

REVIEW REPORT

THE SECOND PHASE OF
THE FOREST CONSERVATION PROJECT

Prepared for IGES

by

The Peer Review Panel

16 July 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND

II. REVIEW SCOPE AND APPROACH

III. REVIEW OF THE FOREST CONSERVATION PROJECT – SECOND PHASE (MAIN FINDINGS)

- The Project's mission, strategy and priorities in the context of IGES' priorities and strategies;
- The quality and policy relevance of the Project plan;
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Project management;
- The quality and policy relevance of the Project's products
- Impacts on the stakeholders, of the Project's products and other related activities such as information outreach, multi-stakeholder dialogues and capacity building initiatives.

IV. REVIEW OF THE THIRD PHASE PROPOSAL OF THE FC PROJECT

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEX I. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE PANEL REVIEW

ANNEX II. MEETING AGENDA

**REPORT OF THE PEER REVIEW PANEL ON
THE SECOND PHASE OF THE FOREST CONSERVATION PROJECT OF IGES**

I. BACKGROUND

The Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), established in 1998, implementing policy-oriented research focusing on the Asia-Pacific region, has paid particular attention to environmental aspects related to climate policy; urban environmental management; forest conservation; environmental education; business and the environment and long-term perspective and policy integration through its strategic research work.

The Forest Conservation (FC) Project implemented its first phase from 1998 to 2001 with the aim to identify principle elements for sustainable forest management. The main outputs of the first phase included a structural analysis of forest destruction in the Asia-Pacific region; a review of participatory forest management policy; a review of timber trade policy; and a review of legal and administrative measures for forest conservation.

Following the completion of the first phase, the second phase of the FC Project was formulated to develop strategies for forest conservation and sustainable forest management in the three selected countries; Indonesia, Lao P.D.R and the Russian Far East. The specific objectives of the second phase were (i) to develop local guidelines for participation in forest management at the local level; (ii) to develop recommendations to ensure the effective application of international treaties on local participation in forest management at the national level; and (iii) to develop national guidelines for participation forest management. It was implemented from April 2001 to March 2004 and it produced

- (i) village action guidelines and district policy guidelines for Indonesia;
- (ii) village action guidelines and district policy guidelines for Laos;
- (iii) village action guidelines and district policy guidelines for Far East Russia;
- (iv) differences and commonalities of the studies of local participatory forest management in Indonesia, Laos, and Russia; and
- (v) national policy recommendations.

IGES issued the execution of a peer review of the second phase of the FC Project in April 2004. The three members of the Peer Review Panel were selected by IGES to carry out the review of the Project. The meeting of the Peer Review Panel was held at the IGES Headquarters, Hayama, Japan on 14-16 July 2004 with the assistance of the IGES Secretariat. The list of the members of the Review Panel and the agenda for the meeting are shown in Annex I and II.

This report summarises the review approach, key findings from the individual research team reviews and the overall conclusions and recommendations.

Figure 1. Location of the three target countries



II. REVIEW SCOPE AND APPROACH

The primary purpose of the review is to provide a concise analysis of the Forest Conservation Project– Phase II so as to point out the successful and unsuccessful outcomes, and to draw lessons that can be used to improve the third phase of the FC Project.

The scope and focus of the Peer Review Panel are specified in the instructions from IGES to the Peer Review Panel as follows:

- i The Project’s mission, strategy and priorities in the context of IGES’ priorities and strategies;
- ii The quality and policy relevance of Project plan;
- iii The effectiveness and efficiency of Project management;
- iv The quality and policy relevance of the Project’s products
- v Impacts on the stakeholders, of the Project’s products and other related activities such as information outreach, multi-stakeholder dialogues and capacity building initiatives.

Based on the terms of reference above, the work of the Panel was divided into three main tasks: (i) reviewing each of the four elements of research, (ii) synthesising the results of the research review, and (iii) preparing recommendations.

The Panel structured its work to consider the presentations on the outcomes of the five research subjects and the reports prepared by the Project. The Panel took note of the presentations, made by the Project leader, Prof. Dr. Inoue, on the structure and management of the Project and the outline of the Project research activities. It further took note of the presentations made by the Project team members on the main outcomes of each element of research.

After each presentation, there was extensive discussion on the appropriateness of the methodologies applied and the outputs, such as village action guidelines, local policy guidelines and national policy recommendations.

III. REVIEW OF THE FOREST CONSERVATION PROJECT – SECOND PHASE (MAIN FINDINGS)

The Panel noted that the Board of the Directors of IGES expressed a critical view on the methodologies and analytical work applied in the second phase of the FC Project, although it is appropriate to the scope of work of IGES and the Project's overall goal reflected actual problems faced by many developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region with regards sustainable forest management. It was recalled that the Board questioned the value and expected contributions of the outcomes of the Project that focused mainly on selected Project site-oriented guidelines, which could not be applicable to many other parts of the target countries and to other countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

During the review of the various aspects of the second phase of the FC Project, the Panel considered the following:

The Project's mission, strategy and priorities in the context of IGES' priorities and strategies

For IGES, the Forest Conservation Project is strategically important as it can contribute to international efforts, including the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), FAO, ITTO, and the Asia Forest Partnership, to curb deforestation and enhance sustainable forest management.

It would be worthwhile to draw attention to the fact that an alarming rate of deforestation has occurred in certain areas of the world, particularly in tropical forests such as those in Indonesia and in the boreal forests of Russia. In particular, tropical forests have become a global political issue in international negotiations leading to decisions likely to affect worldwide political and economic practices, following a scenario that is virtually the same for all environmental issues affecting the entire planet¹.

Many tropical countries in the Asia-Pacific region need policies on how and where to improve land-use allocation, and they need practical guidelines to ensure forest conservation at the local level. Therefore, the FC Project is important in providing practical policy recommendations to target countries drawing from practical examples and lessons learned from field research.

In general, the FC Project has made a positive contribution to the IGES objectives and related activities, although there are fundamental weaknesses in the methodologies and quality of the outputs.

¹ see Lamont C. Hampel, *Environmental Governance, The Global Challenge*, Washington, Island Press, 1996

It could be mentioned that the second phase of the FC Project provided the most practical ways to manage forest resources at the Project sites in the three target countries at the local level, but that the village action guidelines are limited to these selected areas and significant improvements to the local guidelines are required. Furthermore, the three case studies provide important experiences and information for policy improvements at the national level for the future.

The quality and policy relevance of Project plan (design)

The Panel noted that there were several weaknesses in the Project design. The problem analysis was insufficient. It did not identify the key issues of local participation in forest management, which should be addressed by the Project in the given time period and resources. Consequently, the three specific objectives of the Project were not clearly formulated. They were over ambitious and unclear about the essential results intended to be achieved by the Project.

The Project proposal did not precisely specify the intended outputs to result from the research. The Panel questioned whether the outputs of the Project were produced in accordance with the specific objectives. The process of developing the guidelines was also unclear, although stakeholder identification, consultations and commitment at the planning state form part of Project design. At the national level, it did not identify the key stakeholders in the target countries, even though the active involvement of the national forest department/authority was essential as one of the main collaborators with the Project. The participation of these groups at the national level would facilitate the development of national policies and strengthen the engagement of the participating public agencies.

The Panel noted that there is no requirement in Project proposals to specify indicators to measure the achievement of objectives and outputs. Experience suggests that a logical framework approach to Project design is valuable in measuring performance, process and results.

The effectiveness and efficiency of Project management

The Project was implemented by a full-time Project Manager and several experts assigned in relation to the target countries and approaches under the coordination of a part-time Project Leader. Besides this, the Project cooperated with many research collaborators, such as CSF, LIPI and the Ministry of Forestry in Indonesia, NUOL and the Department of Forestry in Lao PDR and ERI in Russia. However, the Panel felt that the Project team did not establish close working relationships with relevant regional and international organisations during Project implementation.

The Project had a Steering Committee for individual country study, to be instrumental in the implementation of each country study. It met twice; once in 2001 and for a second time in 2002. For the formulation of the guidelines and policy recommendations, a series of consultation meetings and two international workshops (the first in 2002 and the second in 2003) were held. However, the Panel noted that the two international workshops did not provide opportunity for a review of the guidelines and recommendations by relevant international experts since the main participants in the workshops were the Project team members and its collaborators.

The Panel noted that the comparative advantage of IGES in conducting the FC Project would be synergy with other professional researchers in IGES who specialise in global environmental issues, but the weakness is that the FC Project team does not have high enough research capacity to develop

innovative guidelines synthesising the vast volumes of information from many stakeholders, due to a limited number of professional staff members and limited experience in developing policy strategies. For instance, the role of the Project Leader, engaged in the Project on a part-time basis, was questioned during Project implementation.

The Project did experience difficulties in Project implementation due to the long-term sick leave of a full-time researcher and a research secretary.

As far as funding is concerned, the Project received the necessary inputs for its activities from IGES. It is worth mentioning that the second phase of the FC Project also received financial support amounting to 15,119,000 Japanese Yen from other sources to facilitate its research work.

It is difficult to quantify the overall cost efficiency due to the lack of a detailed budget in the Project plan. However, the considerable efforts made by the Project Leader to secure external funds make it possible to conclude that the implementation of the Project was efficient in general.

The quality and policy relevance of the Project's products

As indicated previously, given the lack of a logical framework in the original Project plan, the Panel had to rely purely on discussions with the Project team and the Project reports. The Project outputs included the following:

First, guidelines for Indonesia

The guidelines consist of (i) village action guidelines for five villages (Batu Majang, Mataliba, Engkuni-Pasek, Murara Jawa and Tanjung Jann) in West Kutai District, Indonesia, and (ii) West Kutai District policy guidelines for community participation in forest management.

In the village action guidelines, problems, suggested measures and external support needed were identified in relation to four main issues of local forest management: forest and land; village forest-related economy; village institution; and government policy.

The study provided valuable information related to forest conservation and management in the four villages. It was important to note that all the villages faced difficulties relating to land tenures and boundaries. There is a need to introduce income generation activities to provide sustainable income sources. Furthermore, it is important to develop harmonious relationships between villages, external forest users (i.e. forest concessionaires) and local governments.

The Panel felt that the measures suggested were neither soundly formulated nor focused. They appear to be problem-solving measures rather than the provision of a set of guidelines to strategically advise target audiences. What is more, they are simple statements and do not show the ways that the recommended measures should be actually be carried out.

For instance, one of the problems identified in the Government policy is the restriction of villagers' access to forest due to concessions for companies, and the associated recommendation is to propose that the concessionaires allow the local people land-use access within the concession area. This recommendation could result in illegal logging by local communities. It would be better to recommend the development of a forest management plan involving extensive discussions with community leaders and community members to negotiate access and use rights to the concession

forest. Thus, the forest management plan should include clear provisions for access and use rights to the concession forest.

There are no generalised village action guidelines for the promotion of village participation in forest management at the village level.

Second, guidelines for Laos.

Two research sites were selected based on forest conditions: one in a rich forest area in Savannarhet province and the other one in a degraded forest area in Oudomaxy Province.

Village Action Guidelines were elaborated under the title “village action guidelines for a protected area in Savannarhet province, Laos. The Guidelines cover (i) land use/border issues, (ii) livelihood, (iii) institution (regulation, management system, decision-making) and (iv) human relations (social capital). Each subject was elaborated by background, good example/important issues, external/internal factors, principles and recommended actions (for local people). In the local policy guidelines, recommended actions were designed for each district decision maker and/or Forest Section of the Province.

The content is rather general, descriptive for each village rather than analytical, and weak in the actions recommended. It appears that the guidelines were over loaded with non-essential components such as good example/important issues and external/internal factor, which should have been integrated in the background.

Overall, it appears that the elaboration of the village action guidelines and local policy guidelines provided valuable information on social-economic issues of the villages and districts concerned, but they did not lead to general guidelines that could be applied to other parts of Laos or other countries.

Third, Guidelines for Far East Russia

Research sites for this study were selected at three levels: Khabarovsky Krai, Lazo raion and two rural municipal formations (one in a depressed state and the other one under progressive development)

The study categorised a number of obstacles to the involvement of local population in forest management: legal obstacles; institutional obstacles; financial obstacles; communication obstacles; information obstacles; and social obstacles.

The elaborations on the measures recommended to involve local populations in forest management were made in the context of the above categorised obstacles. The elaborations were also arranged for each of the main stakeholders such as Khabarovsky Krai, Lazo raion, rural municipal formation, and others (parties, NGOs, enterprises and intuitions).

It was noted that this research provided measures for local district and rural municipal formations, which were formulated in a much more general form than the research in Laos or Indonesia. The Panel questioned why research in the three countries differed so much in terms of the methodologies applied and the presentation formats of the key issues or obstacles and the recommended measures, even though the three studies stemmed from just one Project.

Fourth, National Policy recommendations for Indonesia, Laos, and Far East Russia

This research was unsuccessful in developing national guidelines and even in developing national policy recommendations for local participation in forest management. In particular, the strategic elements identified for effective implementation of the measures in the target countries are very limited in scope and the actions they recommend are very weak. The Panel questioned the design and implementation of this sub-research since the activities conducted under this research did not contribute to the achievement of the sub-research. It is difficult to identify exactly what was conducted during the second phase of the Project. The partial achievement of this research may be due to the long term sick leave of a full time researcher in charge of this study.

Fifth, differences and commonalities of the studies of local participatory forest management in Indonesia, Laos, and Russia

The Panel noted that the presentation continued to suffer from the lack of an analytical framework of this sub-research. The conclusions appear to have been made without critically analysing the information and data compiled from the field surveys in the three countries. The conclusions of this sub research were considered as merely part of the main findings of the field surveys, which could easily be carried out by non-highly educated persons. The Panel strongly recommended that the presentation should contain an in-depth analysis and describe exactly how the conclusions were made.

The Panel considered the important subjects or obstacle areas to be reviewed by the Project as follows: (i) legal obstacles, including institutional and administrative aspects; (ii) economic viability; (iii) social viability; and (iv) environmental aspects. Following this kind of a general framework, the relevant principles and associated recommended actions could be formulated focusing on the identified key issues for the consideration of the target audiences.

Generally speaking, although the Project produced valuable information and experience related to the concept of local participation in forest management, the level of quality of the guidelines produced by the Project fell far short of expectations.

In particular, the national policy recommendations were not in a position to be introduced to the target countries due to their low quality. Furthermore, the value of the Project outputs, such as the village action guidelines and local policy guidelines is limited mainly to the districts and villages in three target countries' because the Project was unsuccessful in providing local guidelines which could be applied to many countries in the Asia-Pacific region at the local level

Impacts on the stakeholders, of the Project's products and other related activities such as information outreach, multi-stakeholder dialogues and capacity building initiatives

The Panel noted that it is difficult to assess the impact of the Project without sufficient evidence from the selected target audiences on the usefulness of the guidelines and recommendations produced by the Project.

The overall impacts of the Project outputs were limited because the guidelines focused on the selected villages and districts in the three target countries, and therefore, the Project did not have the full impact that would be expected from the development of IGES guidelines for the promotion of local participation in forest management as stated in the Project proposal.

However, the Project was beneficial to the villages and districts concerned in Indonesia, Laos and Russia by recommending practical measures on several aspects to improve sustainable forest management at the local level. In particular, it had a considerable positive impact on the forest policy of Kutai District in Indonesia by providing professional knowledge related to participatory forest management approach, and the District has made extensive use of the information and recommendations made by the Project. The Project also brought the importance of promoting a participatory approach in forest management to the attention of local policy makers.

IV. REVIEW OF THE THIRD PHASE PROPOSAL OF THE FC PROJECT

In addition to the review of the several aspects of the second phase of the FC Project, the Panel considered the Project proposal for the third phase. It was recalled that the 14th meeting of the Board of Directors on the Strategic Research Proposal made several recommendations for the improvement of the proposal. In this regard, the Panel observed that some of the recommendations of the Board of Directors at its 14th meeting had been addressed in the revised proposal.

However, the Panel felt that substantial further work is required to improve the quality of the revised proposal. It noted that the problem analysis was not sufficiently developed in the revised proposal. The Panel questioned the formulation of the three specific objectives, in particular with regard to (i) the appropriateness of identifying initiatives of the existing forest administration at the local level rather than at the national level and (ii) the inclusion of testing the effectiveness of the strategies to be formulated by the Project. These two specific objectives were not strongly supported by the Panel. Testing the effectiveness of the prototype strategies could be conducted as part of the developing process of the formulation of strategies. It should be considered a Project activity rather than a specific objective. The Panel also noted that the proposal showed the same lack of a clear analytical framework as the proposal of the second phase.

In addition, the Panel noted a number of other weaknesses in the proposal. These include: unclear presentation of the definition of the importance terms, such as *collaborative forest governance* and *sustainable forest management*²; weak identification of the basic assumptions, including simply mentioning the ecosystem approach without further elaborations on how and where this approach will be applied; weak presentation of the methodological steps; and weak justification for the selection of three target countries.

² It is important to note that the term “Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)” is often emphasised in a different way by developed and developing countries. The emphasis of developed countries is given to the ecological functions of forests while developing countries link SFM with their development needs. Different definitions of SFM can be found in (i) ITTO, International Tropical Timber Council, 1991, (ii) Rio, 1992, Forest Principles, art. 2b, and (iii) Helsinki, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, June 1993.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the second phase of the FC Project was highly efficient but limited in effectiveness. It was only partially successful in achieving its specific objectives. It did not fully accomplish the development of local guidelines for the promotion of participation in forest management that could be applied beyond the target villages and districts in Indonesia, Laos and Far East Russia.

The Panel felt that this partial achievement resulted from the weakness of the Project design; unclear methodology; and lack of in-depth analytical work to synthesise the information and data from the field studies. It also observed that the Project suffered difficulties due to the long-term sick leave of a full-timber researcher in charge of the international approach and a research secretariat.

The impression from the reports and discussions with the Project team during the Peer Review is that the Project delivered its work mainly to the target villages and districts at the individual study level. Indeed, there was under-achievement of the specific objectives. In particular, the Project failed to conduct in-depth analysis of the data and information compiled from the substantial field work at the research sites.

In spite of the problems mentioned above, the Project has made a valuable contribution to the knowledge of local communities associated with the forests in the Kutai District, Indonesia, the Savannarhet area, Oudomaxy Province in Laos and the Lazo raion District of Khabarovsk Krai, Far East Russia. It enhanced the awareness of the authorities and the local community of the need for local participation in forest conservation and management

The Panel noted that the rationale that led to the elaboration of local guidelines for the promotion of participation in forest conservation and management has become more valid than ever as sustainable forest management is implemented at ground level rather than in offices and research labs. There is an urgent need to develop a harmonious partnership between the local people, forest authorities and forest users (concessionaires) as these groups are often working in confrontation rather than in cooperation due to a lack of practical guidance.

In particular, social conflicts, such as rights of the local community to access and use forests, will become an increasingly difficult issue to be solved by communities, who consider it their right to access common property resources, and concessionaires, who harvest trees from that same piece of forest land.

The Panel was, therefore, of the view that there is a strong need to revise the guidelines developed during the second phase by synthesising the vast volumes of information and data collected from the many forest stakeholders, in order to increase the applicability of the revised local guidelines to many countries in the Asia-pacific region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the review, the following recommendations have been drawn:

To IGES:

- There is an urgent need to improve the Project design, in order to specifically elaborate the specific objectives, outputs, implementation processes and indicators to measure the achievements of Projects. IGES could consider adopting a Project formulation manual by reviewing the Project formulation manuals being used extensively by international organisations such as UNDP and GEP.
- To ensure the formulation of quality Project documents, the appraisal mechanism/system for Project documents should be strengthened.
- A mid-term review or correction mechanism should be in use when there is strong conflict with regards Project design during internal reviews. It is important to carry out a mid-term review whenever implementation shows a clear sign of conflict or weakness.
- Explore ways to establish links with regional forest initiatives. For instance, the Asia Forest Partnership, initiated by the Government of Japan during the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in 2002, would be a good partner to share the experiences of the FC Project.

To the FC Project:

- For the third phase of the FC Project, one of the specific objectives should include the reformulation of the guidelines for promotion of local participation in forest management. The guidelines should be reformulated for application to many countries in the Asia-Pacific region. They should also be comparable with other relevant guidelines that have been developed by international organisations, such as ITTO.
- Consider formulating concise recommendations on the most important subjects related to the promotion of local participation in forest conservation and management.
- Enhance the formulation of active national/local fora in developing policy strategies to increase the ownership of process and to increase the impact of the Project's research. It is recommended that these fora should invite relevant international experts, including international lawyers and national level representatives of the target countries.
- Develop a link with the national policy process in the target countries. Dissemination mechanisms should form part of this link with national policy processes

- Create more partnerships with the private sector, including external forest users, in order to consider local participation from the aspects of forest conservation and management and utilisation, so that the benefits can be shared appropriately among the key stakeholders.
- Based on the comments on the proposal for the Third Phase stated in Section IV, the following modifications should be made:
 1. Provide a more in-depth problem analysis to define at the outset the problem to be tackled by the third phase;
 2. Reformulate the specific objectives to clearly indicate the immediate goals of the proposal in a more logical way;
 3. Improve the analytical framework to be applied and the methodological steps to be taken in the formulation of the collaborative forest governance strategy;
 4. Redefine the definition of important terms, such as collaborative forest governance and sustainable forest management to clarify the main scope of the Third Phase;
 5. Provide more information on the basic assumptions related to the ecosystem approach by comparing it with the scope of sustainable forest management; and
 6. Improve the justification of the selection of the three target countries.

Acknowledgement

The Review Panel would like to thank the President, the Project team and the Secretariat for their invaluable assistance and support to facilitate the work of the Review Panel.

Annex I

**List of the Participants in the Peer Review of the Forest Conservation Project (2nd Phase)
14 – 16 July 2004**

Review Panel Members

Dr Tongroj Onchan (President, Mekong Environment and Resources Institute, Thailand)
Dr Yasuyuki Oshima (Trustee, Japan Wildlife Research Center, Japan)
Dr Hwan Ok Ma (Projects Manager, Division of Forest Industries, International Tropical Timber
Organisation (ITTO) , Japan)

Forest Conservation Project

Dr Makoto Inoue (Project Leader)
Dr Bishnu B. Bhandari (Principal Research Fellow, Project Manager)
Mr Kimihiko Hyakumura (Researcher)
Dr Kazuhiro Harada (Researcher)
Dr Yoshiki Seki (Visiting Researcher)
Ms Kanaru Segawa (Project Secretary)

IGES Secretariat

Professor Akio Morishima (President / Chair, Board of Directors)
Mr Hiroyasu Tokuda (Secretary-General)

IGES Projects

Observers

Annex II. Agenda of the Meeting



*Peer Review
Forest Conservation Project*

14 – 16 July 2004
Conference Room 2. IGES HQ

AGENDA (Rev.2)

13 July 2004 (Tuesday): Arrival of the Reviewers

14 July 2004 (Wednesday)

Morning Session 10:00 – 12:00

Opening Session

- Greeting Prof. Akio MORISHIMA
- Aims and objectives of review Dr. Bishnu B. BHANDARI

Session I: Structure and Management of the Project Dr. Makoto INOUE

- Discussion

- Break 10:50 – 11:10 -

Session II: Outline of research activities of the Project Dr. Makoto INOUE

- Discussion
-

- Lunch (Conference Room 3) 12:00 – 13:00 -

Afternoon Session 13:00 – 16:20

Session III: In-depth discussion of research in the 2nd Phase

- Theme Village Action Guidelines and District Policy Guidelines for Indonesia 1:
Dr. Kazuhiro HARADA

- Break 14:30 – 14:50 -

- Theme Village Action Guidelines and Local Policy Guidelines for Laos 2:
Mr. Kimihiko HYAKUMURA

15 July 2004 (Thursday)

Morning Session 9:30 – 11:30

Session III: In-depth discussion of research in the 2nd Phase (Continued)

- Theme 3: Differences and Commonalities of
Comparative Studies of Local Participatory
Forest Management in Indonesia, Laos, and Russia
Dr. Kazuhiro HARADA

- Break 10:20 – 10:40 -

- Discussion

Luncheon for participants (at IGES Conference Room 3) 11:45-13:00

Afternoon Session 13:00 – 16:00

Session IV: Strategic Research Proposal for the 3rd Phase
Dr Bishnu B. BHANDARI

- Break 14:30 – 14:50 -

- Discussion

16 July 2004 (Friday)

AM: Presentation of review results, finalisation of Panel Review Report

Closing Session

- Concluding remark Prof. Akio MORISHIMA

- Lunch (Conference Room 3) 12:00 – 13:00 -