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FFF Vision

“Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples organisations have improved their livelihoods and the decision-making over forest and farm landscapes”
Forest Status in Kenya

How much forest in Kenya?

3.47 million ha (6% of the total land area) *Source: FAO (2010): Forest Resources Assessment Report.*
Core Forestry Programmes

- **Dryland Forestry**
  - 80% of Kenya

- **Industrial Plantations**
  - 140,000 Ha

- **Forest Conservation and Management**

- **Farm Forests**
Trees on farm
Ongoing support to smallholder producers
Findings of the scoping study

- Kenya is a wood deficit country (current deficit of 12 m³)
- 80% of the national wood supply goes to meeting national energy demand [fuelwood]
- Bulk of wood in Kenya is outside state forests mainly in farmlands, drylands

- 2 national Apex organisations exist:
  - Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK)
  - Kenya Tree Growers association( KETGA)
- Critical mass of framers willing to venture into tree farming
- There is supportive policy environment to spur increased wood production and development of community and farm forestry
- Devolution - County govs incharge of community and farm forestry extension
- Opportunities for synergy with other programs
Current production of sustainable wood is insufficient

Sustainable wood supply 2013 (est.)

- Natural forest types: 12.6 million M³/year sustainable supply (41%)
- Commercial forest types: 3.5 million M³/year sustainable supply (11.4%)
- Trees on farms: 14.6 million M³/year sustainable supply (47.6%)

Current deficit of ~12 million M³

Wood & wood product demand 2013 (est.)

NB. Estimates from PwC report; Data from KFS and UNEP

Adapted from P. Kariuki (KFS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of forest resource (using FAO definitions)</th>
<th>Area (‘000 Ha)</th>
<th>Annual change 1990 to 2010 (‘000 Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous closed Canopy Forest</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Mangroves</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open woodlands</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Plantation Forests</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Plantation forests</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total Forest land (total of above categories)</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush-land</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>24,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms with Trees</td>
<td>9,420</td>
<td>10,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Area of Kenya</td>
<td>58,037</td>
<td>58,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges

Barriers identified in scoping study:

• **Policy and institutional**
  - restrictions on timber trade
  - land and resource tenure
  - PPP investment framework

• **Knowledge and technological**
  - quality germplasm
  - tree nursery management
  - silvi-culural practices

• **Economic**
  - incentives
  - credit facilities
  - processing/value addition
  - markets

• **Socio-cultural**
  - gender equity
  - youth involvement
  - rights for indigenous communities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme climatic events (especially, draught)</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>Selection of drought resistant varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade restrictions (on forest products)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Compliance with trade regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and resource tenure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Policy advocacy and integration of traditional tenure systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural barriers, where some cultures prohibit women from planting trees</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Exposure visits awareness creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwillingness for CFAs to participate in PFM due to minimal incentives and benefits</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Policy advocacy to incorporate more incentives to producer groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pests and diseases</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Use of high quality planting materials, support tree improvement program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest fires</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Forest management in partnership with local community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linkages with ongoing programmes in Kenya

• Review of Forest Policy and Act
• Miti Mingi Maisha Bora (More Tree Better Lives)
• Sustainable forest management in dryland forests
• Support to Bio-enterprises
• Support to sustainable charcoal production
• Climate Change Adaptation/Mitigation in agriculture
• Landscape and Ecosystem Restoration (SLM)
• REDD+ / UNREDD
• Regional FLEGT project
• Support to land and natural resource governance
• Food Security and Nutrition
• Poverty Reduction, Livelihoods and income generation
FFF launch in Kenya

6th Nov. 2014
65 participants from
Government (MEWNR, KFS)
County government reps
International organisations: CIFOR, AFF, ICRAF)
NGOs
Apex PO Reps
Farmer reps
Wood product exhibitors

Key outputs:
• Endorsement of the project by GoK
• Identification for linkages with ongoing activities
• Recommendations for programme activities
Synergies with German Programme

**Pillar I**
Strengthen smallholder producer organisations for livelihoods & policy engagement

**Pillar II**
Catalyze policy platforms at local & national level

**Pillar III**
Link local voices and learning to global arena

**Result I**
A Kenyan association of small and medium forest owners is functional

**Result II**
Extension Services for private forest owners are improved

**Result III**
Awareness for private forest management has been raised at different levels
### Agreed next steps for the inception of FFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the scoping study final version</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; week of November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the draft (1) framework programme for the 3 years implementation included logframe and (2) first year work plan and budget, done by the FFF Kenya core team in a retreat. The output of the launching mission will be used as a basis for the preparation of these 2 documents.</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; week December, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of the FFF Kenya Facilitator in the FFF retreat for facilitators to be held in Rome</td>
<td>10 – 12 December, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Advisory Committee to provide inputs and approve the framework programme for the 3 years implementation included logframe and first year work plan and budget</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; week of January, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send the framework programme for the 3 years implementation and first year implementation to FFF management</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; week of January, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission to discuss the implementation modalities, discuss the Letter of Agreement with the selected implementing organizations, implementation of the Monitoring and Learning and baseline study</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; week January or 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; week of February, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Letter of Agreements (LoA) with the selected implementing organizations. See note (*)</td>
<td>Until 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; week of February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement of funds to the implementing organizations</td>
<td>Until March 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FFF Framework Outcome 1: Strengthened producer organisations engage effectively in policy dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Output 1.1:** Status of existing and potential forest products established | • Number of viable products identified  
• Number of players in the market | Value chains analysis reports | Forest products utilized are legal |
| **Output 1.2:** Capacity for farm forest production and management for POs and indigenous peoples’ improved | • No. of TOTs trained in MAED  
• No of tree farmers receiving extension services  
• No of standard tree nurseries established and seedlings produced | • Training needs assessment report  
• Training modules  
• Training reports  
• Progress reports | Trained POs TOTs will be willing to train others |
| **Output 1.3:** Producer organizations institutional capacity to engage in policy dialogue strengthened | • No of stakeholders in farm forestry mapped  
• No of Apex organizations subjected to OD  
• No of Apex organization | Report of stakeholders mapping  
OD report  
Proceedings/minutes of federation meetings | Willingness of POS to undergo OD  
Willingness of POs to join and be active members of the federation |
### FFF Framework Outcome 2:
Local communities and producers are organized and thereby have the capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Output 2.1**: Status of forest and farm products and domestic market dynamics established | • Number of viable products identified  
• Number of players in the market  
• Nature of value addition  
• Nature of markets | Value chain analysis report                                                          | There will be no drastic changes internally or externally impacting on production or demand (market distortion) |
| **Output 2.2**: PO cooperatives formed and linked to markets                         | • Number of viable forest enterprises  
• Number of people with business development skills  
• Number of men and women benefiting from cooperative model | • Enterprise records  
• Enterprise plans  
• Contracts | Conducive environment for production and trading in nature based products in terms of regulatory frameworks, weather conditions  
Supportive legal environment for setting up of Pos cooperative  
POs willingness to join and support the cooperative and sufficient incentives to sustain their participation |
### FFF Framework Outcome 2 cont...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.3: A revolving fund for development of forest enterprises established and made functional</td>
<td>- Number people borrowing from the fund</td>
<td>Loan records from financial institution</td>
<td>Willingness and ability of borrowers to honour loans repayment schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of repayments and defaulters</td>
<td></td>
<td>The revolving fund will be able to attract additional funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Amount of money disbursed and paid back</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive financial policy of the partner institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of forest enterprises funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FFF Framework Outcome 3: Cross-sectoral coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Output 3.1: Institutional and cross sectorial coordination mechanisms analyzed, established and strengthened** | • ToRs and Code of conduct for the forum developed and implemented  
• Policy briefs, Assessment report, signed MoUs and agreements | Assessment report, Code of conduct, policy briefs, minutes of meetings Progress reports | There will be political good will from both levels of government  
Capacity to undertake the planned activities (resources, training opportunities) will be available  
Increased awareness will lead to action and adoption of proposed tools approaches and technologies  
Conducive environment for production and trading in nature based products in terms of regulatory frameworks, weather conditions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.2:</strong> Smallholder forest farm producers actively participating in multi sectoral forums</td>
<td>position papers developed and presented No of participants engaged in forums</td>
<td>Position papers Proceedings IEC materials, Action plans</td>
<td>Willingness of small holders forest and farm producers to participate in multi-sectoral forums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# FFF Framework Outcome 4: National and global agendas and initiatives are informed about the knowledge and priorities of smallholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.1</strong>: Stakeholders actively engaged at county and national level platforms for information sharing, awareness raising and advocating for change</td>
<td>No of platforms&lt;br&gt;No. of producer group members participating in national and sub national platforms&lt;br&gt;No of information packages produced and disseminated&lt;br&gt;No of people receiving information packages</td>
<td>Proceedings of deliberations&lt;br&gt;Information packages&lt;br&gt;Distribution Records</td>
<td>Change champions have no hidden agenda and advocacy change sought for is for common good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4.2</strong>: Small holder farm forest producers interests and concerns are incorporated into county and national policy processes and international frameworks (FLEGT; REDD+ and UNFCCC; Regional Integration; CBD/NAGOYA; Provisions of the constitution)</td>
<td>No of national and international processes informed&lt;br&gt;No of representatives participating in national policy and international processes</td>
<td>Resolutions of international processes</td>
<td>Decision makers at international level are open and receptive to petitions and suggestions of smallholders, women, communities and Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme implementation arrangements

Participatory approach

• The project Implementation will adopt a participatory approach, engaging various stakeholders whose participation is central to the successful delivery of the project.

• The level of stakeholder involvement will depend on institutional or group stake/interest in the project, the statutory mandate, technical and operational capacity (Stakeholder mapping and analysis).

• The project will have three levels of stakeholder involvement:

  - Level 1 is the core team (programme management unit) that will execute and implement the project,

  - Level 2 (primary stakeholders) that will be closely involved in the management or service provision of the project

  - Level 3 (secondary stakeholders) who will be informed of the project progress and consulted for their input where applicable.
# Programme facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FAO         | • Policy guidance  
              • Technical backstopping  
              • Logistics /facilitation  
              • Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation |
| KFS         | • Project execution  
              • Stakeholder coordination  
              • Communication  
              • Secretariat for PAC |
## Primary stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Governments</td>
<td>• Political will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enabling policy framework / incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budgetary support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex Forest and Farm producer organizations (KEFGA, FF SPAK)</td>
<td>• Project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmer coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
<td>• Extension support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linkage with ongoing programmes (ASDSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based organizations (CFAs FFS, Farmer, Women and Youth groups)</td>
<td>• Project implementation on the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector (Commercial Forest Product Dealers)</td>
<td>• Supply of inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Value addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linkage to markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial institution</td>
<td>• Credit facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training in business management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Secondary stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CIFOR                                           | • Technical knowledge  
• Training tools  
• Resource mobilization |
| Forest action Network (FAN)                      | • Policy Advocacy  
• Capacity building and networking  
• Training in community groups  
• Community mobilization. |
| Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG)               | • Knowledge / experience sharing  
• Community mobilization. |
| AWF                                             | • Linkage with ongoing initiatives |
# Secondary stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)</td>
<td>• Development of wood and non-wood Forest products and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dissemination of best forest and farm practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)</td>
<td>• Environmental awareness creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcement of environmental regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO)</td>
<td>• Integration of farm forestry and agricultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Project Advisory Committee (PAC)

- The project will be guided by the PAC that will be chaired by the Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. The PAC will be convened by KFS who will also provide the secretarial service.

- The main objective for the steering committee is to provide advisory support for the full implementation of the project.

- The work of the advisory committee serves to promote ownership of the project by ensuring that the partners and stakeholders are involved and responsible for key decisions about the project implementation.

- The PSC will also serve to provide common agreement among stakeholders on changes that are beneficial to implementation, and achievement of the project objectives. The PAC will be meeting twice a year or ad hoc if need be.
Project Management Structure cont...

**TOR for PAC**

- Provide high level orientation and guidance for the project (institutional, political and operational);
- Ensure that the project is implemented in accordance within the agreed framework (Project Document, Annual Workplans) and achieves its targets (outputs, outcomes and objectives);
- Ensure collaboration between implementing institutions;
- Review initial project outputs and project progress and address constraints;
- Ensure the integration and coordination of project activities with other related government and donor-funded initiatives;
- Explore opportunities for resource mobilization to ensure sustainability of project initiatives.
Project Management Structure cont...

*Project Management Unit (PMU)*

- The Project Management Unit will be composed of FAO and KFS.
- The PMU will be directly responsible and accountable for all aspects of the project execution.
- FAO and KFS shall appoint focal points to steer the project implementation.
- FAO will provide policy/technical backstopping and oversight while KFS will be the lead implementing agency. The PMU will meet quarterly or as needed.
**TOR for PMU:**

- Coordination of day-to-day implementation of the project
- Facilitation of other implementing partners
- Review technical and administrative concerns during project implementation;
- Nominate consultants and institutions to undertake various contracts;
- Endorse procurement of goods and services;
- Provide oversight on financial expenditures.
- Monitoring and supervision of activities
- Communication
Project management organogram
Welcome to Kenya

Thank You