PRODJUS DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT 23: NGO & POLICY-MAKER INTERVIEW

This guide is for NGO and policy-maker (including government) level actors involved in timber harvesting and trading. This could involve any level of government and NGOS or industry associations that aim to influence policy.

Before starting the interview, be sure to:
- explain the purpose of the research to the respondent
- encourage them to speak from their own perspective (rather than their institution), distinguish/clarify especially for more controversial Q&As
- inform the respondent that her or his participation is voluntary
- inform the respondent how to contact you if they want to change their answers
- agree on anonymity level as:
  - completely anonymous
  - name anonymous, but organisational affiliation not anonymous
  - no anonymity
- Note the interview code based on the coding schedule
- Ask how much time the respondent has
- Gain permission to proceed and note that permission has been granted.

This instrument is a guide. Each interview should touch on each section as appropriate. Questions may have the following markings:
* = Always Ask
// = related to another question. [000/] = related questions follow [/000] = dependent on previous question.
[000] = root question number for coding reference

NOTE: Use the name of the local FLEGT/ EUTR-related programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Questions</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Likely variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A GOVERNANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- NORMAL / ABNORMAL TIMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* What are most important changes in forest management and governance [cultivation, harvesting, processing, manufacturing, policies], in the last 10 years? What drove these changes? [078]</td>
<td>Historical reflection on important changes - this will highlight the key issues that are important to the respondent either inhibiting or enabling their ability to benefit from timber.</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional&lt;br&gt;Claim - other - technocratic&lt;br&gt;Claim - other - functional or efficiency&lt;br&gt;Claim - formation&lt;br&gt;Globalisation&lt;br&gt;Governance - FLEGT&lt;br&gt;Governance - FSC&lt;br&gt;Governance - Other State&lt;br&gt;Governance - Other non-State&lt;br&gt;Land tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could make changes to the way that timber is [cultivated, harvested, traded or processed], what would they be? Why?</td>
<td>Aspirations can be important for understanding claims. The question evokes responses that reveal the respondent's hopes for an ideal world in which claims are satisfied.</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is 'legal' timber and wood for the market?</td>
<td>Different actors are likely to have different impressions of level of importance of illegal and legal. This will be an interesting contrast for understanding justice.</td>
<td>Legality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is 'illegal' timber and wood products for the market?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For who/ who benefits? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does legal mean for your institution in relation to timber / wood products?</td>
<td>Question gests at definitions of legality. The contrasts by different type of actors will be interesting and we will highlight typologies of definitions by actor type. [prompt for personal or institutional]</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are illegal timber/ wood products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about your own perspective - how might it differ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do the definition(s) come from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Are changes in forest management and timber use more extreme now than they have been over the past several decades? | Looking for changes from “business as usual” or “normal” that could indicate changes in the ways justice norms are practiced or implemented. Could be “more frequent” or “more dramatic”. | Change over time 
Corruption / malfeasance 
Environment - climate change 
Environment - deforestation 
Environment - sustainability 
Governance - FLEGT 
Governance - FSC 
Governance - Other State 
Governance - Other non-State 
Market- challenges 
Market- competition 
Market- fairness 
Participation/ exclusion 
Claim - other - generational |
| Are there ‘global norms’ that apply to forest resources? | Fairness of outside influence. Country of interview/ primary concern. | Globalisation 
Governance - FLEGT 
Notions of Justice- recognition 
Notions of Justice- distribution 
Notions of Justice- representation 
Claim- formation |
| -- RUL**ES (In timber exporting countries respondent is most familiar with - ask them to specify; some questions will instead pertain to the EUTR) | Used for comparative analysis by actor type to understand what actors perceive the rules in what ways. | Rules- transparency 
Rules- adequacy |
<p>| In timber exporting countries you are most familiar with, which best represents your view of the rules governing people’s access to timber resources: (a) Too restrictive, there are too many rules that affect people’s livelihoods (b) About the right level of rules (c) Too lenient: if harvesting continues like this, the sustainability of the forest will be threatened (d) Too unclear: I don’t feel I know about them | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that forests in the Global South are currently managed in a way that will leave future generations with sufficient access to forest resources—both timber and non-timber? Why? Examples of some countries or places where this is happening?</td>
<td>Generational and sustainability claims are important for understanding the basis of claims in fairness to the future.</td>
<td>Environment - sustainability Governance - FLEGT Governance - FSC Governance - Other State Governance - Other non-State Limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In those countries you’re most familiar with, who sets [forest management or timber product trade] rules?</td>
<td>Getting at authority and perceptions who has control over access to the forest or resource trade (Gaining access).</td>
<td>Authority Governance - FLEGT Governance - FSC Governance - Other State Governance - Other non-State Market- fairness Actor mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[//017] Who is involved in setting and enforcing [forest management and timber processing or trading] rules? Are certain people invited or excluded from the process?</td>
<td>Looking for mention of authority figures and actors excluded from the decision making process. Primary purpose of question is actor mentions or gaining access.</td>
<td>Legitimacy - procedural Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution Notions of Justice- representation Rules- defiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[//018] Why do specific people have the ability to set and enforce [forest management/timber trade and processing] rules? Why should people listen to them?</td>
<td>Looking for how respondents legitimise or dismiss authorities based on specific claims and notions of justice.</td>
<td>Communication Corruption / malfeasance Legitimacy - outcome/ effect Legitimacy - procedural Limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens when someone breaks the [forest management/timber product processing or trading] rules? Are the consequences fair?</td>
<td>Implications for breaking the rules and claims of fairness for consequences are important for understanding justice claims.</td>
<td>Rules- Penalties- customary Rules- Penalties- statutory Rules- Penalties- other Rules- compliance Rules- enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Authority/ Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do people follow the [forest management / timber processing and trading] rules?  
- Do most people follow the rules?  
- Why do people not follow the rules? | Understand the importance/ weight of the rules and whether the benefits outweigh the costs of following the rules. This also indicates the legitimacy of authority. | Corruption / malfeasance  
Legitimacy - outcome/ effect |
| What kinds of rules are in place there around cultivating, collecting, trading or processing timber or wood products?  
- do these rules apply differently to different people? (describe)  
- do you understand these rules?  
- do you think other people understand the rules? | A general idea about the 'rules' as people see them. Rules (institutions) can be the basis of justice claims as either justifying the status quo, or reflecting it. | Rules- transparency  
Rules- adequacy |
| Do you know what [FLEG/T/FSC] is?  
[if yes] How would you describe FLEG/T/FSC?  
[ If Yes] How do you think [FLEG/T/FSC] have broadly influenced forest management and governance? | This question both acts as a filter for following questions and gets and idea of what people's perspective on FLEG / FSC is. They may describe in terms of market access, governance, or environmental protection, or others. | Environment - deforestation  
Governance - FLEG  
Governance - FSC  
Definition  
Market- relations |
| How effectively do [FLEG/T/FSC] address the most important forest issues today? Example?  
Which of those issues remain today [ie the ones that FLEG/T/FSC were unable to address]? Might FLEG still have an impact on these? | Overall assessment of FLEG/T/FSC as addressing most important issues. This is a nice closing question for the section and an effective transition to the next section. | Change over time  
Environment - climate change  
Environment - deforestation  
Environment - sustainability  
Globalisation  
Governance - FLEG  
Governance - FSC  
Land tenure  
Land use  
Legality  
Market- fairness |
| Do you think that [FLEG/T/ FSC] will be more effective in addressing illegal logging than logging bans, better | Comparing to the past way of doing things will indicate how innovative | Corruption / malfeasance  
Governance - FLEG  
Governance - FSC |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Relevant Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of logging concessions and illegal logging, or other</td>
<td>FLEGT is and how justice claims compete with one another.</td>
<td>Governance - Other State Governance - Other non-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mechanisms of combatting illegal logging? How, why? [074]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think that [the government/ EU] preferred to create [FLEGT]</td>
<td>Did they not want to prefer one group over another? Were they</td>
<td>Accountability - upward Authority Governance - FLEGT Governance - FSC Legality Reputation Limitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than supporting existing third-party certification, like FSC?</td>
<td>reclaiming the conversation to occur in bi-lateral spaces? Did they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[075]</td>
<td>they think that the scale was limited? Were there claims that the EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and nation states were making that they could do and FSC cannot? One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aspect here is that while FSC is affected by a crowded dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>space with SFI and PEFC and so on, the EU is not (or maybe it is in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comparison to the US, Canadian and Australian trade regulations) - or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at very least the compulsory import-export laws embedded with a VPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reduce the space for competition within the EU markets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might or are VPAs affect national governments, for instance in terms</td>
<td>Changing authorities relating to national sovereignty and authority</td>
<td>Authority Change over time Claim - other - constitutional Claim - other - technocratic Globalisation Governance - FLEGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of …(perceptions of their authority?) [079]</td>
<td>over timber industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways has [FLEGT] reshaped the authority of state as well as</td>
<td>Authority changes, and getting at issues of globalisation and the</td>
<td>Authority Change over time Governance - FLEGT Forest management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-state actors in forest product trading? [051]</td>
<td>influence of local authorities and how they have changed leading up to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLEGT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEGT’s role in changing governance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Authority Governance - FLEGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which other forest governance institutions and organizations have become more influential due to FLEGT? Have any become weaker? Why?</td>
<td>Participation of non-state actors is variable by country and different actors are likely to have different perceptions on the extent to which non-state actors were involved in the formulation of FLEGT.</td>
<td>Actor mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much influence did non-State actors have in the formulation of [FLEGT]? In the VPA process? Which were included and which were not, why? How did they influence (examples); or how were they excluded from influencing and why? [Probe for FSC and other third-party certifiers]</td>
<td>Comparison of FLEGT and other forest governance innovations will pit claims of justice and legitimacy against one another. May require teasing out in conversation.</td>
<td>Legitimacy - procedural Participation/ exclusion Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do different forest governance innovations, such as FLEGT, REDD+, FSC, PEFC and others influence one another? From what kinds of global norms do they base their legitimacy? How are their claims of legitimacy different from one another? How do these differences in 'legitimacy', affect the goal of sustainable, and ethical, forest management? Does the competition amongst them serve the overarching goals?</td>
<td>Looking for specific market effects- eg difficulty to source or sell products, price changes, volume changes and so on.</td>
<td>Change over time Governance - FSC Governance - Other State Governance - Other non-State Market- fairness Market- relations Limitation Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* [/*032=YES] What do you think recent changes related to [FLEGT/FSC] in timber markets mean for the overall timber/wood furniture market? (e.g. EUTR) - Will it improve sales, sustainability, equal distribution of revenues, land tenure security? Do you think that any of these will get worse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### - Why?

| What [would happen / would have happened] if [country] [did not / doesn't] sign the VPA? [085] | This question both acts as a filter for following questions and gets and idea of what people’s perspective on FLEGT / FSC is. They may describe in terms of market access, governance, or environmental protection, or others. | Claim - other - technocratic  
Claim- other - functional or efficiency  
Governance - FLEGT  
Market- challenges  
Market- competition  
Market- fairness  
Market- relations |
|---|---|---|
| [//032=YES]  
Which forest governance institutions and organizations have become more influential due to FLEG?  
Have any become weaker? Why? [045] | FLEG’s role in changing governance structures is important for understanding who is making what claims. [lease out level of government if possible] | Authority  
Governance - FLEGT  
Actor mention  
Forest management |
| [//032=YES]  
Who is accountable to whom under FLEG processes?? Do these accountabilities seem appropriate to you? If yes, why? If no, why not? [046] | Accountability is a key concept in power relations and this question will evoke responses that indicate perceptions of accountability. | Accountability- downward  
Accountability- upward  
Authority  
Governance - FLEGT |
| [//032=YES]  
How does FLEG assert its role in the timber trade? How is this understood differently by different actors involved in timber and wood furniture trade? (Optionally: how does this compare with US Lacey Act, FSC or PEFC?) [050] | Perception of assertion of role and dominance is important for understanding how institutions vie for legitimacy and from whom the seek it. | Accountability- downward  
Accountability- upward  
Authority  
Communication  
Governance - FLEGT  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Legitimacy - outcome/ effect  
Claim- formation |
| [//032=YES]  
In what ways has [FLEG] reshaped the authority of state as well as non-state actors in forest product trading? [051] | Authority changes, and getting at issues of globalisation and the influence of local authorities and how they have changed leading up to FLEG. | Authority  
Change over time  
Governance - FLEGT  
Forest management |
| In what ways have trading relationships among timber and wood furniture product traders changed with the [introduction of FLEGT] or in the last 10 years? |
| Looking at how altered governance structures affect governance through trading relationships. |
| Change over time |
| Corruption / malfeasance |
| Governance - FLEGT |
| Governance - FSC |
| Governance - Other State |
| Governance - Other non-State |
| Legitimacy - outcome/ effect |
| Loyalty |
| Reputation |
| Trust |
| Market- relations |
| How would you contrast that with other influences on forest governance, such as FSC or PEFC? |
| IF //032=YES |
| How would you contrast that with other influences on forest governance, such as FSC or PEFC? |
| [053] |
| In what ways have different types of actors [specify if appropriate] had to adapt their practices in reaction to FLEGT? |
| Adaptation indicates a need to change, which can mean the response to perceived injustices. |
| Adaptation to change |
| Choice |
| Financial |
| Governance - FLEGT |
| Governance - FSC |
| Governance - Other State |
| Governance - Other non-State |
| Alternative activities |
| Limitation |
| Can you share a good example of what works, and what doesn’t, to respond to FLEGT? |
| Why do some actors succeed and why have others struggled? [Prompt for different types of forest governance actors: village level harvester, logging companies, saw mill owners, timber traders, furniture factories, furniture traders, retailers, policy makers, NGOs (and any others you want to add).] |
| [055] |
| How does (or will) the involvement of a supranational governance institution, such as the EU (specifically as pertains to the EUTR), affect the ability of timber and wood furniture actors to make decisions about markets? How is this different than before FLEGT VPA negotiations started. |
| Whether or not FLEGT restricts in some way the sovereignty or decision making capacity of other actors and what the effect of that is. |
| Change over time |
| Choice |
| Corruption / malfeasance |
| Environment - deforestation |
| Governance - FLEGT |
| Governance - FSC |
| Governance - Other State |
| Governance - Other non-State |
| Legitimacy - procedural |
| Loyalty |
| Market- challenges |
| Market- competition |
| Market- fairness |
| Participation/ exclusion |
| Reputation |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What would happen if the country did not sign the VPA?                   | This is a hypothetical question that builds the scenario of the country not joining the VPA. The answers will be interesting to understand the effect of the VPA or perceived potential effect of the VPA. | Change over time  
Choice  
Corruption / malfeasance  
Environment - deforestation  
Governance - FLEGT  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Legitimacy - procedural  
Loyalty  
Market- challenges  
Market- competition  
Market- fairness  
Participation/ exclusion  
Reputation  
Trust  
Market- relations |
| How are workers in different countries and at different points of production (foresters, furniture workers etc) affected by FLEGT? | Specifically targeting the effects on workers and labour relations in case it has not come up already. | Corruption / malfeasance  
Environment - climate change  
Environment - deforestation  
Environment - sustainability  
Governance - FLEGT  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Notions of Justice- recognition  
Notions of Justice- distribution  
Notions of Justice- representation  
Actor mention |
| What are the advantages and disadvantages (to different actors) of state-led legality verification schemes (such as FLEGT, the US Lacey Act and others) compared with market-based non-state solutions such as FSC and PEFC? | Comparing FLEGT TO FSC | Governance - FLEG  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Land tenure  
Land use  
Legality  
Legitimacy - outcome/ effect  
Legitimacy - procedural  
Loyalty  
Market- fairness  
Notions of Justice- recognition |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Linked Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the transaction costs of co-ordinating [FLEG] at different</td>
<td>Comparing transaction costs to REDD+ gives an idea of where the two sit against each other in terms of burdens against specific actors.</td>
<td>Financial governance - FLEG, Financial governance - Other State, Financial governance - Other non-State, Land tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels versus streamlining with other ongoing processes such as REDD+?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any rationale for a single national institution to address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple governance processes dealing with forests?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[062]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think about FSC/FLEG? Why?</td>
<td>Starts to get a general opinion about FLEG/FSC and to understand</td>
<td>Governance - FLEG, Governance - FSC, Governance - Other State, Governance - Other non-State, Notions of Justice- recognition, Notions of Justice- distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Do you agree or disagree with it?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you interested/ disinterested in FLEG/FSC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[033]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[034]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is [FLEG/FSC] more fair to some people than others?</td>
<td>Perceptions of equality and how it affects some actors differently than others. This will be key to understanding how claims are based and how the claims of others are perceived or refuted.</td>
<td>Governance - FLEG, Governance - FSC, Market- fairness, Limitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What about for your business, is it fair?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Why or why not?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[035]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How may other actors’ perspective on what is fair or not fair in terms of [FLEGT, FSC and forest management] differ to yours?</td>
<td>This question looks at perceptions of the claims of others and is important to understand perceptions about how claims are made.</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional Claim - other - technocratic Claim- other - functional or efficiency Market- fairness Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution Notions of Justice- representation Actor mention Conflicting perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do others communicate their ideas of what is fair in terms of [FLEGT, FSC and forest product management]?</td>
<td>Communication of ideas is important for understanding how claims are formed, to whom they are made, and on what basis they are made.</td>
<td>Communication Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution Notions of Justice- representation Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any [the same type of actor] who agrees or disagrees with your thoughts about [FSC and FLEGT] being fair? On what basis do they disagree? How do you try to convince them?</td>
<td>Looking for alliances or justification through the agreement or disagreement of others.</td>
<td>Communication Governance - FLEG T Governance - FSC Market- fairness Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution Notions of Justice- representation Conflicting perspectives Alliance / coalition Conflict Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways is [FLEGT/FSC/ forest management] fair and in what ways is it not fair? - To whom do these different levels of fairness apply? - Why do you think they apply differently?</td>
<td>This question is useful following [035] because it probes more deeply into the specific ways that FLEGT/FSC is fair or unfair, substantiating claims.</td>
<td>Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution Notions of Justice- representation Conflicting perspectives Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/<em>032=YES</em>/ Why do you think [FLEGT/FSC] have adopted some of notions of 'fairness', and not others? How did this (version of fair) come about?</td>
<td>The effect, at several levels, of the uptake of claims. Inevitably some will be taken up and others not- this questions tries to dissect.</td>
<td>Claim - other - constitutional Claim - other - technocratic Claim- other - functional or efficiency Notions of Justice- recognition Notions of Justice- distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Notions of Justice</th>
<th>Resource and output and how different organizations respond to conflicting claims of legitimacy. This is important in understanding how claims are taken up or not by different institutions and the perceptions of others about how different organisations defend or assert their claims. [may need an example]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - What does it mean for your personally?                              | Notions of Justice- representation | Authority  
Governance - FLEGT  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Legitimacy - outcome/ effect  
Claim- formation  
Communication of legitimacy is important for understanding how claims are formed and argued. This question gets at how others perceive the claims of the EU. |
| - What does it mean for your business?                                 | Participation/ exclusion |  
Conflicting perspectives  
Limitation  
Communication of legitimacy is important for understanding how claims are formed and argued. This question gets at how others perceive the claims of the EU. |
| - What does it mean for other people, who are not included in [your activity]? |                     |                                                                                                                                  |

[041]

[//032=YES] Among the various companies, communities and governments involved in the timber trade and wood furniture processing, which of them stand to gain and lose the most from FLEGT? What are the types of gains or losses? How do different actors respond to the losses?  
[047]

How does the [EU/FLEGT] try to make itself seem legitimate? Does this differ to strategies by groups like [FSC and PEFC] to also appear legitimate? What arguments do they use to assert their position to make decisions or set rules about timber governance and trade?  
[048]

How do [FSC and FLEG] actors respond differently, or are they likely to respond, to multiple and often conflicting legitimacy and accountability claims? Can you think of a time that actors involved in FSC and/or FLEGT had to defend themselves (and their legitimacy)?[049]

From Black 2008 in which she asks how different organisations respond to conflicting claims of legitimacy. This is important in understanding how claims are taken up or not by different institutions and the perceptions of others about how different organisations defend or assert their claims. [may need an example]  

Accountability- downward  
Accountability- upward  
Communication  
Corruption / malfeasance  
Governance - FLEGT  
Governance - FSC  
Governance - Other State  
Governance - Other non-State  
Legitimacy - outcome/ effect  
Conflicting perspectives  
Communication of legitimacy is important for understanding how claims are formed and argued. This question gets at how others perceive the claims of the EU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Notions of Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are the claims that people make different? What are the biggest gaps in understanding?</td>
<td>This is a broad question to get a sense of perception of how others understand justice. This is important to highlight groups with divergent views and also compare how some types of actors understand others' claims.</td>
<td>recognition, distribution, representation, Conflicting perspectives, Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you try to convince someone else that [FLEGT/FSC] is fair or not fair? OR Why do your supporters agree with your perspective?</td>
<td>Gets at the basis of claim making</td>
<td>Communication, Market- fairness, distribution, representation, Conflicting perspectives, Limitation, Claim- formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could (will) [FLEGT] affect other sustainable development initiatives related to land tenure security and indigenous people’s rights claims? Any examples you know of?</td>
<td>Understanding FLEGT in relation to other &quot;rights&quot; goals will evoke claims of justice and prioritisation to some extent. It will also show how supranational governance affects other rights-based initiatives and claims. [may need examples such as increased timber trading affecting conservation targets for example]</td>
<td>Environment - sustainability, Governance - FLEGT, Governance - FSC, Governance - Other State, Governance - Other non-State, Land tenure, Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are (will be) the implications of FLEGT on other sustainable development initiatives related to pro-poor market development?</td>
<td>Understanding FLEGT in relation to other &quot;rights&quot; goals will evoke claims of justice and prioritisation to some extent. It will also show how supranational governance affects other rights-based initiatives and claims.</td>
<td>Change over time, Governance - FLEGT, recognition, distribution, representation, Quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the effects of the timber markets on forests?</td>
<td>General question again on markets and forests.</td>
<td>Environment - deforestation, Environment - sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the interview, follow up with contact details for any actors mentioned.