (CNVP).
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Adresimi dhe perfaqesimi i interesave të anetave ne nivele të ndryshme

Me poshte japet skema e rëtit paresor te Federates Kombetare, Federatave Rionale dhe SHPPKK:

- **Federata Kombetare**: Perfaqesim, Lobim
- **11 Fed. Rionale**: Forcim Kapacitetesh
- **250 SHPPKK Anetare**: Menaxhim i qendrueshem i pyjeve Ndergjegjesim i komuniteteve.

**Cfare kemi arritur?**

- Ndergjegjesimin e fermerit, se përmerësimi i pyjeve prodhon dhe shërben për të dhe familjen e tij;
- Trajmini i përdoruesve ne 250 shqota dhe 80 bordet (perditori i qendrueshem i pyjeve dhe kullotave);
- Krijimi i modeleve të Pyjeve: pyjet e fermerave, monitorimi nepermjet siperfaqeve prove te perhershme.
- Nxjita dhe zhvillimin i të ardhurave ne aktivitetet në pyje produkteve të veçanta (krijimi i grupeve prodhuase) si per: Arrore, bimë medicinale, perpunimi i produkteve etj.
Lobim dhe advokaci per te drejtat e prones

- Pjesëmarrja në forume te ndryshme për të shqyrtuar dhe diskutuar per aspektet ligjore dhe institucionale të Pyjeve Komunale, është një proces i gjatë dhe sfidues.

- Procesi ka kaluar nëpërmjet konsultimit me të gjitha palët e interesuar dhe të anëtarëve, duke organizuar shumë takime me politikëbërësit dhe vendimmarrësit, për të artikular nevojat e perdoruesve te pyjeve dhe kullotave dhe ndikuar ne vendimet dhe veprimet e qeverise.

- Kjo rezultoi në përshtepjimin e procesit të transferimit te pyjeve dhe kullotave nga shteti tek Bashkite NjQV.

- Ndryshimet në kuadrin ligjor per problemet e pronësisë dhe te perdomin.

---

Partneriteti dhe mbeshtetja

- Me ndryshimin e sistemit politik, fermeret ndemoren nisma sporadike bazuar ne menaxhimin tradicional te pyjeve.

- Pjesëmarrje e gjerë e fermereve ne procesin e transferimit te pyjeve dhe kullotave shteterore tek pushteti vendore.

- Mbeshtetje e forte nga BB, SIDA, USAID, SNV/CNVP, ILC.

- Procesi filloi si nje qasje nga larte-poshte nga qeveria Shqiptare, me te drejta shume te kufizuara per perdoruesit;
Problemet lidhur me perdorimin e tokës

Pronesia dhe tregu:
- Çeçhtjet e pronesise mbi token bujqesore, pyjore e kulloresore,
- Ferma te vogla, tregu i pazhvilluar i shit-blerjes se tokës; niveli i ulet i kooperimit, rrjëta e informalisitetit te konkurrenderise se sektorit.
- Niveli i ulet i modernizimit te teknologjive te prodhimit (perfshiujtjen mekanizimin e proceseve te prodhimit e perpunimit).
- Kapacitetet e pa mjaftueshme te mbijljes se cikli te prodhimit nga prodhuiesi, perpunuesi, tregtaret.
- Mungesa e harmonizimit/perputhja e legjislacionit dhe politikave zhvillimore me ato te BE.
- Kuadri ligjor për privatizimin e pyjeve dhe kullojave mungon, ndersa për pyjet komunale nuk është ende i plotë;
- Informaliteti i larte ne menaxhimin e tokës dhe pyjeve.

Cfare kerkohet?

- Perfshirjen e pyjeve ne sherbime mjedisore, si sekuestrimi i karbonit, ruajtja e ujit, pakesimi i erazonit, qe te ecin paralelisht me zbutjen e varferise e punesimin e fermereve.
- Rehabilitimin e pyjeve sidomos shkurreve.
- Konsolidimi i sistemit te kadastres se tokës (dixhitalizimi i metejshem),
- Zbatimi nje plani kombetar per konsolidimin e pronesise se tokës, i sherben gjallerimit te tregut te tokës; krijimi i nje sistemi informimi per perdorimin e tokës dhe fuqizimi i sherbimit ekstensiv per permejresimin e menaxhimit te tokës.
SYNIMI

- Duhet të sanksionohen ligjërisht të drejtat eksluzive të përdoruesve/pronareve te pyjeve.
- Dokumentimi i pyjeve dhe kullotave nga përdorimi/pronësi të përdoruesve ne masen mbi 35% te pyjeve dhe kullotave.
- Thellimi i marrëdhënies të tregut të lirë në pylltarinë.
- Legalizimi i informalitetit që ekziston në pyje e kullota.
- Zgjerimi i shërbimit këshillmor pyjor, veçanërisht për pylltarinë ne shkalle te vogel.
- Hartimi i një ligji të ri për pyjet dhe aktet n/ligjore?
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Macedonia – presentation on Rural Development
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Opportunities for rural development through concrete measures in forestry

02-05.07.2016, Zabljak, Montenegro

Current opportunities

- Program expanded reproduction of forests
- 122 Investments to increase the economic value of forests.
Program expanded reproduction of forests

- Through institution:
  - Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management

- Through reforestation
  - 100 eu / 1 da (or 1000 eu / 1ha)

- Eligible applicants

- Chronology (Genesis, present, possibilities)
As a possibility for 2016 is only allowed 25 ha !!!!

Program expanded reproduction of forests

Investments to increase the economic value of forests.

- Through institution:
  - Agency for Financial Support of Agriculture and Rural Development
Investments to increase the economic value of forests.

- Eligible applicants
  - legal or natural person owner of private forest or association of private forest owners

- Chronology (Genesis, present, possibilities)

50% of approved eligible costs for investments but no more than

- For visible and permanent marking to 20,000 mkd
- For marking to 10,000 mkd
- For equipment to 120,000 mkd
Investments to increase the economic value of forests.

- Appropriations for this measure in 2015 are 10,000,000 MKD
- Appropriations for this measure in 2016 are 5,500,000 MKD of which 500,000 MKD for payment of approved investments last year!!!
FOREST-RELATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT MEASURES IN MONTENEGRO - STATUS, IMPLEMENTATION AND PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Union of private forest owners’ associations of Montenegro (UPFOA-MNE),
REFORD Meeting,
Žabljak, Montenegro, July 3 - 4, 2016
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Representatives of UPFOA-MNE after a working meeting (Rođaje, April 19, 2016)
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1. State institutions competent for private forestry and rural development
2. Status, implementation and proposals for improvement of Forest Law in terms of rural development measures
3. Status and proposals for implementation of Forestry Strategy in terms of rural development measures
4. Status, implementation and proposals for improvement of IPARD II program in terms of forest-related rural development measures
5. Conclusions

Competent state institutions

1) Ministry of agriculture and rural development (MARD):
   ▶ Directorate for forestry, hunting and wood industry (DFHWI)
   ▶ Forest Administration (FA) (as a body / organ within)
   ▶ Directorate for rural development (DRR)
   ▶ Directorate for IPARD payments (after accreditation)

2) Ministry of sustainable development and tourism:
   ▶ Public Enterprise National Parks of Montenegro (competent for private forests in parks)

3) Forestry Inspection within Administration of Inspections Affairs
Forest Law (2010, 2015)

Forest Law regulates numerous issues (such as rights and obligations of forest owners, bans, forestry planning and participation in decision making, administrative and technical services, marking of trees for felling, controlling of felling sites and of wood shipment & transport, financing of activities and measures, supervision and sanctions) related to private forestry and, among others, provides legal base for:

1. Co-financing of planned works in private forests based on annual plan of management with private forests.
   - However, these works and financial means have not yet been planned, nor assured!

2. Possibility for using financial incentives in the framework of rural development (according to aims of EU Regulation on support to rural development).
   - However, neither this possibility has not started with implementation until now (because of non-complete provision of the Law and exclusion of forestry from the field of rural development)!

Recommendations of UPFOA-MNE for improvement and implementation, related to the co-financing of forest works and forestry measures in the context of rural development:

1. To amend the Forest Law in a way that forestry incentive measures - that are defined by Forestry Strategy and in accordance with the EU Regulation on support to rural development – will be included in IPARD II program!

2. To provide certain - for a start bar minimum - budget funds within the Forest Administration, and previously in the state budget - for co-financing of certain forest works and/or measures in private forests!

3. To introduce distinction (in the Forest Law) between the forest works that are co-financed from the forestry budget and the forestry incentive measures, that are co-financed from the rural (IPARD) budget!
Forestry Strategy (2015)

Forestry Strategy contains:

A. Typical forest(ry) support measures:
   1. afforestation,
   2. conversion of coppice forests into high forests by thinning,
   3. construction of forest roads,
   4. protection of forests against fires and rehabilitation of burned areas (excluding the works).

   **These measures are not being implemented in private forests (except for granting seedlings to private forest owners)!**

B. Forest-related support measures in the context of rural development:
   1. improving forestry infrastructure in rural areas,
   2. diversification of economic activities of rural households through the provision of forest works, wood processing, processing of non-wood forest products and forest-related tourism.

   **These measures are not being implemented yet!**

C. Institutional support measures:
   1. establishing Local Action Groups (LAGs),
   2. getting started with forestry advisory services within the Forest Administration,
   3. intensifying the development of forest management plans and establishment of forestry information system,
   4. promotion of associating of forest owners and provision of budget financing.

   **These measures are not being implemented yet for private forestry!**

**Recommendations of UPFOA-MNE for implementation:**

1. To develop a detailed financial plan of measures with clearly indicated funds for private forests and forestry!
2. To ensure annual planning and implementation of these measures (through national forestry and IPARD programs), subject to the prior provision of additional budgetary funds!
Program IPARD II (2014-2020)

Program IPARD II contains 7 groups of rural development measures:

1. Investments in physical capital of agricultural holdings (including the production of renewable energy from wood for their needs);
2. Investments in physical capital related to processing and marketing of agricultural and fish products (wood products excluded);
3. Agro-ecological measures (forestry measures excluded);
4. Implementation of local development strategies - LEADER - through the establishment of Local Action Groups (LAGs), which include forest owners' associations;
5. Investments in public rural infrastructure (forest roads excluded);
6. Diversification of holdings and their business development (including eco-tourism related to the forest natural values);
7. Technical assistance to implementation of IPARD program.

Implementation from 2017 onwards! However, major forest(ry) and wood-related measures are excluded!

Recommendations of UPFOA-MNE for improvement:

It would be indispensable to amend the IPARD II program with measures related to forest(ry) and wood!

It would be necessary in this regard to include:

1. A standard EU measure „Investments in development of forest areas and enhancement of vitality of forests“, which includes reforestation of private lands, prevention and rehabilitation of damages in all forests (due to pests, diseases, climate change and fires), improving the resilience and environmental value of private forests and investments in forestry technologies, processing and marketing of forest products.
2. Support to investments in forest infrastructure that enables access to the private forest land.
3. Support to elaboration of management plans for private forest holdings.
Conclusions

1. Forestry legal framework for rural development measures is generally favourable, while agricultural and rural one almost completely excludes forest(ry) and wood, which is necessary to be changed!
2. The forestry strategy is much appropriate for private forestry and forest(ry)-related rural development measures.
3. However, forestry legislation and strategy in respect of measures relating to private forests and rural development have not been implemented and budget funds (subsidies) not planned / provided.
4. IPARD II Program 2014-2020 is not appropriate for forestry because it does not include forest(ry) and wood-related measures in the context of rural development - therefore it is necessary to amended it!
5. The major challenge for the forestry sector and the UPFOA-MNE is to raise private forestry at appropriate place in the rural development (in accordance with the EU Regulation). The first activities by UPFOA-MNE have already been taken in this respect.
RDP Measures

- Rural development program
  - M01 – Exchange of knowledge and informations
  - M02 – Advisory services
  - M04 - Infrastructure
  - M08 – Investments in developing of forest areas and sustainable management

M04 – Infrastructure
- Construction and reconstruction of forest roads
- PFO, APFO, LSGU, Ltd.
- 10,000 – 1 mil. €
- 100 %
- Base: Forest management plan
- First call will be closed 7.7. (3,500,000 €)
RDP Measures

- **M08 – Investments in developing of forest areas and sustainable management**
  - Conversion of degraded forest and cultures
  - Building of educational paths and other small infrastructure
  - Forest mechanisation
  - Machinery in primary wood processing
  - Marketing of forest products
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RDP Measures

- Conversion of degraded forest and cultures
  - PFO, APFO, Ltd.
  - 5,000 – 700,000 € (100%)
  - Base: Forest management plan
  - Fixed costs from 5,500-13,000 €/ha
  - PFO can do it by themselves
  - First call is open till 10.10. (8,000,000 €)
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RDP Measures

- Forest mechanisation
  - PFO, APFO, SMEs
  - 5,000 – 700,000 € (50%)
  - Base: Business plan
  - First call is open till 15.11. (4,000,000 €)
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RDP Measures

- Machinery in primary wood processing
  - SMEs with max 10,000 m³ capacity per year
  - 10,000 – 1,000,000 € (50%)
  - Base: Business plan
  - First call is open till 15.11. (4,000,000 €)
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RDP Measures

- **Building of educational paths and other small infrastructure**
  - PFO, APFO, NGO, Ltd.
  - 5,000 – 100,000 € (100%)
  - Base: Business plan
  - First call is open till 17.10. (330,000 €)
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RDP Measures

- **Marketing of forest products**
  - PFO, APFO, NGO, SMEs, LSGU and LAG
  - 5,000 – 30,000 € (50%)
  - Base: Business plan
  - First call is open till 22.11. (330,000 €)
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CroUPFOA achievements

- Education
  - workshops
- Cooperations
  - Extension service & Croatian forest ltd
    - Forest roads
    - Forest management plans
    - Silvikultural works
    - Restoration of forest
  - Ministry
    - Accepted as representative of PFO
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CroUPFOA achievements

- Participate in preparation:
  - Changes of Forest Law
  - Rural development program
  - National Forest Strategy
  - Law for biomass production
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CroUPFOA achievements

- Permanent public bodies (Ministry of agriculture) – participation
  - Committee for Forest Reproductive Material
  - Committee for approval, supervision and control of green-tax found

Thank You

Miljenko Županić
secretary

www.hsups.hr
All kinds of activities, related to forests are united in Measure 8 of RDP. Total budget for the whole period is 64 309 597 euro.

Measure 8 includes the following sub-measures:

- **Sub 8.1.** Afforestation and creation of woodland with total budget 15 866 660 euro;
- **Sub 8.3.** Preventing damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events;
- **Sub 8.4.** Restore the damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events; sub measures 8.3 & 8.4 are with total budget 19 192 931 euro;
- **Sub 8.5.** Investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems with total budget 11 250 000 euro;
- **Sub 8.6.** Investments in technolgies for forestry and processing mobilization and trade of forest products with total budget 18 000 000 euro.
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**Afforestation and creation of woodland**

**Benefits:**
- Natural and legal persons and local religious branches, owners of agricultural and non-agricultural land;
- Municipalities, owners/operators of agricultural and non-agricultural land;
- Legal entities - individuals, managing agricultural and non-agricultural land, including State enterprises governing agricultural and non-agricultural land.

**Terms of choice:**
- All applicants must prove ownership of the land to be afforested or the right to manage it;
- The land to be afforested must fall within the area of forest cover less than 60% or in an area with high to medium risk of erosion;
- The minimum area for afforestation should be as follows:
  - Natural and legal persons and local religious branches, owners of agricultural and non-agricultural land - 0.5 ha;
  - Municipalities, owners/operators of agricultural and non-agricultural land - 1.0 ha;
  - Legal entities - individuals, managing agricultural and non-agricultural land - 1.0 ha.

**Aid intensity:** 100% of the total eligible costs.

**Amounts and amount of aid:**
The minimum total eligible cost per project is the equivalent of €2,500 and the maximum is the equivalent of €300,000. The maximum total eligible costs under this sub-measure for the entire period of the RDP (2014-2020 years) for a candidate to support is the equivalent of 0.1 million euros.

---
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**Afforestation and creation of woodland**

**Tangible investments:**
- Soil preparations:
  - Purchase of afforestation material;
  - Transport and temporary storage of afforestation material;
  - Labor costs for afforestation;
  - Treatment of seedlings with the necessary protective materials (eg: infection with spawin or nitrogen-fixing bacteria carried individually or by protecting forested area);
  - Fencing of afforested area (where necessary);
  - Preventive actions against wild grazing animals, pests and diseases, to ensure long-term results and avoid failure of afforestation;
  - Cost of purchasing land, when they are directly related to the implementation of the project and do not exceed 10% of total eligible project costs.

**Intangible investments:**
- Total costs related to the project to feasibility studies, fees, fees for architects, engineers and consultants, consulting environmental and economic sustainability of projects, feasibility studies of the project. The total cost of the project may not exceed 12% of the total eligible investment under the project.
- Costs of know-how, acquisition of patent rights and licenses, cost of trademark registration and processes for preparing and implementing the project.
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Sub 8.3. Preventing damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events

Beneficiaries:
- Natural and legal persons and local religious branches, owners of forest areas;
- Municipalities, owners/managing forest areas;
- Legal entities managing forest areas;
- State enterprises governing state forest areas;
- Forest protection stations;
- Regional Forestry Directorates

Terms of choice:
- All applicants must prove ownership of the land to be afforested or the right to manage it.
- Preventive actions against fires are eligible only in forest areas classified as medium or high risk of fire.
- All preventive actions against forest fires should be part of an approved forest management plan or program.

Aid intensity: 100% of the total eligible costs.

Amounts and amount of aid:
The minimum total eligible cost per project is the equivalent of €2,500 and the maximum is the equivalent of €1,500,000. The maximum total eligible costs under this sub-measure for the entire period of the RDP (2014-2020 years) for a candidate to support is the equivalent of 1.5 million euro.
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Sub 8.3. Preventing damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events

Tangible investments:
- The creation, improvement and maintenance of fire protection facilities - silvicultural breaks, fire breaks, mineralized strips;
- The construction/improvement of helipads, with the exception of airport facilities for commercial purposes;
- The construction/improvement of water supplies for firefighting;
- The construction/improvement of observation points for fire fighting;
- Purchase of communication equipment and tools for monitoring of forest fires, pests and diseases;
- Construction and improvement of forest roads;
- Prevent and limit the spread of pests and diseases.

Intangible investments:
- Total costs related to the project to feasibility studies, fees for architects, engineers and consultants, consulting environmental and economic sustainability of projects, feasibility studies of the project. The total cost of the project may not exceed 12% of the total eligible investment under the project.
- Cost of knowledge, acquisition of patent rights and licenses, cost of trademark registration and processes for preparing and implementing the project.
- Purchase of software
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**Sub 8.1: Restore the damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events**

**Beneficiaries:**
- Natural and legal persons and local religious branches, owners of forest areas;
- Municipalities, owners / managing forest areas;
- Legal entities managing forest areas;
- State enterprises governing state forest areas.

**Terms of choice:**
- All applicants must prove ownership of the land to be afforested or the right to manage it;
- Restoration activities will be eligible in the forest areas of the country;
- The choice of tree species for reforestation must comply with the type of habitat;
- The amount of damage is at least 10% of the relevant forest potential on a damaged area;
- In case of damages from diseases and pests, the description of the ensuing disaster must be accompanied by scientific evidence;
- In reforestation will use standard costs of sub-measure B1;
- Filling in forest plantations will be admissible only if:
  - are created under this measure or measure 215 from the previous RDP;
  - takes place the second or third year after the establishment of culture;
  - interception established in their autumn inventory is between 15 and 5% percent;
- eligible for support will only projects that meet a certain minimum number of points.

**Aid intensity:**
- 80% of the total eligible costs.

---
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**Sub 8.1: Restore the damage to forests from forest fires, natural disasters and catastrophic events**

**Amounts and amount of aid:**
The minimum total eligible costs per project is the equivalent of € 1 000. The maximum total eligible costs under this sub-measure for the entire period of the RDP (2014 - 2020 years) for a candidate to support is the equivalent of 1 million euro.

**Tangible investments:**
- Clean the areas in forests damaged by fires and other natural disasters, with a view to their artificial regeneration;
- Reforestation of damaged forests;
- Restoration of damaged investment, protective equipment, engineering works, installations, roads and places to monitor fires;
- Create deports wood harvested from forests affected by natural impacts, in order to avoid further damage by fungi or insects;
- Filling in plantations.

**Intangible investments:**
- Total costs related to the project to feasibility studies, fees, fees for architects, engineers and consultants, consulting environmental and economic sustainability of projects, feasibility studies of the project. The total cost of the project may not exceed 25% of the total eligible investment under the project;
- Cost of know-how, acquisition of patent rights and licenses, cost of trademark registration and processes for preparing and implementing the project.
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**Sub 8.6: Investments in technologies for forestry and processing mobilization and trade of forest products**

**Beneficiaries:**
- Natural and legal persons and local religious branches, owners of forest areas;
- Municipalities, owners of forest areas;
- Associations of private owners of forest areas or municipalities;
- SMEs;
- Forest owners, service providers;

**Terms of choice:**
- The purchase of equipment for logging is eligible for support only if the sustainable use of wood in the forest, which manages its proper beneficiary allows efficient use;
- Private owners must have a minimum 0.5 ha of forest areas;
- Associations of private owners must have forest areas with a minimum area of 1.0 ha;
- Legal entities - private owners are eligible only if they are registered under Bulgarian legislation and maximum participation of the state does not exceed 25%;
- Municipalities and their associations must have a minimum of 10 hectares of forest;
- Applicants for support for investment in processing and marketing of timber are eligible only if processed no more than 10 000 cu.m roundwood per year;
- Applicants for support for investment in processing and marketing of forestry products and the purchase or lease of friendly soil and resources specialized forestry machinery and equipment for logging, hauling, loading and up service Wood submit a business plan to demonstrate economic viability;
- Eligible for support will be only projects that meet a certain minimum number of points;

---
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**Sub 8.6: Investments in technologies for forestry and processing mobilization and trade of forest products**

**Aid intensity:** LTV of the total eligible costs for projects in rural areas of Bulgaria and 40% for all others.

**Amounts and amount of aid:**
- The minimum total eligible cost per project is the equivalent of € 5,000. The maximum total eligible costs under this sub-measure for the entire period of the RDP (2014 - 2020 years) for a candidate to support is the equivalent of 0.5 million euros.

**Tangible investments:**
- Investments in processing and marketing of forestry products, incl.:
  - Construction, acquisition or improvement of buildings and other real assets required for primary processing of timber and land-purchase as directly related to the project;
  - The purchase or lease of new machines and equipment for primary processing of wood and other working operations prior to industrial processing, to the market value of the asset;
  - The purchase or lease of new machines and equipment for processing of non-timber forest products.
- Costs for investments in improving the economic value of forests, incl.:
  - Thinnings into high seed and resumed Coppice to 40 years of age;
  - Purchase or lease friendly soil and forest resources specialized machinery and equipment for logging, hauling, loading and up service timber for one or more farms.
- The cost of purchasing land, when they are directly related to the implementation of the project and do not exceed 10% of the total eligible project costs.
Sub 8.6: Investments in technologies for forestry and processing mobilization and trade of forest products

**Intangible investments:**
- Total costs related to the project to feasibility studies, fees for architects, engineers, consultants, consulting environmental and economic sustainability of projects, feasibility studies of the project.
- Cost of know-how, acquisition of patent rights and licenses, cost of trademark registration and processes for preparing and implementing the project.
- Purchase of software.
- Costs for introducing good manufacturing practices, systems of quality management and certification training in enterprises.
- Costs for the development of plans for forest management or equivalent instrument.

Accepting applications for support under Measure 8 of the Programme for Rural Development will be after 2016.

Annex 4: Presentations on planning processes in Forestry

Kosovo - Presentation on Rural Development and planning in forestry
Forest Situation in Kosovo

- 42% of Kosovo's land area is covered by forests (464,800 ha), of which 60% are state-owned forests (278,080 ha) and 40% are private forests (185,920 ha).
- Farms are small and fairly spread over. The average farm size is ha 2.36, agricultural land 2.01 ha, meadows and pastures 0.7 ha. Average number of agricultural parcels is 3.4.
- The number of forest parcels is: 317,100 owned by 121,074 owners, the average forest parcel area is: 0.63 ha. An owner possesses in average 1.50 ha fragmented forests in 2.4 parcels.
- Kosovo's rural areas are characterised by rich natural resources, good natural conditions and diverse landscape.
Planning on rural development

- Forestry is a good opportunity for extension of rural development
- Sustainable economic, environmental and social use of forest.
- Forestation of agricultural abandoned lands
- Creation of agroforestry systems
- Modification of land use as an contribution for climate change through carbon sequestration

Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development in Kosovo for the period 2014-2020

(i) Support establishment of APFOs addressing the interest of different stakeholders;
(ii) Create favorable environment for business;
(iii) Create an opportunity for private sector to develop management of public forests and to initiate the process of joint forest management.
Selected RD measures to be implemented in Kosovo

1. Enhancing farm viability, competitiveness
   - Investment in physical assets of agricultural holdings
   - Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products

2. Restoring, preserving, enhancing ecosystems
   - Agri environmental measures and organic farming
   - Establishment and protection of forests

3. Promoting social, economic inclusions
   - Farm diversification and business development
   - Preparation and implementation of Local Development Strategies - LEADER

4. Transfer of knowledge, innovation
   - Improvement of training
   - Advisory service
   - Technical assistance

Modalities community involvement for Rural Development

- Support to the agro-forestry sector, mainly collecting non-timber products,
- Beekeeping, building of nursery gardens and cultivating seedlings and incentives for rural ecotourism.
- Communication and awareness campaigns in rural areas in terms of rural development and activities for forestry revenues.
The role of NAPFO and APFOs in Rural Development

- The NAPFO together with the Associations of Private Family Forest Owners lobbies for the forestry sector to be part of rural development scheme, through:
  - information and various training events for private owners to become part of competition
  - support application in finding space for cultivating of non forest products

NAPFO role and APFOs in the Rural Development

- The NAPFO continue support of farmers in rural development activities, and support of the forestry sector corresponding to Measure 302 (MAFRD) “Diversification of farms and business development”.
  - The objectives of this measure are to provide employment in order to increase the level of economic development in rural areas and reducing migration of the population.
Activities of NAPFO through producer groups

- Encouraging the use of forest fruits (wild apple, juniper berries, hazelnuts, blueberries, etc.) plants, fungi, etc.; (Introduction of Value chain from production to sale)
- Facilitating and connecting with merchants to create a collection point near forest areas.
- Collecting fruits, medicinal plants, mushrooms, etc.

Agroforestry – component of Rural Development

Biomass – part of agroforestry
- Management systems in coppice forest – studied
- Average annual production – compared
- In Malishince (Novo Berde) and Pashtrik (Gjakove) – experiments field
- Growth in different systems is monitored
- Demonstration of models of fast growing trees; salix alba, paulonia and assessment of their potential renewable energy source
### Biomass Value Chain

- Main sources and potential
- Forest waste from the illegal logging
- Silvicultural harvesting
- Sources from private forests
- Sources from agroforestry
- Residues from wood processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category of Biomass</th>
<th>The first priority (To be removed in the first year) m³</th>
<th>Average for other years (2-10) m³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Firewood</td>
<td>47195</td>
<td>11210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Woodchips</td>
<td>8400</td>
<td>2850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wood biomass for pellet</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biomass for charcoal production from private chestnut forest</td>
<td>280,000 in total shared in years based on the intervention for chestnut rehabilitation</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Identification and experimenting with degraded coppice for biomass production

- Kosovo Forest Agency, Ministry of Labour, municipality (Gjakove), APFO with the support of CNVP worked on rehabilitation of coppice forest of Pashtriku.

- Biomass resulted from improvement of forestry is collected and transported by APFO Gjakove to the school of Doli that will be used for heating with wood chips.
Processing of waste for wood biomass - employment opportunity

People in rural areas gather their resources to improve the living and working conditions.
JFM – model for improvement of living conditions in Rural area

- Cooperation with KFA, municipalities (sharing the products, responsibilities, control and decision making authority over forest lands)
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Due to the planning/production cycles in the forestry sector, investments in forest management are highly depended on policy and legal security. For this reason should be taken into account the favorable policy, legal and institutional conditions as necessary conditions for development of the forestry sector.

Since the maintenance of Permanent Forest Fund is a necessary condition for SFM, the latter cannot be treated separately rural development and strategies of land use.
Sector's specifics

- Planning and production cycles in the forestry sector are long and sometimes last for decades;
- Harvesting of forest products cannot be based (totally) on the current demand, but on the regeneration potential of forests, taking into account a wide range of products, services and benefits.

Objectives of the sector in Albania

**Short term**
- Reorganization of the forestry service in 61 municipalities;
- Transferring of forests and assets to Municipalities;
- Annual planning;
- Awareness raising and participation of community.

**Mid term**
- Forest rehabilitation/reforestation;
- Expansion of protected areas;
- Registration of ownership;
- Sustainable exploitation;
- National inventory of Forest Fund.
Assessment for planning

- Management plans (250 MP for 750,000 ha);
- Families, Forest Exploitation Companies, MAP collectors, etc.
- Census of Forestry Sector;
- Information at LGU level.
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Information sources for forestry planning
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### National Forest Fund

- **Forest**: 1,042,760 ha (60%)
- **Pasture**: 505,290 ha (29%)
- **Forest land**: 29,120 ha (1.5%)
- **Bare land**: 48,770 ha (3%)
- **Unproductive**: 116,570 ha (6.5%)
- **TOTAL**: 1,742,510 ha (100%)

**Ownership**
- Private: 3%
- Municipal: 44% (about 70%)
- State: 53% (remained 27%)

---

### Annual Operational Plans

The annual operational plan is a summary of concrete possibilities of resources, implementing and managing capacity, funding opportunities that will be conducted or achieved for a certain period (yearly).

- Drafting of the operational plan aims at well administration and sustainable use of forest and pastures, as well as natural resources within the administrative territory of LGUs.
- Creation of tradition, as well as improvement of practices for treatment of communal forest and rational use of forest and pasture resources.
- Increase of income generation from natural resources, their development on benefit of community and detailing of investments for their further development.

---
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It is based on the current situation of municipality’s forest and pastures, management plans of each administrative unit and DCM no. 22.

The plan should be focused on assessment of two main aspects:

- Income source for community (users) which impacts in increase and improvement of livelihood.
- The opportunity of coming up in market with other products that can be sold, ensuring incomes for the local government unit.

**Steps of the Annual Operational Plan**

- Preparatory phase;
- Data collection, including survey in the field;
- Data analysis;
- Drafting and compilation of the operational plan;
- Approval of the plan in the commune/municipality council.
Firstly it is made a general socio-economic analysis for the LGU where there are given:
- Demographical data;
- Population structure;
- Trend and demographic movements (migration/immigration);
- Job occupation;
- Main activities;
- Main income sources;
- Current use of forests, pastures and natural resources.

Assessment is made for:
- Forest areas, plots/subplots where can be ensured wood material, can be grazed, collected MAPs, mining activity etc. (quantitative assessment for as above based on MP);
- Calendar;
- Trend of these resources periodically (every year);
- Quality of natural resources;
- Problems encountered by users;
- Measures taken in different time for augmentation and enhancement of resources;
- Incomes generated from these resources.
**Market assessment**

- Assessment of main forest products demanded by market;
- Prices for main products (according the sources);
- Main collection points;
- Historical data of trade;
- Assessment of the ratio demand/supply

**Analysis of technic-financial plans**

- Analysis of technical-financial plans for investments where there are given:
- A summary about the kind of investments in harvesting of products and sale;
- Assessment of investments and selection of those most priority;
- Prediction of costs and profits for foreseen investments;
- Potential risk;
- Source of financial support.
Balance of incomes and expenses

FOUNDING SOURCE FOR INVESTMENTS
(example)

RISK ANALYSIS
(Comment)

PREDICTION OF TIME FOR PAYBACK OF INVESTMENTS

Note: Of high importance is that the profits are higher than expenses.
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Current situation

- Only during 2015-2016 are compiled 70 Operational Plans in 70 LGUs by Regional Federations of Diber, Kukes, Korce, Tirane, Lezhe, Elbasan.
- There are assisted 4 municipalities, such as Diber, Kavaje, Fier and Elbasan.
- The process is ongoing due to still there is no DCM associating the Moratorium.
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In socio-economic terms, incomes derived from NWFP comprise over 30% of the main forest products in country;
Forestry sector provides a considerable employment (formal and informal);
Country facing loss of forest resources (consumption exceeds annual possibility);
High value timber used for firewood (economic loss);
Informal market impedes intervention by state structures and disorient the market dynamics;

**CONCLUSIONS**

- Provision of alternative resources for heating;
- Improvement of plantations with speed growth species for firewood;
- Assessment of existing potentials of pastures through inventories conducted at local level, taking into account the respective ownership rights;
- Increase of utilization of pastures through improvement of infrastructure.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
Improvement of access to market information;
Provision and dissemination of market information by government based on objective and accurate research;
Formalization of the market of forestry sector;
Increase of competitive advantages of NWFP in international markets.
Planning process in forestry with special accent to private forests in Macedonia

02-05.07.2016 year Zabljak Montenegro
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Introduction

- Forestry is integrated part of rural development
- Private forests are 10% from the total area of forests in Macedonia
- More than 60,000 private forest owners with more than 220,000 private forest parcels.
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Management of forests

- Management of forests in Macedonia is regulated by the Forest law
- Forest ownership by the Forest law is recognized as state and private
- The planning, management and protection of forests in Macedonia are matters of public interest
- 1979 when the last forest inventory in Macedonia was conducted

Planning documents

- Management plans (MP)
- Program for management of forests (PMF)
- Annual plan for management of forests
Adoption of Management plans (MP) is regulated by law, but...

- Criteria for management of private forests
- Harvesting permit in private forests

Forest management of private forests can be done by: Management plans, programs for management or criteria for management of private forests

Preparation of MP’s and PMF’s is obligation of the forest owners (from 10 to 30 ha for PMF’s and above 30 ha for MP’s) these plans are payed by the forest owners and should be approved by the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management.
The issue of management of private forests is appearing in communication and cooperation with the PE, and also responsible for issuing the permits for harvest and transport document for the timber harvested in private forests.

In the process of preparation and adoption of MP’s, the private forest owners are not consulted at all.

More than 60,000 private forest owners with... 

Conclusions

lot of envisaged silvicultural measures are not in accordance with the interests of private forest owners...reason...

Private forests parcels are mainly part of the Forest units managed by the state. (Inside of a bigger forest areas there are small forest parcels scattered through the forest unit).
In the constitution of the R. Macedonia private property is one of the essential constitutional rights, but in the case with private forests this is not practiced fully.

But... It is all done according to the plans adopted by the PE and the state, not representing the reality on the ground and needs of private forest owners.

Conclusions

The procedure of preparation and adoption of the MP's is done without consultation of the general public and without consultation with private forest owners.

Based on that management decisions are made which are not in line with needs and requests of the private forest owners.
Thank you for your attention

Borce Bojcovski
Forestry MSc
secretary NAPFO Macedonia

bbojcovski@yahoo.com

Planning process in forestry with special accent to private forests in Macedonia
02-05.07.2016 year Žabljak Montenegro

Questions?

Montenegro - presentation on planning process in forestry
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PRIVATE FOREST PLANING
SYSTEM IN MONTENEGRO

Union of private forest owners of Montenegro
REFORD Meeting
Žabljak, Montenegro, July 3 - 4, 2016
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The basic principle of forestry planning is sustainability and multifunctionality. The planning levels and documents defined by the Forests Law Change (2015):

- National Forest Policy
- Strategy with the plan of forests and forestry development (Forestry Strategy)
- Forest development plan for ALL forest within a Forest Administration Unit (municipality or groups of municipalities)
- Long-term forest management plan (entitled as program) for state forests within a forest management unit
- Long-term forest management plan for private forest holdings
- Annual forest management plan for state forest (summarised at national level and given by Forest Administration Units and concession holders)
- Annual forest management plan for private forest (summarised at national level and given by Forest Administration Units and local forest district).

Long-term forest development planning for all forests

According to the Forest Law (2010), the forest development plan should be:

- Elaborated in accordance with the national Forestry strategy;
- Made for the forest area of one or more municipalities, for a period of 10 years;
- Assured by the Forest Administration and adopted by Government.

The contents of the forest development plan are defined by the rulebook.

No direct influence of forest owners / associations is enabled by the law (as this was the case between 2010 - 2015);

Only one example of such a plan has been elaborated until now (from 2010); none of other municipalities are covered by the forest development plan yet.
Long-term forest management planning for private forests

According to the Forest Law, the long-term forest management plan for private forest should / shall be:

- Made in accordance with the forest development plans;
- Made for individual forest parcels or groups of parcels, equal or larger than 5 hectares, for a period of ten years, at the request of the owner or association of the private forest owners;
- Assured by the Forest Administration, with participation of appurtenant forest owners or their associations;
- Adopted by the Forest Administration, with the previous approval of the Ministry responsible for forestry.

Until now, the rulebook on the content of the plan has not been adopted yet and also no experiences or good examples for it exist in MNE.

The stand inventories and elaboration of the plans is expected to be provided by qualified private service providers.

None of such plans have been elaborated for private forests yet (a few plans have indeed been elaborated for bigger private forest holdings, but based on the methodology for state forests).

Annual forest management planning for private forests

According to the Forest Law, the annual forest management plan for private forests should / shall be:

- Prepared on the basis of the requests for cutting of private forest owners and subjective assessments of forestry engineers and technicians who are responsible for professionally-technical services for private forests.
- Prepared by the Forest Administration, in cooperation with forest owners, and adopted not later than by 15 December (for the next year).
- The base for the co-financing of forest operations in private forest from the state budget.

The plan is actually only a simple review of requested and approved cuttings by forest owners (with information on ownership, cadastral parcels, area of forest and other land, and amount of cuttings in previous years), with corresponding summaries of at national, regional and local level.

Based on the annual forest management plans, marking of trees for felling (in private and state forests) is performed by the Forest Administration.
Conclusions

- Forest development planning system for private forests is the same as for state forests (includes all forests, by municipalities), but is not implemented yet;
- Consequently, there is no any reliable information on the private forest condition on the local level and particularly not on forest holdings (only national forest inventory exists from 2010);
- The forest management planning system now differs between state and private forests, while it was the same (after 2010) until change of the Forest Law (in 2015); the main reason is that the joint (state and private) forest management planning could not be implemented (mainly because of lack of budget funds);
- Long-term forest management plans for private forest are not obligatory any more: they should be elaborated by Forest Administration on the request of forest owners / associations (but there is currently no budget funds available);
- The only plans which are steadily available for private forests are actually the annual forest management plans, which serve also as the base for co-financing of forest operations from the state budget (however, currently there is no budget founds available).

Recommendations

- The Forest Administration should assure forest development plans with appurtenant inventories in order to assure corresponding planning framework (also) for private forest!
- Corresponding participation of the private forest owners / associations should be assured in the process of elaboration of the development plans as well as annual forest management plans!
- The Forest Administration should assure preparation of long-term forest management plans for small private forest holdings or associated holdings, which are requested by the forest owners / associations!
- Content of the forest management plans - to be prescribed by the rulebook should be appropriately adapted to the forest holdings’ needs and be as simple as possible, based on good foreign examples! Such pilot forest plan could even be jointly tested for selected forest holding(s), possibly under support of CNVP.
- Corresponding budget funds should be assured for planning in private forests!

Annex 5: Presentation on Producer groups (example from Albania& Kosovo)

Kosovo – presentation on producer groups
Woman in private forestry
Producer Groups

Blerina Hoxha
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Woman section in:
1. Istog
2. Novoberde
3. Junik
4. Gjakove
5. Suharek
6. Shrepe
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Establishment of Producer Groups

Novobërdë
Junik
Gjakovë

The importance of creating producer groups is to offer the opportunity for better access in taking information regarding cultivation, collection, marketing and market of NTFP

Create job opportunities even in rural areas
Create access to different regions
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Support producer groups with new nurseries of raspberries in Gjakovë and Novobërdë
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NAPFO with the support of CNVP Kosovo is providing different trainings for producer groups.

- Trainings provided for woman producer groups are:
  - Techniques of collection, drying, cultivation, marketing of selling of NTFP.
  - Processing of forest fruits
  - Effective communication etc.
Exchange of experiences in cultivation of strawberry and raspberry in Ferizaj
Study visit of woman group in Shkodër/Albania - June 2013

- Learning from practices in region
- Cultivation and collection of medical herbs (sherebela/salvia officinalis) in forestry areas in Shkodra region from producer groups

CNVP and NAPFO has signed the agreement with Company AgroProdukt in Istog.

- The Company will offer trainings to producer groups and will offer the nurseries in order to give the opportunity to these groups to cultivate some of medical herbs and will have contract for five (5 years) between producer group and company.
- Provide nurseries for cultivation of bio products as: Mullaga e zezë (malva sylvestris), kamomili (matricaria chamomillia), sherbela (Salvia officinalis), aguliqja (primula veris) etc.
The issue of property to be solved (the right of woman ownership)

- Education and capacity building (awareness, experiences and learning from practices and services)
- Involvement of woman in the existing associations (producer groups)
- Promotion and exchange of successful models
- Promotion of organic products and approach to the market (in all levels)
- Information on market

Support on forming and strengthening of woman groups

- Strengthening of politic actions in increasing simulative masses as: BE funds, subvention schemes from the Government, payment for environment protection etc.

- Participation of woman in preparation of management plans and action plans in forestry areas.

- Motivation for woman groups:
  - New job Opportunities
  - Financial support schemes
  - Capacity building for qualitative products
Thank you for your attention

Albania – presentation on producer groups
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ORGANIZIMI I PRODHUESEVE:
Formimi dhe Menaxhimi
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Roli i Federatave / Shoqatave

- Fuqizimi ne nivel organizativ
- Organizimi i Komunitetit
- Gender dhe fuqizimi i pjesemarrejes se grave
- Menaxhimi i qendrueshem i burimeve natyrore
- Edukimi

Identifikimi dhe perfshirja e prodhuesve/anetareve ne planifikim, zbatim, mirembajtje, si dhe menaxhimi te burimeve natyrore dhe programeve te zhvillimit
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Ata mund te **artikulojne** ne menyre te qarte nevojat e tyre, te **organizojne** sherbime te ndryshme ne perfitim te tyre, si lende te pare, kredi, transport, **akses** ne informacion dhe ofrues te sherbimeve te ndryshme dhe ….nese eshte e nevojshme, **aktivizohen** si grup per te lobuar per te drejtat e tyre dhe perfimiresim te politikave te caktuara.

Kur prodhuesit bashkohen...

Ata mund te **artikulojne** ne menyre te qarte nevojat e tyre, te **organizojne** sherbime te ndryshme ne perfitim te tyre, si lende te pare, kredi, transport, **akses** ne informacion dhe ofrues te sherbimeve te ndryshme dhe ….nese eshte e nevojshme, **aktivizohen** si grup per te lobuar per te drejtat e tyre dhe perfimiresim te politikave te caktuara.
Cfare eshte nje grup prodhuesish?

Nje grup prodhuesish eshte ai grup me interesa dhe shqetesime specifike, me nje strukture te caktuara, antaresim formal, statut dhe funksione te miratuara dhe me nje grup rrregullash te detajuara.
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**PRODUKTET PYJORE NGA PYJET & KULLOTAT KOMUNALE**
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CILAT JANE KARAKTERISTIKAT E NJE GRUPI PRODHUESISH

• Dinamik dhe fleksibil, me norma dhe procedura operimi.
• Me objektiva te qarta afatshkurtra dhe afatgjata dhe plan veprimi te detajuara.
• Funksionimi nepermjet anetaresimit dhe pageses se anetaresise
• Demokraci nepermjet zgjedhjeve te regullta
• Transaksione transparente
• Kapacitet organizativ per stabilitet dhe qendrueshmen.
• Bashkepunim dhe rrjetezim me organizata te tjera prodhuesish.
• Lidership

Pse organizim ne Grupe Prodhuessish?

• Prodhuessit e organizuar mund te influencojne politikat dhe te kerojne sherbime te permiresuara.
• Prodhuessit e organizuar mund te marrin pjese ne procese te vendinmarjes dhe aktivitete konkrete.
• Sistemi i sherbimeve behet me efektiv dhe me i pergjegjshem.
• Ata mund te arrijne tregjet dhe teknologjine me te fundit.
• Mund te perfshihen ne aktivitete edukuese dhe promovuese.
Pse organizim ne Grupe Prodhesish?

- Aftesim i prodhuesve te organizohen per zhvillimin e aktiviteteve te ndryshme dhe menaxhimin ne burimeve
- Analize dhe gjetje e zgjidhjeve per problemet e prodhuesve
- Me shume sherbime u ofrohen prodhuesve nga nje burim i vetem.
- Ofrimi i nje mjedisi te pershtatshem per informim dhe bashkepunim.
Llojet e Organizatave te Prodhuesve

- Organizata te prodhuesve te orientuara nga burimet
- Organizata te prodhuesve te orientuara nga tregu

Aktivitetet e Organizatave te Prodhuesve

- Menaxhimi i Aktiviteveve
- Menaxhimi i Mjedisit
- Menaxhimi i Makinerive
- Menaxhimi i prodhimit (prodhimi kolektiv)
- Menaxhimi i te mirave materiale te perbashketa
- Blerja e lendes se pare
- Marrje kredie ne menyre kolektive
- Menaxhimi i shitjeve te produkteve
- Keshillim I prodhuesve
- Trajnim I prodhuesve
Hapat per krijimin e Organizatave te Prodhuesve

1. Te kuptuarit e nevojave te komunitetit te nje ose me shume fshatrave
2. Identifikimi i Liderave ne Komunitet
3. Komunikimi me liderat e identifikuar dhe kerkimi i bashkepunimit nga agjensi/organizata te tjera.
4. Asistimi i liderave te komunitetit per te organizuar takime me komunitetin
5. Percaktimi / emerimi i liderit te grupit per te krijuar grupin e prodhuesve
6. Kriimi i nje strukture organizative per Grupin e prodhuesve
7. Zhvillimi i menaxhimit te Grupit te prodhuesve nepermjet edukimit
8. Organizimi per aktivitete konkrete
9. Zbatimi i projekteve te planifikuara
10. Monitorim dhe Vleresim i progresit te Grupive Prodhuese
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Hapat per Planifikimin e Menaxhimit me pjesemarrje

Te kuptuarit e situates
   Identifikimi i problemeve/ mundesive
      Zhvillimi i zgjidhjeve
         Zhvillimi i nje Plani
            Zbatimi
               Rishikimi dhe Reflektimi
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Suksesi i Organizatave te Prodhuesve...

- Njohja nga institucione te ndryshme
- Njohja ne politikat e Qeverise
- Fokus në aktivitete të gjëndërimit të të ardhurave
- Aftesi të anetareve
- Perfijtë e ndjeshme të anetareve
- Mbeshtetja zyrtare ne aktivitete te ndryshme
- Përquasje me pjesëmarrje
- Marredhjen e ndershembulli me individe dhe organizata
- Lidhja me programe të tjera
- Marredhjen korrekte brenda grupit
- Forcimi i kapaciteteve te prodhuesve

---

FORMAT E ORGANIZIMIT TE GRUPEVE

**NR.**

**GF.**

**FR.**

**RF.**

**M.**

**S.**

**H.**

**B.**

**SB.**

**BB.**

**SH.**

**BO.**

**Q.**

**A.**

**TS.**

**SH.**

**PP.**

**FK.**

**GRUP INFORMAL**

Forme organizimi per prodhuesit në fazat e para të organizimit

**SHBB**

Biznes i krijuar dhe menaxhuar në bashkuprin mëdha prodhues

**SHQATA**

Bashkuprin jo fitim pruses per arritjen e një qellimi

**SHPPK SI GRUP PRODHUESHE**

Trijshëm, informacion, asistencë teknike, Marketing dhe Promocijën, si grup prodhuesh
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Bordi i Drejtoreve (BD) 
Menaxhimi & Stafi 
Kontabiliteti & Financa 
Administrata 
Sektori i biznesit: 
- Kontratat 
- Magazini
- Perpunimi
- Shitje, etj
Anetaret
KOOPERATIVAT

SHPPK dhe grupet prodhuese
Federatat 
SHPKK 
Grunet prodhuese informale 
Tregetare 
Anetaret
Opsion 1: Grupet prodhuese informale bashkupunojnë me SHPPK. Shitja behet nga grupet prodhuese
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SHPKK dhe Grupet Prodhuese te Regjistruar

Opsioni 2: Grupe prodhuese te regjistruar bashkupunojnë me SHPKK; Shtja behet nga grupi prodhuas.

SHPKK dhe Organizata Umbrelle

Opsion 3: Organizata Umbrelle e grupave prodhuase bashkupunon me SHPKK; Marketing behet nga Organizata Umbrelle.
Opsion 4: SHPKK si Organizate Umbrelle e cila zhvillon dhe aktivitetet e marketingut dhe ofron shembine tek anetaret e saj.

Opsion 5: Federata e perfshin direk te aktiviteze biznesi nepermjet strukturave te saj.
Rekomandime per Grupet prodhuese

- Zgjedhja e modelit Organizativ
- Forcimi Organizativ
- Krijimi i rrjeteve dhe marredheneve midis grupve prodhuese dhe aktoreve kryesore.
- Zhvillimi i mundesive te biznesit
- Forcimi i menaxhimit te qendrueshem te pyjeve

Rekomandime per SHPKK

- Qartesimi i rolit dhe pozicionit te SHPKK
- Zhvillimi Organizativ
- Menaxhimi i qendrueshem i pyjeve
- Zhvillimi i zinxhirit te vlerave te biomases
1. Antarësim vulinetar bazuar ne besim reciprok
2. Pjesemarrje ne vendimmarrje
3. Funksionim i pavarur
4. Edukim, Trajnim dhe shqerndorje informacioni
5. Bashkëpunimi ndermjet prodhuesve

5 HAPA PER TE ARRITUR QELLIMIN
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Konkluzione:

- Organizata te qendrueshme drejtojne zhvillimin
- Strategjite duhet te perfshijne Grupet Prodhuese
- Agjensite Publike dhe Private si dhe OJF-te duhet te perfshijne edhe Grupet Prodhuese.
- Departamentet qeveritare duhet te luajne nje rol mbeshtetes ne formimin dhe menaxhimin e grupeve prodhuese.
- Grupet prodhuese duhet te rrisin kapacitetet e tyre ne menyre te vazhdueshme
Working together to grow a canopy of trees providing home, shelter, food, a livelihood as well as a place to wander

CNVP, a The Netherlands based foundation, is a legacy organisation of SNV in the Balkans. Established through a legal demerger, CNVP will continue the SNV forestry and rural development programme in the Balkans and beyond.

CNVP envisions:

- Local communities achieving their own development goals;
- Maximising the production and service potential of forests through Sustainable Forest Management and locally controlled Natural Resource Management;
- Forests contributing to equitable local economic development supporting rural livelihoods;
- Forests contributing to wider societal interests and values including biodiversity conservation and wellbeing;
- Connecting natural values and people!

Connecting Natural Values & People

Tolakkerweg 68, 3739 JP,
Hollandsche Rading, The Netherlands