

**Proceedings of the Technical Meeting  
“Understanding Forest Tenure:  
toward supporting forest tenure diversification”**

**12-14 February 2007  
FAO, Rome**

**Facilitator’s Report by Anna Mischler**

**Venue and Participants**

The technical meeting “Understanding Forest Tenure: toward supporting forest tenure diversification” was organised by FAO Forest Policy Service and took place at FAO Headquarters in Rome, from 12 to 14 February 2007. Over 30 participants from different geographic regions attended the meeting (see annex 1 for the full list of participants). The meeting was targeted at governmental institutions, research and development organisations, UN agencies and other international organisations that have practical experience with issues related to forest tenure and in particular with forest tenure diversification. The focus was on organisations that operate at international level; however the representation of specific national experiences and perspectives of NGOs was an important part of the meeting.

**Background**

Excessive deforestation and forest degradation resulting from population growth, agricultural expansion, escalating demand for wood products, illegal logging, industrial development, unsustainable commercial trade of Non Wood Forest Products and rapid economic growth have triggered a debate not only on the effectiveness of public sector forest management but also on changes in forest resource tenure and institutional arrangements. Over the last 20 years, the commitment to empowering local communities, to decentralizing decision making to local government units and to increasing private sector involvement in forest management has been growing. However assessment of these past and ongoing efforts points to the tenure issue as one of the root cause of poor performance in the forestry sector. There is therefore a great need to improve understanding of the nature and implications of forest tenure, stimulate national and international debate on the subject, and raise the awareness of policy-makers, providing them with the arguments and evidence that can encourage an in-depth reform of the forest tenure system.

For several years FAO and other organisations (AFP/ TNC/ Tropenbos, Forest Trends\*, CIFOR\*, ICRAF\*, RECOFT\*, UNFF, ILC, , WWF and others ) have been interested in the role and the impact of forest tenure, with particular emphasis on major trends and their implications not only for SFM, but also for poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods. As the results of these studies become available, they can form the basis for the formulation of policy recommendations.

**Objectives**

The goal of the two and half day technical meeting was to define strategic ways forward to support a forest tenure diversification which could enhance SFM and support forest based poverty alleviation.

To achieve this, the meeting had the following objectives:

1. Present results of various regional and global studies on major forest tenure trends, and forest tenure diversification;
2. Identify best practices from presented studies;
3. Identify and develop key principles for forest tenure diversification to assist governments;

4. Establish a constructive dialogue among participating organisations; and
5. Propose and share strategies among participating organisations for future action and work including:
  - defining priority areas of work and approaches to be taken (partnership agreements, project proposals);
  - publishing available information and disseminating it widely; and
  - bringing forest tenure on the forestry sector agenda, and specifically for FAO, with particular emphasis on the forthcoming Meeting of the Committee on Forestry in March 2007.

### **Methodology:**

Presentations, plenary discussions, working groups, brainstorming.

This information note aims to share the outcomes of the technical meeting among the participants and to keep the momentum initiated and to inform potential partners that were not able to attend.

## **The process and outcomes of the technical meeting**

### **Opening**

Mr. Jan Heino, ADG, Forestry Department opened the workshop.

Mr. Dominique Reeb, organizer of the meeting, welcomed all the participants.

Facilitator Anna Mischler presented objectives, methodology and expected outcomes of the workshop.

Self-introduction round followed: The participants were asked to present themselves, their current projects or reforms on forestry tenure and their expectations from the workshop.

### **Presentations**

The meeting continued with the presentation of case studies and practical experiences by FAO, RRI, European organisations and ILC on following subjects:

- *FAO: Understanding forest tenure in South and South East Asia and Africa.*  
*By Dominique Reeb, Francesca Romano*
- *RRI: Who owns the forest +5.*  
*By Andy White, Augusta Molnar*
- *European partners: Forest tenure and SFM in Europe.*  
*By Robin du Parc (ELO), Natalie Hufnagl (CEPF), Erik Kosenkranius (Eustafor), Franziska Hirsch (UNECE)*
- *ILC: Expanding the circle: opening tenure policy development to multiple stakeholders.*  
*ILC approaches from the land tenure policy process.*  
*By Bruce Moore, Peter Giampaoli (ILC):*

The audience was asked to pay special attention to best practice examples described in presentations. In addition, one volunteer per presentation was asked to take notes on **constraints** that were mentioned during presentations. These findings were recorded and posted on a separated flip chart. They were used later on as a basis for discussion about constraints and possible solutions.

## Facilitated Working Sessions

- **Step 1: Best practices**

*Plenary*

The purpose of this task was to identify best practices: Examples of significant changes in the tenure system diversification that resulted in improved SFM and/or contributed to poverty alleviation. Participants were given 10 minutes to prepare a short presentation (approx. 2-3 minutes) of their best practice examples and to write down the **key elements of success**.

**FOCUS QUESTION:** *What are the key elements of success that made the system working?*

Following information was indicated as well:

- *Country name*
- *Tenure system*
- *Elements for success*

Participants presented their best practices along with elements of success in the plenary. They were asked to order their results in three different categories according to the impact each single element had on SFM, poverty alleviation or both. A complete list of results can be found in annex 2 of this document.

- **Step 2: Analysis of constraints**

*Working groups, Plenary*

The workshop proceeded with the short analysis of constraints (and solutions). The analysis was conducted on the basis of the results achieved by 'listeners', volunteers who were focusing on constraints during presentations.

Discussion in small groups of 3-4 people followed: It was necessary to analyze constraints, complete the list and reflect on solutions for them. Further, it was needed to identify, if any of those solutions could build a supplementary element of success that was still missing in the list elaborated before.

The aim of the exercise was completing through analysis of constraints the previous list of elements of success.

**FOCUS QUESTION:** *What major constraints are missing on this list? What are possible solutions for them that can be included in the table of 'elements of success'?*

A short discussion of results followed in the plenary, some new constraints were added to the list of constraints and others concluded the list of elements of success.

Annex 3 reflects the list of constraints.

- **Step 3: Clustering**

Elements of success of the same art were grouped together under generic terms, which provided main principles for tenure security and diversification. The division into three categories (impacts on SFM, poverty alleviation or both) remained. This classification built the basis for group discussion and in-depth analysis on the following day. (Annex 2 displays the results formed in clusters already).

- **Step 4: In-depth analysis**

*Working groups*

Workshop continued with an in-depth analysis within the identified principles. The most detailed and profound explanation of every relevant issue was expected. Four groups were

formed, each was handling several different problems. The composition of the groups and their discussion topic can be found in annex 4. In each group a Moderator (to moderate the discussion), a Reporter (to present results) and a Time Keeper were nominated.

**FOCUS QUESTION:** *What are the main features of the relevant principle?*

- **Step 5: Elaboration of messages**

*Working groups*

Making use of the outputs from the best practices exercise, analysis of constraints and the results of the previous working session (Step 4), groups (of same composition) were tasked to elaborate short, clear messages (3-4 lines). These messages can be used by partners for different targets, aimed at raising the awareness and visibility of tenure for SFM and poverty alleviation.

The joint results of steps 4 and 5 can be found in annex 5. After presentation of the each group short plenary discussion took place. Thus, the results of the working group were completed with comments from the plenary, which are reflected in the annex as well.

- **Step aside: Cost effective reform process**

It was decided to put particular focus on the issue of costs of implementing the tenure reform. Short brainstorming was performed to get few ideas on this difficult topic. The results of this short session can be found in annex 7.

### **Partnerships**

*Plenary*

In this dynamic session, all participants were invited to have a closer look at the broad overview of ongoing and planned activities and the areas of work of the participating organisations. First, participants were asked to share with others their current projects and studies and then to indicate which actions are planned or intended in the future. At the end, a broad spectrum of activities in different parts of the world was displayed on one board and could be viewed at a glance. See annex 7 for these results.

The purpose of this session was not only to get an overview of ongoing activities, but also to identify possible synergies and opportunities to coordinate or collaborate.

### **Presentation of Action Plans**

*Plenary*

Finally, within this informal session participants were invited to study the results displayed on the board and to get together with possible partners to discuss ways to initiate partnerships based on concrete action plans. They presented their experiences in plenary, briefly indicating what partnerships could be initiated and what action was foreseen. Some of the action plan projects can be found in the annex 8.

**Annex 1**  
**List of participants**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<b>External Organisations</b>		
1	Andy White	Rights and Resources Group *
2	Augusta Molnar	Rights and Resources Group *
3	Bruce Moor	International Land Coalition - ILC
4	Deborah Barry	Centre for International Forestry Research - CIFOR *
5	Dicky Simorangkir	Tropembos
6	Ed Barrow	The World Conservation Union - IUCN*
7	Erik Kosenkranius	EUSTAFOR
8	John Guernier	Regional Community Forestry Training Centre – RECOFTC *
9	Natalie Hufnagl	Confédération Européenne des Propriétaires Forestiers - CEPF
10	Peter Giampaoli	International Land Coalition - ILC
11	Pier Carlo Zingari	European Federation of Forest Municipalities and Local Authorities - FECOF
12	Robin du Parc	European Land Owners Organisation - ELO
<b>Countries</b>		
13	Ernesto Guiang	Philippines
14	Frank Matose	University of Western Cape, Land and Agrarian Studies, South Africa
15	Iman Santoso,	Planning Agency of the Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia
16	Jiang Jisheng	Department of Policy and Law, State Forest Administration, China
17	Kanimang Camara	NACO (Private Extension Organisation). Gambia.
18	Li Shuxin	Department of Policy and Law, State Forest Administration, China
19	Nguyen Quang Tan	Vietnam
20	Rene Oyono	CIFOR, Cameroon
21	Rosina Blomley	Independent consultant. Tanzania
22	Xu Jintao,	Peking University, China
<b>FAO</b>		
23	David Palmer	FAO – Land Tenure Service (SDAA)

---

\* member of the Right and Resources Initiative

24	Dominique Reeb	FAO – Forestry Policy Service (FOEP)
25	Eva Muller	FAO – Forestry Policy Service (FOEP)
26	Eve Crowley	FAO – Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD)
27	Francesca Romano	FAO – Forestry Policy Service (FOEP)
28	Francois Wencelius/ Jerker Thunberg	National Forestry Programme Facility
29	Franziska Hirsch	UN Economic Commission for Europe/Food and Agriculture Organisation
30	Lars Gunnar Marklund	FAO – Forest Resources Assessment (FRA)
31	Michel Laverdiere	FAO- Regional Office for Africa (RAF)
32	Paul Munro-Faure	FAO – Land Tenure Service (SDAA)
33	Victor Mosoti	FAO Legal Office (LEG)

## **Annex 2**

### **List of elements of success**

#### **SFM**

##### **MULTISTAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT (*GROUP A*)**

- Multistakeholder management (PAs) (Indonesia)
- Improve NGO activity in SFM
- Responsibility in the hand of local people (Bavaria, Germany)
- Participatory forest land use planning (Indonesia)
- Increased stability of forest stands (Bavaria, Germany)
- Allowing local innovation and investment (no limited government intervention) (Indonesia)
- Gender dimension (Gambia)
- Community initiated (Tanzania)
- Stability of indigenous population and sustainable forest use (Ethiopia)

##### **LOCAL KNOWLEDGE (*GROUP A*)**

- Use of existing knowledge (traditional, local) in management (Tanzania)
- Sacred 'forest' (100.000 + of them) (India)
- Recognize indigenous practices – government commitment (Indonesia)
- Use of traditional and formal institutional framework (Tanzania)

##### **ADAPTED TOOLS (*GROUP B*)**

- Simple management plans approval (Cameroon, Gabon)
- Simplification of NFP (Gambia)
- Splitting authority/management functions (Estonia, Latvia)
- Modern management concept (market oriented, new culture) (Estonia, Latvia)

##### **PROCESS/COMMUNICATION (*GROUP B*)**

- Consulting process between parties/communication (Czech Republic)
- Establishment of forestry communication unit (Gambia)
- Phase-wise implementation (Gambia)
- Develop sense of ownership (Gambia)

##### **POLITICAL WILL (*GROUP B*)**

- Political context (Vietnam)
- Political commitment (China)
- Demand driven (Vietnam)
- Commitment of parties involved (Vietnam)

##### **LEGAL FRAMEWORK (*GROUP C*)**

- Establishment of parliamentary committee on natural resources (Gambia)
- Statutory and customary laws
- Clear demarcation (Europe, Tanzania, Gambia)
- Cadastral/ownership records – consistent and credible
- Through approved municipal land use lands support CBFM with infrastructure, extension, linkage (Philippines)
- Use of existing land legislation as entry point (Tanzania)

## **CAPACITY BUILDING (GROUP C)**

- Strong technical support to local forest by local NGO (Ethiopia)
- Technical support (Vietnam)
- Standards for sustainability (Zimbabwe)
- Monitoring systems in place for SFM (Zimbabwe)
- Capacity building at all levels (Gambia)

## **INCENTIVES (GROUP D)**

- Tax incentives (Gambia)
- Access to forest resources in national park (Uganda)

### **Poverty Alleviation**

## **FINANCIAL INCENTIVE (GROUP D)**

- Value of sustained forest benefits to neighbouring farmers/annual natural coffee crop (Ethiopia)
- Discretionary powers in the management of revenue (Cameroon, Gabon)
- Creation of small and middle forest enterprises (SMFE) for improving livelihoods (Gambia, Ghana, Mozambique, Uganda)
- Financial transfers to rural councils (Cameroon)
- \$ from Mega-Fauna providing incentives for devolved management – but current recentralization (Zimbabwe)
- Benefit Sharing (DR Congo)
- Commercialization of forest products and access to world markets/ privatization of communal resources (Zimbabwe)
- “Gum Arabic” Woodlands (alt system) – 30.000km (Sudan)

## **SECURED LIVELIHOOD (GROUP D)**

- Long term supply of subsistence forest products (Tanzania)
- Pastoralist “Rich Patch” areas-forests (Kenya)

## **PRO POOR (GROUP D)**

- Focused on the poor (Nepal)
- Simplify regulations (Indonesia)

### **Poverty Alleviation and SFM**

## **MULTISTAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION (GROUP A)**

- Government recognition of indigenous SFM of community tenure make sustainable (Philippines)
- Multistakeholder partnership in national park management (Indonesia)
- Democratic decision making in tenure reform (China)
- Support by roots (China)
- Better community and inter-community communications frameworks (Cambodia)
- Conservation effort allow for major community role (CBF=Buffer zone) (Guatemala)
- Household contract on natural forest protect in state forest area (China)
- Village forests (‘Keyn Forest’) – No government (Somaliland)

## **USE OF LOCAL KNOWLEDGE (GROUP A)**

- Ethical collection standards for complex HFTP harvest ing instead of FMP (USA)
- Data on CCAs and NTFPs question “face of the forestry view” (India, Brazil, Africa)
- Participatory approach to PA zoning leads to broader stakeholder support
- Well combined community mapping + official

### **SOCIAL MOBILIZATION & POLITICS (*GROUP B*)**

- Civil society – Social Mobilization
- Pressure from other (non-forestry) ministries (China)
- Global Alliance & Forest community organisations
- Use of political moment to change law s without waiting to get it ‘all right’ (Philippines)
- Rural protest – throwing out government concessionaires (Mexico)
- FECOFUN refuses to allow taxation of community forests (Nepal)
- Indigenous movement in Latin America – exception (they have a strong international voice)
- Widespread land reform – extended to forests (China)
- (Mexican) communities organized + resisted government + Private interests – took over management of their forests

### **PROCESS (*GROUP B*)**

- Law-based (China)
- Pilot-trial (China)
- Deregulate CFM to enable experimentation and lower cost – allow multiple outcomes (Mexico)
- Horizontal exchange among communities in different countries allows some to avoid mistakes and evolve more quickly but locally (Guatemala and Mexico)

### **TENURE SECURITY (*GROUP C*)**

- Secure collective tenure + ...% management in community hands (when good forests) (Mexico)
- New owner to respect/acknowledge existing land claims (SA)
- Secure tenure over long period of time – Investment (Mexico)
- Recognition of individual property rights in state, CBFM, co-management tenure systems (Philippines)

### **CAPACITY BUILDING (*GROUP C*)**

- Well-prepared department (China)
- Support to policy implementation (Budget, Staff, Training, Incentives)
- Government – Incentives for “clustering” / capacity building amongst owners and communities
- Legal literacy (educating local people of their rights under the law) (Uganda, Kenia, India)
- School programmes in rural areas (Zambia)
  - raise acknowledge
  - raise education

### **BENEFIT SHARING (*GROUP D*)**

- Benefit Sharing (Vietnam)
- Fairer benefit sharing (Indonesia)
- Creation of new market (bio energy, high value timber) (Bavaria, Germany)

### Annex 3: List of Constraints

- „Disguised“ state control
- Never a major effort to address forest tenure
- Compromise between statutory and customary tenure systems
- Disconnection between land ownership and resource use
- Variety and types of „communal forests“ (municipalities)
- Overemphasis (currently) on privatized, individual ownership (overlooking collective, customary systems), e.g. pastoral systems
- Land tenure → tree tenure (clarity, link, distinction)
- Complex land policy
- Conflict over subsoil rights
- Legal ownership is not enough
- Recognition of customary tenure alone is inadequate (to protect interests and rights of the poor)
- Fragile rights
  
- Corruption
- Impact of climate change on resource scarcity
- Balance between allocation of forest land use (biodiversity vs. plantation)
- Lack of collective action in Africa (why?)
- Lack of political organisation of local forest communities
- What rights do we have?
- Lack of information of legal processes
- Land values forest devolved
- Ambiguity of decentralization
- More meaningful devolution
- „Rigid“ data collection thwarts local innovation and change
- Distorted perception of „the forests“
- „Forced democracy“ (is t really participatory?)
- Role of subsidies (+? -?) and context to benefit flows
- Architecture of aid
- Role of restitution
- Recognition of private/community forests
- Perception → can local (private) manage? (Negative attitude, politics)
  
- Problems of forest fragmentation (link to inheritance)
- Small forest ownership → imp. of cooperation (cooperations, associations)
- Need to improve the negotiating position of local people (need to clearly perceive (and accept) conflicts)
- Public control of major industry dominant
  
- How to get to economies of scale on local/community forests? (cooperations, associations)
- Elite captured benefits
- Vested interests block people’s participation (i.e. power imbalance)
- Access to „wood“ markets (local, community)
- Role of NWFP in Europe – data (spp), economics, markets
  
- Inadequate civil society engagement (advocacy)
- Confrontation

- Insufficient sharing of knowledge (between and within stakeholders groups)
- Government-led reforms without civil society participation tend to fail (lessons from agricultural sector)
  
- Inaccuracies in data is harmful
- Data on small scale forests (individual) difficult (size, ownership)
- Informal data (e.g. on NFPs) underrepresented
- Contribution of smallholders (m<sup>2</sup>, €) – difficulties in data collection

**Annex 4:**  
**In depth-analysis and messages**

**Composition of groups and discussion topics**

<b>Group A</b>	<b>Group B</b>	<b>Group C</b>	<b>Group D</b>
Ed Barrow	Michel Laverdiere	Augusta Molnar	Deborah Barry
Dicky Simorangkir	Franziska Hirsch	Erik Kosenkranius	John Guernier
Natalie Hufnagl	Peter Giampaoli	Francesca Romano	Xu Jintao
Ernesto Guiang	Frank Matose	Iman Santoso	Jiang Jisheng
Kanimang Camara	Li Shuxin	Nguyen Quang Tan	Rene Oyono
Rosina Blomley			Dominique Reeb

**Group A**  
MULTISTAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT  
MULTISTAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION  
(USE OF) LOCAL KNOWLEDGE

**Group B**  
SOCIAL MOBILIZATION & POLITICS  
POLITICAL WILL  
PROCESS/COMMUNICATION  
ADAPTED TOOLS

**Group C**  
LEGAL FRAMEWORK  
TENURE SECURITY  
CAPACITY BUILDING

**Group D**  
FINANCIAL INCENTIVE  
BENEFIT SHARING  
SECURED LIVELIHOOD  
PRO POOR

**Results**

**GROUP A**  
MULTISTAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT  
MULTISTAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATION  
(USE OF) LOCAL KNOWLEDGE

**Awareness and capacity**

- Policy and law
- Rules and regulations
- Capacity building and education
- Local innovation
- Build on local knowledge

**Recognition**

- Recognize different groups (community, with community, private sector) – have different uses of the forests
- Different users, different uses

- Gender, equity
- Indigenous use

### **Negotiation**

- Equity, level playing field
- Different groups can negotiate for their use of resources
- Roles and responsibilities
- Access and rights
- Objectives
- Landscape level

### **Stable policy framework**

- Allow freedom to decide within framework
- Flexibility
- Local support (political, decision)

### **Institutions**

- Recognize local forest use
- Decentralized decision making

### **Forest assets for wealth creation**

- Processing and value adding at local level
- Business mapping and opportunities
- High level timber processing
- Financial base to enter market
- Start simple and build up

### **Plenary points/comments**

- Institutionalize participation
- Forest @ high value for mega-fauna → ecotourism (good examples)
- Option to involve “marginalized” groups at local level and engage
- Respect customary tenure

### **Message:**

Get beyond “blah-blah” participation to real empowerment for both SFM and SD  
 → Improved livelihoods and wealth creation

## **GROUP B**

SOCIAL MOBILIZATION & POLITICS

POLITICAL WILL

PROCESS/COMMUNICATION

ADAPTED TOOLS

### **Social mobilization and politics**

- Use opportunities of political momentum to achieve changes in forest tenure
- Use opportunities to share message with more perceptive audience
- Develop opportunities for collective action
- Users can successfully mobilize to resist/policy changes support

### **Process/communication**

- Develop good communication among stakeholders
  - On-going
  - Stakeholders perceive their views are heard

- Multi-phased
- Need to balance
- Cost and participation
- Cost to both Government and citizens stakeholders

#### **Adapted tools**

- Management plans
  - Regulations that expedite approval
  - Provide extension (advice) to communities, individuals
  - Regulations that allow simplified management plans
  - Develop processes for monitoring and assessment of plan monitoring

#### **Political will**

- Government institutions at all levels need to demonstrate a commitment to forest tenure reform. Reform at one level (local or national) is insufficient

#### **Plenary points/comments**

- Develop sense of ownership → process
- General public must be addressed as well
- Harmonize land reform and forest reform
- Multiple and appropriate forms of media and communication to reach the poor and everybody involved
- Process takes time and it iterative (embraces mistakes)
- Identify and support champions of change (within governments, communities etc.)
- Issue guidelines for this to work
- Management plans for communities and indigenous people should be simplified to their level of capacity

#### **Message:**

*Sustained social mobilization and organisation combined with effective communication can create the political will for forest tenure reform*

#### **GROUP C**

LEGAL FRAMEWORK  
TENURE SECURITY  
CAPACITY BUILDING

#### **Legal framework**

1. Multiple approaches needed, tailored to countries
2. Ensure active stakeholder participation in law formulation (P)
3. Ensure harmonisation of policies and laws, including customary practices/regulations (P)
4. Realistic and simple language for policies and laws (P/I)
5. Recognize and secure local ownership in policies and laws (P)
6. Strengthen and empower marginalized groups in policy process (P)
7. Disseminate and make available laws/policies (I)
8. Integration of forest policies into national strategic framework
9. Define and demarcate forest land – cadastral ownership recognized credible (e.g. participatory mapping)
10. Pilot can be a basis for developing the framework and support to prepare a law approving community forestry (Vietnam)
11. Participatory monitoring and evaluation system to monitor the implementation of laws and policies (e.g. Mexico, consultation council)

**12. The legal framework should be clear and transparent about benefit sharing arrangements**

**Capacity building**

- Needed at multiple levels and multiple phases
  - For strengthening social actors and their horizontal networks
  - Capacity to assume roles and responsibilities
  - Capacity to manage and govern resources
- All level
  - Government
  - Local Government
  - Local communities
  - Social movement
- Different phases
  - During the tenure reform
  - After tenure reform
- Capacity building
  - Responsibility
  - Rights

**Plenary points/comments**

- Legal framework to provide secure, long-term, rights, robustness excludability

**Message:**

*Tenure security and food legal framework can be achieved through an iterative process in which there is strong political participation by local rights holders, adequate benefit sharing, as well as engagement of government long term goal. Interim laws are helpful to support process.*

**GROUP D**

FINANCIAL INCENTIVE  
BENEFIT SHARING  
SECURED LIVELIHOOD  
PRO POOR

**Tax incentive**

- Reduce taxation
- Harmonize taxation (reduce ≠ taxes)
- Exempt/ reduce taxation for local forest managers/owners
- Harmonization of inter-sectoral subsidies → pro forest
- Level of subsidies adapted to forest condition
- Provide valuable forest resources to owners/managers

Tax exemption for local producers as financial incentive → produce up-stream revenue from Δ wood based industry and markets, which contribute to:

- a) Poverty alleviation
- b) Improved economic performance in other sectors
- c) Environmental outcomes (water-shed management)

Effectiveness of the conservation paradigm on forests is hypothetical. So is CBF: so give CBF and other local schemes a chance!

**Payment for environmental services**

- Institutionalize the payment of conservation fees

**Access to Markets**

- Market info on market chain and prices
- Governmental infrastructure investment in forestry sector

**Benefit sharing**

- Design more equitable systems of benefit sharing/redistribution
- Intra-sector transfer from state and large producers to all
- Monitor benefit (from state) sharing system (e.g. at the community level)
- Define quotas of forestry-based employment in rural areas

**Non-financial incentives**

- Provide access to NWFP harvest in exchange for forest protection services
- Provide exclusive access to protected areas to local communities for tourism
- Gender equity in benefit sharing
  - Community
  - Household levels
- Monitor elite capture
- Promote internal accounting systems
- Autonomy to manage all the forest-based own revenue

***Plenary points/comments***

- Option for agricultural cropping in forest
- Balance between conservation and production forests

***Message:***

*Without significant financial and non-financial incentives no tenure arrangement will lead to improved forest condition and livelihoods.*

## **Annex 5: Cost of implementing tenure reform**

### **Cost of implementing tenure reform / Cost effective reform process**

- Comparison of costs: Poverty in forest-dependent communities with minimal forest tenure rights and tenure conflicts VERSUS cost of supporting tenure reform process
- Tenure award or improvement in response to stakeholders demand results to improve volunteerism and counterpart labour for SFM
- Transition in forestland tenure reform
- Phased approach → time and adjustment and capacity building
- Need for national framework for coordinating consultation, capacity building, cost support etc.
- Pilot demonstration → up-scale
- Work/improve tenure using existing laws and policies
- Use existing institutions at local level
- Using existing cadastral system
- Use of market-oriented instruments, i.e. economic rents of forest lands to discourage speculation and open areas for other users, e.g. community
- Recognize and legalize customary rights
- Private sector partnership in developed state forests/parks
- Align forest tenure reform with land reform
- Look for opportunities outside the forest sector, e.g. local government reform and decentralization
- Audience-oriented advocacy with clear messages to law-makers, ministers
- Delegate technical parts to specialized agencies/private sector
- Schedule meetings other activities during times suitable for desired participants
- Cost-sharing between government and civil society
- Designated percentage of forest-related revenues to reform process
- Training of village paralegal volunteers
- Decentralize decision making at local level (→ demarcation)
- Tenure/ownership assessment in National forest assessment (NFA)
- Multi-disciplinary approach on tenure reform
- Establishment of National forestry fund

**Annex 6:  
Partnerships**

Organisation/ Country	Ongoing activities	Planned, intended activities
<b>CIFOR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support to policy reform and innovation</li> <li>- Policy review and analysis → Government and other initiatives</li> <li>- CIFOR/RRI Research: Improving equity and livelihoods in community forestry - (Cameroon, Burkino Faso, Ghana, DRC)</li> <li>- Research: Global project. Impact on livelihoods, incomes + forest of different tenure regimes, regulatory frameworks, community organisations + enterprises + markets (role of customary institutions, statutory + de facto) (Asia, Africa, Latin America)</li> <li>- Study on common property and property rights in forest margins (Cameroon)</li> <li>- Study on policy reform and decentralization (Central Africa, Central America+Bolivia)</li> <li>- Study on distributional equity in decentralized forest taxation (Cameroon and DRC)</li> <li>- Overview of forest tenure in Central Africa/Congo bassin</li> <li>- Scientific and public knowledge/information (research community to general publics)</li> <li>- Community based forest management and its contribution to poverty alleviation (Mozambique)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Informal institutions access to resources, livelihood and equity in Africa (Central and West Africa)</li> <li>- Alternative tenure and forest industry in Africa (RRI/CIFOR) (Central and West Africa)</li> <li>- Research: Policy dialogue, to be determined → each region</li> </ul> <p><u>LA:</u> Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua  <u>Asia:</u> Nepal, Laos, India, Philippines  <u>Africa:</u> Cameroon, Ghana, Burkina Faso, DRC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key activities: political opportunities → Bolivian Government + Civil Society invitation, International Workshop and Policy discussions on forest strategy in land reform (CBF leaders from all LA + RRI “expert” network)</li> </ul>
<b>RRI</b>	<p>1) LLS → Scoping Exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current state of advance/stagnation of tenure security in key regions/groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Indigenous lowland tropics</i></li> <li>- <i>Non-indigenous CBF</i></li> <li>- <i>Highland indigenous</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Common agenda’s emerging for the basis of regional policy narratives</li> <li>○ Strategic analysis of possible key “interventions” for RRI future</li> </ul> <p>2) Networks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Redforestal/Mercofor</li> </ul>	<p><u>Strategic analysis</u>  Who owns + 5  Other Strategic Analysis on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implications of Avoided Deforestation and other climate change initiatives</li> <li>- Forest and Conflict</li> <li>- Alternative Business and Trade Models</li> </ul> <p><u>LLSL</u>  Lustering learning is scoping at regional + country level of social movements, ONGs (NGOs??) key</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Megaflorestais</li> <li>- Links to global alliance of forest communities</li> <li>- Links to civil society,</li> <li>- Advisory group to ITTO</li> </ul> <p>3) Threats + Opportunities and Broad Context for CBRM + Community forestry/Ecoagriculture</p> <p>4) Strategic Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Future threats + opportunities</li> <li>- Who invests in Forest Conservation</li> <li>- Community Forest Enterprises</li> <li>- Tenure and Trade issues w/h Forest Trends Papua New Guinea (CIFOR) Indonesia (ICRAF)</li> <li>- PES/MES</li> </ul> <p>5) Country Level Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Business and Trade Models</li> <li>- Policy + Tenure Studies/Workshops (China, Mekong Region, Starting in Africa, Latin America and India)</li> <li>- Policy networks in regions</li> </ul> <p>6) IASC – Conference in UK, July 14-18 2008)</p>	<p>threats and opportunities to identify points of engagement and organisations interested in doing joint activities</p>
<p><b>FAO Regional Office Africa</b></p>	<p>1) Sustainable Land Management in Kaffa/ Ethiopia (phase 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess and classify forest and wetland resources</li> <li>• Build zonal database</li> <li>• Develop sustainable management and utilization of inhabited forest <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Appropriate land management practices</li> <li>ii. Environmental education</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>2) Sustainable Land Management in Ethiopia (phase 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building of local government institutions (increase)</li> <li>• Stimulate policy dialogue zone-state-federal (national)</li> <li>• Scale-up reform from Kaffa zone to Southern region</li> <li>• Dialogue with potential partners in meeting</li> </ul>

<p><b>CEPF</b> <a href="http://www.cepf-eu.org">www.cepf-eu.org</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UNECE/MCPFE/FAO/CEPF enquiry on PFO in Europe</li> <li>- Lobbying MCPFE on property rights</li> <li>- Lobbying UNFF on property rights</li> <li>- Lobbying EU-Institutions on property rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Livelihood improvement through alternative income sources (partnership: TBI-MOF-RECOFTC, etc..)</li> <li>- Enlarge IFFA network through partnership with FOA in Asia, Africa, South America</li> <li>- Involvement in FAO forest tenure work in Europe and beyond</li> </ul>
<p><b>China</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selecting different pilot areas in some provinces (SFA)</li> <li>- Supporting study on forest tenure reform by academic institution and local authority (SFA)</li> <li>- National level survey and assessment of forest tenure situation with SFA, RRI, WB, FORD, SIDA (Peking University)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting policies to support tenure reform (SFA)</li> <li>- Capacity building – training staff forest tenure reform at provincial level (SFA)</li> <li>- Policy recommendations to Government on tenure and regularity reform (Peking university)</li> <li>- National and International conference on forest tenure reform; October 2007 (SFA)</li> <li>- Drafting guideline on forest tenure reform (SFA)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Philippines</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tenure assessment of more than 200 tenure holders in 28 LGDs re: SFM (completed, report done)</li> <li>- The Philippine environmental governance project of GoP and USAID (2002-2009) – all tenures</li> <li>- Philippines tropical forest conservation foundation grant to NGOs/Pos</li> <li>- GTZ rainforestation project (CBFM)</li> <li>- UTICS-CBFM enhancement project</li> <li>- FAO NFP in the Philippines (CBFM strategy)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amendment of NIPAs</li> <li>- Implementing rule/regulation – various NGOs and national organisations (tenure for PA communities)</li> <li>- Facilitate approval of omnibus forestry guidelines</li> <li>- Up-scaling the use of forest land use planning at the provincial level to address tenure issues (LGDs, Pos, NGOs, Gov)</li> <li>- Assessment of reservations, industrial forest national agreement and protected areas (joint effort)</li> <li>- World Bank environment and natural resources development project (2007/8)</li> </ul>

<b>RECOFTC</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) RRI-RECOFT Project: Transforming China’s forest impacts in South-east Asia: Advancing pro-poor market reforms for sustainable livelihoods and forests</li> <li>2) Lao: Pro-poor markets and trade</li> <li>3) Vietnam: National study on poverty tenure and markets: Impact on forest land allocation</li> <li>4) Conference in Bangkok “Poverty Reduction and Forests: Tenure, market and policy reforms” (September 2007)</li> <li>5) Forest Governance learning group (IIED Coord.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on the implementation gap in forest policy</li> <li>• RECOFTC working within IIED supporting groups in Indonesia, Vietnam and India</li> </ul> </li> <li>6) CF forum (13-14 March 2007)</li> <li>7) RECOFTC and AFN helping to document lessons learnt regionally (8 countries) that participated in UNDP Small grants Programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promote tropical forests</li> <li>• strengthening resource rights analytical theme</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More evidence needed on impacts of rights based approach</li> <li>- Benefit sharing</li> </ul>
<b>Tanzania</b>	<p>P.F.M.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joint Forest Management</li> <li>- Community based forest management</li> <li>- Village land forest reserve</li> </ul> <p>Developing of Guidelines on cost and benefit sharing within community and between partners</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Linking communities to markets</li> <li>- Missing and need further study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender equity at local level</li> <li>• Decision making structures, e.g village government</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Gambia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community Forest Programme</li> <li>2. Joint Forest Park Management</li> <li>3. Community based enterprise development (on tress and forest products)</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion of community-based enterprise development in the sub-region (ECOWAS)</li> <li>- Formulation of project proposal</li> <li>- Follow-up on project proposal</li> <li>- Capacity building at all levels (community-based enterprise development and group management)</li> </ul>
<b>South Africa</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Breaking new ground”: CBNRM reflections in Southern Africa, a series of case studies assessing impact of reforms</li> <li>2. CROSCOG: Taking stock of status of community management in Southern africa</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PLAAS (third year): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action research with communities and department of forestry to improve community forests formerly state forest</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>3. PLAAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact of tenure reforms in the country on livelihoods and resources</li> <li>- <a href="http://www.ac.za/plaas">www.ac.za/plaas</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need for and support to more civil society involvement in ensuring security in forest tenure especially in protected areas</li> </ul>
<b>Vietnam</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Study on forest tenure and poverty alleviation</li> <li>- Assessment of outcome from forest tenure reform in Daklak province, central highlands of Vietnam</li> <li>- Development of a tool to assess outcomes of forest tenure reforms</li> <li>- Project on forest governance and learning in Vietnam (by IIED and RECOFTC)</li> <li>- Study on forest tenure and ownership with FAO</li> <li>- Study on forest tenure and trade by RRI and RECOFTC</li> <li>- Project on forest laws enforcement and governance in Vietnam (with IUCN)</li> </ul>	
<b>Indonesia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agrarian reform on convertible forests</li> <li>- Collaborative management (under jurisdiction of the MOF)</li> <li>- Benefit sharing, Java teak forests</li> <li>- Participatory mapping</li> <li>- Participatory forest land use planning in national parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Customary forest government regulation</li> <li>- Strengthening land tenure working group</li> <li>- Community plantation forest study</li> <li>- Establishment of FMU to be managed by community</li> </ul>
<b>UNECE</b>	<p>UNECE/FAO/MCPFE/CEPF enquiry “private forest” ownership in Europe → completion</p>	<p>Enhance cooperation with FAO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Forest tenure in Europe (input to COFO)</li> <li>- Future reporting on tenure/ownership (FRA 2010,...)</li> <li>- Online information repository with up-to-date information on private ownership in Europe</li> <li>- Analysis to be reflected in Report “State of Forests and SFM in Europe 2007”</li> <li>- Analysis → MCPFE ministerial _Nov 2007</li> </ul>
<b>ILC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial support, advice to VFA, MACDEFA in Kenya – organisation, engagement as CFA’s</li> <li>- Support to KPA in Indonesia – involvement , policy research and advocacy in land tenure/forest tenure reform</li> <li>- NGO exchange on participatory cartography Albania – Nicaragua</li> <li>- Facilitate increased cooperation of ILC partner in Cameroon with other CSO’s on IP issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support to transborder wildlife Association, NACPA in Albania to replicate TWA process on broader scale</li> <li>- Financial, other support to CSO partners in Kenya to document traditional, customary forest governance use as basis for negotiation with Government</li> </ul>

<b>Tropembos</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social planning (training, establishment of multi-stakeholder forum, field implementation) at national, provincial and district level</li> <li>- Development of conservation districts (concept, c/I, implementation), inc. spatial planning, benefit sharing, etc. , in collaboration with community, private sector, etc.</li> <li>- Development of legal and institutional framework for forest area management (collaboration with government)</li> <li>- Policy analysis on the management of protected and conservation areas</li> <li>- Management of protected areas (national parks, protection forests) → collaboration with Government, community and NGOs</li> <li>- Community based forest management activities (land use, livelihoods, rights, etc.) with community groups in three sites)</li> <li>- Forest partnership programme → collaboration TBI-WWF-CIFOR and Dutch Government. Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forest governance</li> <li>o Market</li> <li>o Forest conservation</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Asia Forest Partnership</li> <li>- Design and development of HCVF at FMV levels. Collaboration with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Timber concessionaries</li> <li>o Oil-palm company</li> <li>o Industrial timber plantation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Livelihood improvement & alternative incomes)
<b>FAO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional study Africa</li> <li>- Regional study Central Asia</li> <li>- Data on forest tenure – FRA 2010</li> <li>- Side session COFO March 2007</li> <li>- Stakeholders Participation in NFPs – Asia (6) and Guidelines</li> <li>- Capacity building</li> <li>- Participatory forestry</li> <li>- Community based enterprise development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Option for tenure reform</li> <li>- Publication on forest tenure</li> </ul>

**Annex 8:  
Action plans**

<b>Partnership Action Plan</b>				
<p><u>Organizations/ institutions:</u> RECOFTC, ECOGOV/Philippines, RRI, CIFOR, Indonesia</p> <p><u>Action/ project:</u> Minister-level: Advocacy campaign for inquiring country tenure rights</p>				
<p><u>Objective:</u> Present recommendations to concerned Ministers/Directors on how to improve tenure rights</p>		<p><u>Anticipated outputs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions by leaders</li> <li>• Instructions to do follow-up actions</li> <li>• Analysis for PPT</li> </ul>		
<p><u>Focal point:</u> Countries: Counterpart of project</p> <p><u>Partners:</u>  (see above)</p>		<p><u>Target (participants):</u> Ministers, forest directors, private sector, LGDs, Tenure holders (IPs, CBFOR)</p>		
<u>Action steps:</u>		<u>Start</u>	<u>Finish</u>	<u>Who</u>
Develop concept paper for circulation among partners		mid 2007		
Identify focal points/country				
Action plan by partners				
<p><u>Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):</u> Local cost of meetings/workshops (by each country counterpart) Travel cost by partners to each conference</p>				

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

CIFOR Africa

Action/ project:

1. Improving equity and livelihoods in community forestry
2. Market reform and alternative trade and business

Objective:

Understand the impact of tenure arrangements, community organization and market on livelihoods

Anticipated outputs:

- Publications
- Policy dialogue
- Tenure reform
- Market reform

Focal point:

René Oyono (CIFOR)

Partners:

FAO, PLAAS, NACO, ILC, IUCN

Target (participants):

- Local communities
- Civil society organizations and NGO
- Governments
- Regional initiatives
- Global initiatives

Action steps:

Start

Finish

Who

- Flexible research
- Sharing meetings
- Thematic research and research action
- Outreach, Policy engagement

Jan

June

June

July

September

Oct

Dec

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

Funding: IDCR, FORD and, hopefully, PROFOR and FAO

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

CIFOR – RRI Research in Latin America

Action/ project:

Improving equity and livelihoods in community forests – policy oriented research in Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala and Nicaragua

Objective:

Understand the impact of different tenure regimes, regulatory framework, community organizations and market linkages on community benefits. Help local groups formulate policy proposals

Anticipated outputs:

Publications  
Regional learning meetings  
Country level policy dialogue

Focal point:

Washington DC CIFOR and IFPRI (Deborah Barry) for LA

Partners:

Flauso - Guatemala  
Nitlapun - Nicaragua  
CEDLA – Bolivia  
FASE - Brazil

Target (participants):

local and national governments (cross-ministerial → agriculture, forestry, conservation)  
Community organizations

Action steps:

Start

Finish

Who

Flexible research component: Scoping exercises to ground research in local interest (design stage)

Jan 07

March

Field work - local partners

Apr 07

Nov 07

Regional workshops

Nov 07

Jan 08

Write-ups, policy dialogue, publications

08

08

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

Funding: IDRC, Ford foundation and PROFOR

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

SFA/FAO

Action/ project:

Review history tenure reform in Chine (study)

Objective:

Anticipated outputs:

Focal point:

Target (participants):

Partners:

NFP facility

Action steps:

Start

Finish

Who

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

RRI/FAO

Action/ project:

COFO presentation

Objective:

Anticipated outputs:

Focal point:

Target (participants):

Partners:

Action steps:

Start

Finish

Who

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

SFA/FAO

Action/ project:

Assessment of tenure reform

Objective:

Develop indicators for assessment.  
Technical support

Anticipated outputs:

Legal framework for participatory policy formulation

Focal point:

Partners:

Target (participants):

Action steps:

Start

Finish

Who

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

## Partnership Action Plan

Organizations/ institutions:

ROF/TROPENBOS/FAO

Action/ project:

Objective:

Project proposal CBED + livelihoods

Anticipated outputs:

Indonesia (Sulawesi and Kalimantan)

Focal point:

RECOFTC - IGES

Partners:

Target (participants):

Action steps:

Concept Note → FAO

Start

03/07

Finish

Who

Dicky

Resource requirements (time, money, people etc):

Approx. 300.000 – 400.000 (2 years)

→ TCP?

→ FNPP?