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Executive summary

These proceedings are derived from the First African Farm/Family Forestry Producer Organizations Conference held on 9–11 June 2015 at the Laico Regency Hotel in Nairobi, Kenya. The conference brought together family farm forest business organizations, broader locally controlled forestry networks, forest and farm producer organizations, associations and federations, policymakers, universities, researchers, non-government organizations (NGOs), and civil-society organizations working with family farm forestry groups. Its overall theme was “forestry for improved livelihoods”.

The conference was coordinated by the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA), the Forest Action Network (FAN), the African Forest Forum (AFF) and the Kenya Forest Service (KFS), in close collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF), the Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK), the Great Green Wall of the Sahara and the Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI), Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) and European Union – Africa Caribbean Pacific Group of States (EU-ACP) cooperation. The conference, which had 110 participants, was opened by Professor Judy Wakhungu, Cabinet Secretary for the Environment and Natural Resources. It was graced by Mr Emilio Mugo, Acting Director of the KFS; Mr Dampha Almani, African Union (AU) Senior Policy Officer for Forestry and Land Management; Mr Peter deMarsh, Chair of the IFFA; Mr Geoffrey Wanyama, Director of FF-SPAK; Mr Jeff Campbell, Manager of the FFF; Mr Luca Alinovi, FAO Country Representative in Kenya; KFS senior deputy directors; government and forestry practitioners from Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Nepal, the Netherlands, Niger, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

At the end of the three-day conference, participants agreed on statements and important messages on farm/family forestry and their producer organizations in Africa, which will be used at the XIV World Forestry Congress (WFC) to be convened in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015.
Introduction

Natural forests are being degraded in many African countries, and this is usually a function of inadequate local control over forest resources, which undermines incentives to manage and restore those resources. Degradation is creating an increasing gap between the demand for and the supply of forest goods, which increases commercial returns to tree-growers. As a result, an important change is beginning to happen: families are deciding to plant more trees on their farms. This has led to the formation of forest farm producer organizations (FFPOs) and federations, but such organizations face many challenges that threaten their sustainability. One such challenge is ensuring that their members can access markets and financial services for their forest products. Another is engaging with government forest agencies to solve conflicts that arise out of unclear tenure arrangements.

To ensure the strengthening and sustainability of FFPOs, it is necessary that they share information with each other and use this information to articulate their views and influence policy formulation by government agencies. Through their networks, FFPOs should be able to access resources that can build their capacity to serve their members more effectively. It is against this backdrop that the First African Farm/Family Forestry Producer Organizations Conference was held on 9–11 June 2015 at the Laico Regency Hotel in Nairobi, Kenya.

The conference attracted 110 participants from 20 countries worldwide representing farm/family forestry, as well as government forest managers, forest technical agencies, NGOs, donor agencies, academic institutions, and general forestry groups committed to encouraging the development of FFPOs and their federations.

Conference objectives

- Strengthen networking among African family farm forest owners and producer organizations.
- Provide a forum to discuss policy and legal frameworks for locally controlled forestry development and emerging forest producer federations.
- Emphasize and help understand the importance, potential, policy and legal challenges, and opportunities that forest farmers encounter in efforts to establish and develop effective FFPOs and federations.
- Produce resolutions for the XIV World Forestry Congress.

Outputs

- African FFPO network to enable FFPOs to communicate, share best business practices and influence family farm forestry policies and legislation in their countries.
- Opportunities to encourage the establishment or strengthening of family farm forest producer groups, or national organizations and federations identified.
- Background paper.
- Summary report of conference outcomes, including statements and important messages on farm/family forestry and their producer organizations in Africa, to be used at important international events such as the WFC in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015.
1. Opening session

1.1 Remarks
Peter de Marsh, IFFA chair

Peter deMarsh welcomed delegates to the three-day conference. He noted that the conference had attracted participants from 20 countries and would provide an opportunity for sharing challenges and opportunities on farm forestry. The conference would also offer a chance for lasting connections between associations and encouragement to form new associations where these had not been established.

Mr deMarsh noted that 2015 was an important year for international events, such as the international conferences scheduled to take place in Durban and Paris. He indicated that this farm forestry conference would provide an opportunity to develop strong messages for the WFC. As chair of the IFFA, Mr deMarsh reiterated the support provided during the formation of FF-SPAK.

Zeroing in on the conference agenda, Mr deMarsh expressed hope that there would be shared experiences on security of tenure, access to markets, farmer associations and financial and extension support services, as well as advice. He concluded by saying there was possibility for a win–win situation for associations and farm producers. A similar meeting had been held in Mexico and another is scheduled in Asia in 2016, all targeted at improving the lives of communities.

Geoffrey Wanyama, FF-SPAK chair

Geoffrey Wanyama noted that this was the first meeting on farm forestry in Africa with representatives from across the world. The meeting would provide a roadmap for farm forestry in Africa as well as an opportunity to learn from various countries on how they promote farm forestry.

He acknowledged support from FAO, the KFS, We Effect, IUCN and other stakeholders in making the conference possible. Moving forward, he hoped for more support from the Government of Kenya and other players in supporting farm forestry. He pointed out that the conference needed to address the issue of extension services, access to finance and how to ensure farmers are networked. He expressed hope that issues discussed at the conference would be cascaded downwards to the local level.

Mr Wanyama concluded by saying that FF-SPAK was a voice for negotiating on behalf of smallholder producers, including the involvement of youth and women. In addition, FF-SPAK was keen to learn from other success stories around the world. He hoped that good extension services and other innovative proposals would emanate from the conference.
1.2 Background paper
Julius Chupezi Tieguhong and Jolien Schure, authors

The authors of the background paper set the scene on the status of farm/family forestry in Africa, noting that:

- Mechanisms for locally controlled forestry exist through, for example, individual tree/land ownership and community forestry.
- Forest policies generally refer to agroforestry, trees on agricultural land, farm forestry and integration with agriculture.
- Institutional frameworks for farm/family forestry are in the early stages and are weakly developed. There is little transfer of rights to communities, unclear tree and land tenure, little awareness of legal rights, and a lack of technologies and skills.

Farm/family forestry offers important benefits for people’s livelihoods and sustainable landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihoods</th>
<th>Sustainable landscapes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence: food, fodder, fuel, medicine, construction, etc.</td>
<td>Ecosystem services: biodiversity, carbon stock, erosion control, soil fertility, pest control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash income</td>
<td>Landscape restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>Climate-change mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations: underdeveloped markets, vulnerable groups excluded</td>
<td>Limitations: transition to monocultures, replace other land uses, pressure on forestland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An enabling environment for farm/family forestry requires a number of measures to be put in place. A key element of such an environment is ensuring tenure rights and access to forest products, which are hindered by competing land claims, disconnection between official land laws and customary rules, large-scale land acquisition, and difficulties in implementing community forestry. Other enabling policies include: facilitating market access; promoting tree-planting and rural development; and putting in place compensation mechanisms such as carbon finance, bio-carbon projects, REDD+¹, payments for environmental services (PES), sustainability certification and ecotourism.

Tieguhong and Schure noted that the present expansion of global and urban markets offer opportunities for developing the trade of forest products by smallholders. There are many limitations, however, such as low prices; a lack of market information; limited value adding; limited access to finances; difficulties and bribes during transportation; competition with illegally harvested produce; and national and international initiatives that exclude smallholders.

Creating an enabling environment can be enhanced through capacity and extension services. The capacity needs of forest farmers include:

- secure access to land and trees;
- training on sustainable techniques;
- materials for tree-planting;
- training and technology for processing and packaging; and

¹ REDD+ = reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks.
Initiatives dealing with farmers’ needs include: new types of partnerships; the introduction of tools and techniques; and policy improvements.

Tieguhong and Schure noted various kinds and sizes of FFPOs, with varying objectives and responsibilities towards their members. The formation of FFPOs is governed by district, provincial or national regulations and FFPOs may operate at the community, national or regional scales. Depending on the enabling legal, institutional and policy environment, the scale of operation of an FFPO may also be influenced by the spatial distribution of the products of interest.

FFPOs are important because they harness the strength of large numbers of small operators; this strength is important in overcoming challenges of community development, such as a lack of skills for collective action, recordkeeping and business management; a lack of access to information; and insufficient support. In addition, FFPOs help unleash the economic power and entrepreneurial potential of members by increasing their political “voice” for securing tenure and other rights to the natural resources on which their enterprises are based. FFPOs also increase the negotiating power of smallholders in obtaining fair value for their products and environmental services. FFPOs deliver business advice and services through partnerships with NGOs, private companies and governmental and development agencies. It is therefore key to build their capacities to achieve financial, food and energy security, and to boost their participation in policy processes.

A good producer organization has a clear sense of purpose and voluntary membership; it is well-structured and autonomous and uses democratic governance tools. A good producer organization has open and accountable leadership and administration, sensitivity to social inclusion/gender equality, a representation of youth, and strong grassroots support. It respects indigenous peoples’ rights and cultural perspectives and has good communication strategies to ensure its visibility and outreach. It emphasizes collaboration among FFPOs through exchange visits and organization into federations at different levels – local, national, regional and international.

Examples of policy and/or resource support for FFPOs:
- The Kenya Forests Act (2005) recognizes the importance of community forest associations (CFAs). CFAs are allowed to grow annual crops alongside young trees and to sell seedlings to the KFS.
- In Gambia, the new Forest Act has improved commercial forest rights to forest products for communities by its provisions for the development of community forestry and the co-management of national parks under joint forest park management.

FFPOs provide multiple services for addressing policy and market challenges. Multiple forms of FFPOs exist in Africa, such as those:
- providing individual products or services (Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo – DRC, Ethiopia, Liberia and Zambia);
- around producer groups along value chains, such as tree-grower associations, artisanal milling groups, and domestic lumber traders’ associations (Ghana, Kenya and Mozambique);
- a combination of the above (Gambia and South Africa). In Gambia, tree-grower associations are based on cashew production, ecotourism, fuelwood and
honey/honey by-products, as well as wood and other non-wood forest products (NWFPs).

- In Zambia, FFPOs – such as the Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) – are organized loosely around wood and seasonal NWFPs.

Farm/family forestry holds great potential for expansion throughout Africa while providing for people’s livelihoods and sustainable land management. They can assist in: achieving land tenure security; opening up markets; building capacity and providing extension services; linking smallholders and international initiatives; strengthening knowledge on the contributions of farm forestry to economic development; ensuring the inclusion of vulnerable groups; and improving environmental outcomes.

Challenges for FFPOs in Africa include:
- inadequate investment by donors;
- the short-term nature of project-based funding for FFPOs compared with the need to build long-term forestry initiatives;
- fragmented initiatives dealing with farm/family forestry;
- the weak capacity of forestry services and sometimes contradicting messages of forestry and agriculture extension;
- uncertainties on how to deal with prospects for carbon sequestration and carbon finance, obstructed by complicated tenure arrangements in most African countries; and
- overall weak capacity and lack of knowledge and organization among farmers, requiring long-term monitoring and capacity building.

Opportunities for FFPOs in Africa include the following:
- FFPOs can enhance their role in providing benefits for forest and farm producers by: good governance, optimal group size, transparency, appropriate product types and market orientation.
- National policies provide FFPOs with types of associations, and official registration is generally easy.
- Present reforms on land and tree tenure and community forestry and the creation of multi-stakeholder platforms are providing enabling policy environments in which FFPOs can promote sustainable forest management and increase the benefits for local communities.
- Global markets for forest products are expanding, providing FFPOs with opportunities for creating market networks and information centres for members.
- FFPOs can benefit from increasing international attention on financial mechanisms, such as REDD+ projects, carbon finance and PES to sustain their activities and increase benefits for their members.

Some existing FFPOs, such as the Sontaaba women’s group in Burkina Faso, offer key functional and organizational attributes for the successful FFPOs of tomorrow:
- Build trust, purpose and passion. Regular exchange visits and internal meetings are keys to strengthening the cooperative spirit, sharing information and purpose and reducing internal competition.
- Fullness in access to and control and ownership of the natural resource base, with full trade rights. Fully registered with the relevant ministries so all transactions are legal. Well-assured supply.
- Access to technology for communication to reach potential customers globally, and knowledge, training, skills and technology for collecting and processing products to customer specifications.
• Optional certification of brand, which will provide products with assured outlets or at least influence the availability of outlets for products. Third-party involvement can provide a great opportunity for pro-poor certification.

1.3 Plenary on the background paper
Participants provided the following suggestions and comments on the background paper:

• The importance of adding value to products and stimulating value chains, especially by promoting research and development for lesser-known and valuable native species.
• Present difficulties of selling carbon credits and low prices in international markets.
• Pressure on land, and large-scale land acquisition, as a great risk for poor smallholders.
• Need for investment in FFPOs, including from domestic and local resources.
• Options for certification of forest products for export.
• Lessons that can be learnt from other continents, such as from community forestry associations in Nepal.
• Capacity building of FFPOs and groups of these organizations at the local, regional and international levels, working through capacity-building platforms.
• Illegal trade of forest products as a main obstacle.
• Need to make small-scale farm forestry economically viable.
• Need for good-quality germplasm.
• Women and their land rights need special attention.
• Need to consider and take into account views of small producers and consumers.
• Armed conflict is an important obstacle for securing access for smallholders in some countries (e.g. Central Africa and South Sudan).
• The position of indigenous peoples, such as Pygmies in DRC, and their roles in managing forests, need special attention
• Community forestry is hampered by difficulties in management and perhaps by unrealistic expectations.

1.4 Emilio Mugo – Acting Director, KFS
Mr Mugo noted that the conference was an important function in Kenya focusing on forests outside protected areas. He said that, in the past, too much emphasis had been placed on protected areas to the detriment of farm forestry. The conference had added importance because it was the first such forum in Africa.

Citing recent achievements, Mr Mugo mentioned that FAO and the KFS had received an award in Rome to the tune of US$25 000. These funds had been placed in a forest conservation and management fund. The KFS and FAO are to work on interventions to support farm forestry in the country through these funds.

In conclusion, Mr Mugo indicated that the government would step back so as to allow small-scale farmers to come forward and benefit from the market. The KFS has been piloting farm forestry in Nakuru and Laikipia with the aim of scaling up in other areas. Mr Mugo finished by saying he was a firm believer in not just involving local communities but empowering them to benefit from their efforts.
1.5 Luca Alinovi, FAO Country Representative

Mr Alinovi said that FAO believes in a future for Kenya without hunger, in which smallholders have access to opportunities. Farm forestry associations need to be at the forefront, exploiting economic opportunities themselves, without other institutions talking on their behalf. In addition, there is a need to make better use of economic opportunities for trees. This is especially important because the vast majority of important players are small producers.

FAO believes in the forestry space in Kenya, micro-resource management, and supporting small producers. It is important to implement legal frameworks that tackle illegal timber trade and to track the illegal timber trade. FAO is working closely with the KFS and the FFF on REDD+ initiatives and bio-enterprises as ways in which forests can be sources of sustainable income. It is important to make farming economically attractive and to attract the new generation while ensuring that the system is sustainable into the future.

1.6 Jeff Campbell, FFF

Mr Campbell welcomed all participants. The FFF is a partnership that works on three major pillars:

1. Strengthening forest and farm producer associations for business, improved livelihoods and advocacy. Helping producers to organize into associations and small enterprises is important in stimulating rural development.
2. Helping governments improve coordination through multi-sectoral platforms.
3. Supporting FFPO exchanges, and working at the regional and international levels.

The FFF works in ten countries, four of which are in Africa – the Gambia, Kenya, Liberia and Zambia. In those countries, the FFF works closely with ministries and leading producer organizations. The FFF directly supports producers and catalyses existing programmes and organizations. In Kenya, the FFF is piloting in Nakuru and Laikipia, where it is providing training in market analysis and development.

Recommendations from the three-day conference will be shared at the WFC in Durban. Mr Campbell concluded his remarks by saying he was hopeful that participants would be key actors in the process.

1.7 Dampha Almani, African Union Commission

Mr Almani noted that the conference was very timely because it addressed the fundamental requirements for the management of forest resources in Africa. He noted the importance of involving local communities in such management.

At the AU, the focus is on:

- Poverty alleviation in the continent: farm forestry is important in improving livelihoods.
- The challenges of desertification and land degradation – the core of poverty; rural–urban migration; and the exodus of African youth to other foreign lands.
- Job and wealth creation – there is a need to involve youth and women. Addressing security challenges in Africa and reducing the engagement of youth in illegal activities.
- Food security and agricultural productivity.
- Addressing the challenges of climate change – sustainable forest management addresses climate change.
• Addressing energy demand – e.g. if charcoal producers are organized in a formal way, they will be more likely to pursue sustainable forest management and income generation.

At the international level, the AU is working with the AFF, the European Union, FAO and other key players, for example in implementing the GGWSSI, which covers the area from Dakar to Djibouti. The AU is planning events at the WFC at Durban, in collaboration with FAO, the AFF and the United Nations Forum on Forests.

Mr Almani concluded by noting that the AU was working regionally to create opportunities for sustainable forest management and address land tenure issues. In addition, it was keen to partner with various institutions to address continental challenges of poverty and climate change.

1.8 Keynote speech by Professor Judi Wakhungu, Cabinet Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Government of Kenya

“Principal Secretary Environment and Natural Resources, Kenya
The FAO Representative in Kenya
The President, International Family Forestry Alliance
The Manager, Forest and Farm Facility, FAO Rome
Director, Kenya Forest Service,
Representative of PEFC,
CEO Forest Action Network and
CEO Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya
Members of the media
Distinguished delegates
Guests all gathered here, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am delighted and greatly honoured to be here this morning to participate in the first African Farm Forestry Producer Organizations Conference which has participants drawn from Africa and interested partners internationally. It affords me a great opportunity not only to officially open this important gathering but also to interact with and share my thoughts with you on the emerging farm forestry sector in Africa.

Ladies and gentlemen, my Ministry has a major responsibility in overseeing how natural resources in this country are sustainably managed and utilized for the realization of the aspirations of the Kenyan people.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Forests constitute a vital natural resource in Africa. Over 70% of rural households in Africa depend on forests for their livelihoods, domestic fuel requirements and timber which is an essential raw material required in the construction and furniture industry. Forests in Africa are critical in conservation of biodiversity and in the sustenance of water resources. They are becoming increasingly important in bio-prospecting for the pharmaceutical and other bio-products industries, and in alternative medicines (herbal medicine). They are also critical in providing a variety of environmental services which are critical to human wellbeing and which also underpin many sectors of the growing economies on the Continent. It is for this reason that most African governments have prioritized enhancing conservation of forests and promotion of farm forestry as a strategy of reducing pressure on existing natural forestry resources.

Ladies and Gentlemen, let me remind you that The African Forestry and Wildlife Commission was established by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
(FAO) in 1959 and it has continued to provide a policy and technical forum for the countries of the African region to discuss and address forest issues on a regional basis. The African Forestry and Wildlife Commission is one of the six regional forestry commissions of FAO. Its purpose is to advise on the formulation of forest and wildlife management policies and to review and coordinate its implementation at the regional level; to exchange information and, generally through special Subsidiary Bodies, advise on suitable practices and action in regard to technical problems; and to make appropriate recommendations in relation to the foregoing.

At the regional Level, the African Union has drafted the Africa Agenda 2063 in which it is envisaged that the Continent will have achieved sustainable development driven by the African people by 2063. In this aspiration, the African union foresees the sustainable utilization of Africa’s rich natural resource base as a great driver towards the achievement of this endeavour in which Africa envisages transforming, growing and industrializing African economies through beneficiation and value addition of natural resources.

Ladies and gentleman, this Conference today is focusing on the emerging farm forestry producer organizations in Africa. This is indeed happening at the right moment in Africa when most governments are reforming their national forestry policies to effectively contribute to the livelihoods of the people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am aware that the development of farm forestry producer organizations faces great challenges ranging from inadequate policy and legal frameworks, inadequate institutional capacity for the producer organizations to conduct business and engage in the market economy, inadequate quality standards for products and overall lack of emphasis by most governments on the contribution of this sector to the economy.

Ladies and Gentlemen, In order for the African Governments to tackle these emerging challenges in farm forestry development, a paradigm shift from business as usual to business un-usual is needed. This new paradigm shift should focus more on the development of farm forestry on farmlands, conservation of the vast woodlands and the development of a policy and legal environment favourable to the development of locally controlled forest enterprises and businesses in Africa.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to note that this conference will produce messages to be taken to the World Forestry Congress that will be held at Durban, South Africa in September this year. I am sure that the Congress discussions will be greatly enriched by the contribution from this conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am aware this conference has been organized by the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA) in close collaboration with the following partners: the Kenya Forest Service, the Forest and Farm Facility at FAO, the Forest Action Network, the African Forest Forum, We-Effect, Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade, the Great Green Wall Initiative, the Program for European Forest Certification, and the Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya. I am very grateful for the support all these partners have provided towards the organizing of this important conference aimed at discussing challenges facing farm forestry development with special emphasis on farm forestry producer organizations in the continent.

Ladies and gentlemen, In conclusion, it is now my pleasure to declare this first African Farm Forestry Producer Organizations conference officially open. I wish you all very fruitful
discussions which will in the future inform the policies of the various African Governments towards the development of a more proactive farm forestry policy in the Continent, which offers the greatest opportunity for increasing forest/tree cover for the sustainable development of the peoples’ livelihoods. **Ladies and Gentlemen**, Let me extend my warm welcome to all the delegates present and hope you will enjoy the warm hospitality Kenyans are known for.”
2. Securing land tenure and enabling policies

2.1 Introduction by James Makori, environmental lawyer, Kenya

Land tenure addresses the terms and conditions under which rights to land and land-based resources are acquired, held, transferred or transmitted. It is the quantum of property rights that a country has decided to allow individuals or groups thereof to hold, and the conditions under which those rights are to be enjoyed. Because it determines access to land and land-based resources, land tenure is a critical variable in the management and conservation of the environment. This also explains why the state retains powers to regulate private land use and to entirely abrogate property rights in land in the interests of environmental conservation.

2.1.1 Property rights and categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>PROPERTY RIGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private land:</td>
<td>User rights: Constitution of Kenya talks of access to land. Right to use the land for housing, grazing, subsistence farming, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community land:</td>
<td>Control: decision-making on how the land should be used, including deciding what crops should be planted, planning regulations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land:</td>
<td>Transfer rights: right to sell/charge/lease the land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Why secure land tenure?

Secure land tenure is important so as to develop and/or improve property taxation. In a devolved system such as in Kenya, land tenure helps county governments raise revenue through taxation. Secure land tenure is also important for unifying land markets, providing access to finance (i.e. loans/mortgages), guaranteeing investments and in the provision of public services (such as water and sewerage), and it allows property insurance.

Insecurity

Insecurity is caused primarily by informal arrangements such as land squatting, unapproved and unsurveyed subdivisions, unofficial leases and certificates of ownership, double allocation and fraud. Such situations are further exacerbated by the marginalization of women, youth, the disabled and the uneducated, etc. Urban sprawl and unsustainable subdivisions further augment insecurity. Capacity limitations, such as on concessions, play a part in fuelling insecurity. In Africa, conflicts between “settlers” and “indigenous” landholders are commonplace, with a typical example playing out in Zimbabwe over the years.


Security of tenure

Security of tenure implies that the right of access to and use of land and property is underwritten by a known set of rules, and that this right is justifiable. Tenure can be effected through constitutional and legal frameworks, social norms, cultural values and individual preferences. A secure expectation is that your land rights will be respected, for example from eviction. Existing types of tenure include:

- **Freehold.** The freeholder of a property owns it outright. Benefits include that the owner doesn’t have to worry about the lease running out, can make long-term investments, doesn’t have to deal with a landlord, and doesn’t have to pay ground rent, service charges or any other landlord charges. Ownership is formalized through titling, either by grant or the recognition of a pre-existing right. Through registration, the state makes an official record of the right or a document creating the right.

- **Leasehold.** Leasehold provides equity to disadvantaged groups by giving them rights over a given parcel of land for a specified duration. Prices are low compared with those for freehold land. However, the downside is that more planning and control powers are exercised on this land, both by governments and landlords.

2.1.3 How to secure land tenure

Land tenure issues are largely similar across Africa. The following are some solutions for increasing land tenure security:

- Land law reform, including land regularization and the harmonization of tenure systems.
- Reform of land administration and public land management.
- Redistributive land reform, either from private holders or the state and by compulsory acquisition or via the market.
- Community-based land reform and tenancy reform.
- Land-use planning reform/zoning laws.

Important players in securing land tenure

Community members, CFAs, group representatives, water resource user associations (WRUAs), etc., all have key roles to play in informing and participating in decision-making processes on land reform. Governments provide the legal recognition of rights, affirm the rights that people hold, and empower them to keep away trespassers. They oversee land registration and cadastral systems, and enable the adjudication of disputes through a formal court system. Illegal organizations such as Mungiki and Al shabab are a threat to good governance.

Need for reform

Changes in land use and the growing human population have increased demand for land, especially in and around the major urban centres for housing, industries and commerce, and putting pressure on valuable agricultural land. There is great awareness among people in Africa of the value of land and property. For many, land is the core of their existence because they depend on the produce derived from the land for their livelihoods. The current categories of land – public, community and private – are a direct result of the colonial history, when land was categorized on racial grounds. This categorization has contributed to existing problems in land management and administration.
2.2 Roundtable discussion
Participants were requested to discuss challenges and solutions in securing land tenure. The following are the major points that arose.

Challenges
The major challenges to land tenure are:
• Forced evictions from ancestral land.
• Conflict of customary law and government law.
• Corruption/fraud.
• Divisions/fragmentation of land.
• Tedious process of acquiring land titles.
• Cartels in land offices.
• Different government agencies with different/conflicting opinions.
• Lack of defined land ownership and youth involvement.
• Developing industries within forests.
• Lack of stronger laws. They do not protect indigenous forest dwellers.
• Lack of community sensitization on land tenure.
• Government using land and housing companies to build in forests.
• Diminishing role of traditional leaders.
• Marginalization of women and youth in land matters.
• Lack of clear understanding of value of land vis-à-vis forests.
• Corruption.
• Increasing political demand on land compromising user rights.
• Competition from other land uses.
• Definition of land tenure away from colonial mentality.
• Lack of recognition of customary rights in national constitutions.
• Fuzzy lines between access, control and ownership, especially for women and youth.
• Legislation that fragments land processes.
• Limited access to information governing land use.
• Conflicting policies.
• Competing mandates on matters of tenure.
• Poor coordination and land-use planning.

Solutions
The following were listed as solutions to challenges on land tenure:
• Strengthen local communities to develop strong CFAs.
• Develop participatory plans with incentives, and prevent the transfer of land use.
• Integrity in enforcing land laws.
• Harmonization of land-use laws.
• Clear land recordkeeping.
• Public participation in land law-making.
• Strengthened advocacy to engage government on land ownership.
• Harmonization of policies and legislation.
• Plan to redistribute land.
• Take advantage of existing laws so as to fight for rights of indigenous people.
• Advocacy and awareness creation for farm community organizations.
• Housing agencies to make agreements with communities before.
• Strengthen role of community leaders in land matters.
• Involvement of women and youth in policymaking.
• Clear value attached to land vis-à-vis forests.
• Strong anti-corruption policies.
• Working towards making forestry attractive, e.g. research on fast-growing species.
• Networking with like-minded organizations to push for strong legislation.
• Redefine land tenure from local perspective.
• Formalize and recognize user rights and access rights of indigenous communities within the constitution and relevant laws.
• Government to issue titles to legitimate landowners.
• Encourage subdivision of communal lands.
• Coordinated land-use planning.

2.3 Plenary discussion
During plenary sessions, participants made various comments and recommendations on land tenure, including the following:
• Organizations need to develop tools to help communities lay claim to their land – i.e. land community mapping, as done in India.
• Political instability has a profound impact on tenure if not well addressed. Such issues should be entrenched in peace discussions.
• There exist many inconsistencies in various laws that protect the rights of peoples in mining, forests, etc. There is a need to enact laws that protect local communities.
• There is little involvement of local communities in many land initiatives. More effort needs to be made in involving them in tenure issues.
• Most of the time, land laws are not exhaustive because they do not take into consideration traditional systems, which vary from village to village. Traditional values should not be abandoned.
• In some instances, different rights exist to the same land – such as the right to farm and graze as well as rights to tree products such as fruits, fodder and woodfuel. There is a need for a code of conduct on how such trees should be managed.
• There is a need to separate land access and user rights. In Zambia, for example, land tenure does not define these two. The systems have to be defined and legislated.
• Communities who take care of a resource need to be able to get benefits from it.
• In some communities, women and youth have limited access to land. A system is needed that provides marginalized groups with secure tenure.
3. Gaining access to markets and effective service provision, and organizational strengthening in differing African contexts

3.1 Introduction by Serge Razafimahatratra, Partage, Madagascar

**English summary**

In 1990 in Madagascar, as a reaction to disappearing natural forests, the government started experimenting international integrated conservation policy practices seeking to combine community well-being and sound environmental management. In 1997 the forest law was revised to follow the path of decentralized management and increased community participation. However, private forestry is still often in the hands of wealthy producers. As for private reforestation for commercial purposes, Malagasy legislation provides for multiple technical, financial and tenure incentives.

To support smallholders and community management, the following measures were adopted:

1. Set up of a legal framework for sustainable management
2. Product quality improvement
3. Improved local control through the setup of a Decentralized Forest Control system
4. Creation of a monitoring system for traceability
5. Creation of a revolving fund to stop dependency of small producers on intermediaries

To motivate private reforestation and increase in wood production, the following incentives for individuals have been created:

1. Tenure incentives include simplified access to property and more secure rights.
2. Technical incentives include awareness campaigns and extension services delivered by the Forestry Department.
3. Financial advantages are either subsidies for preparation of plots, maintenance and protection of reforested areas, or exemption of forest taxes.

Some initiatives have tried to federate the associations of small producers. However the federations have not worked out and stopped because they were created only to implement policies. According to our findings, the process was not owned by the groups. The individuals were trained to implement the laws, not to manage natural resources. **Therefore, there is a strong need to strengthen the associations at all levels to help them be actors and partners of development, and organize dialogues to influence policy.**

Therefore, one can consider that the new forest policy has not really helped FFPO access market, mainly because of continued dependence of small producers on owners of big plantations and other stakeholders along the supply chain. In addition, the Decentralised Forest Control (DFC) system doesn’t cover the entire productive zones and illegal products still take a big share of the market. When the DFC is totally operational, market access is simplified for small producers who are directly integrated in a system. However at the country scale, having a DFC active in all the productive areas is still a utopia that only a strong political will could make happen.
Presentation in French
Introduction

Pour lutter contre la disparition de ses forêts naturelles, comme dans la plupart des pays africains, à partir de l’année 1990 Madagascar est entré dans le processus d’expérimentation des politiques internationales de conservation dites « intégrés » qui cherchent à concilier les besoins des populations et la gestion durable des ressources forestières. Avec cette nouvelle politique forestière, il a été adopté des reformes dans la gestion forestière qui favorisent « la responsabilisation des acteurs » et la mise en cohérence avec les politiques nationales de développement rural, d’environnement et de décentralisation. Elle tient compte aussi de la dégradation des ressources forestières et du recul de la préséance de l’autorité de l’administration publique.

Les activités d’extraction à but commercial de produits forestiers ligneux ou non ligneux sont et ont souvent été présentées comme des facteurs de dégradation environnementale. Il est souvent mis en avant l’insuffisance de moyens de contrôle et/ou de régulation de l’administration de l’Etat. Les exploitants profitent de cette défaillance du contrôle pour maximiser leurs profits sans respecter les normes et les réglementations. La faible capacité de l’administration forestière à impliquer les populations rurales riveraines des massifs forestiers pour s’opposer à ces exploitations abusives et illicites de leur terroir ne fait qu’aggraver ce constat. Faute de moyens, elle est enfin incapable d’assurer ses tâches régaliennes de surveillance des espèces forestières qu’elle a sous ses responsabilités.

Face à ces constats, la nouvelle réforme a été matérialisée par la loi n°97-017 du 08 Août 1997 portant révision de la législation forestière. Les petits producteurs œuvrant dans les forêts naturelles et regroupés en communauté, ils sont régis par le texte réglementaire instituant la gestion communautaire locale de ressources forestières (lois 95-025 pour Madagascar) autrement appelé gestion décentralisée de forêts dans d’autres pays.

L’exploitation de forêts domaniale par des privés doit se faire par voie d’adjudication. Elle est souvent réservée à des riches exploitants.

Concernant le reboisement privé à des fins commerciales, la législation Malgache prévoit des nombreuses mesures d’incitation technique, financier et notamment foncier (les incitations foncières tendent à faciliter l’accession à la propriété ou à la sécurisation foncière).

En somme, le but de tout ça est d’augmenter l’offre de bois au vu de la dégradation notamment de la forêt naturelle. Et sur le plan économique la valorisation rationnelle de cette ressource doit apporter une part de revenu pour les nombreux paysans notamment agriculteurs vivant dans le monde rural.

Après plus de 20 ans de mise en œuvre est-ce que cette nouvelle politique a permis aux petits producteurs d’accéder réellement aux marchés locaux et/ou internationaux ?

Pour le cas de Madagascar, le marché de bois, notamment les bois de forêts naturelles, a été dominé par des produits illicites qui proviennent des exploitations effectuées par des privés souvent dans des conditions complètement illégales.

Pour appuyer les petits producteurs légaux notamment ceux qui opèrent dans le cadre de la gestion communautaire (GELOSE) à accéder au marché légal, les mesures suivantes ont été adoptées et expérimentées dans le massif forestier d’Ambohiler (NAP CAZ de catégorie IV selon la classification de l’UICN):

- **Mise en place d’un cadre de gestion légal durable** (Contrat de gestion, cahier de charge, plans d’aménagement, fixation de quotas de production annuel en fonction de la capacité des forêts objet de la valorisation). Cette mesure vise à intégrer la valorisation dans un cadre légale et durable. Etant légaux, ces producteurs peuvent amener eux-mêmes leurs produits sur le marché.
• L’amélioration de la qualité des produits (amélioration des techniques sylvicoles). Des sessions de formation ont été dispensées aux petits producteurs et dans le but d’offrir des produits de qualité aux consommateurs exigeants qui pourraient être vendu facilement avec une plus-value sur le marché.

• L’amélioration de contrôle local par la mise en place d’un CFD (contrôle forestier décentralisé). Orchestré par la CLB gestionnaire de la forêt, la commune et l’agent locale de l’administration forestière. Elle permet d’éliminer la concurrence déloyale avec les illicites déjà niveaux locaux. En effet, si le contrôle et efficace à ce niveau il est difficile pour les illicites de sortir la zone ou d’accéder au marché qui s’y trouve. Comme il nécessite la mobilisation des plusieurs acteurs, pour assurer sa pérennisation ce système doit être autonome ; c’est à dire son fonctionnement doit être assurées par une parties des taxes prélevés sur les produits.

• La mise en place d’un système de suivi de flux et de la traçabilité. Ce système permet l’identification de l’origine des produits et les distingue aussi des bois illicite. Il est exigé par la réglementation en vigueur et facilite le contrôle sur le marché. Il est surtout mis en place pour répondre aux exigences des marchés internationaux.

• La mise en place d’un mécanisme fond de roulement (MFC). Cette mesure qui constitue l’initiative propre du promoteur de projet pour éradiquer la dépendance des petits producteurs aux intermédiaires qui dictent souvent les prix sur le marché notamment au niveau des producteurs car ils ont de gros moyens notamment pour avancer les dépenses liées à l’exploitation. Ces fonds de roulement ont été déposés auprès d’une institution financière locale (micro crédit) en guise de font de garantie. Ces producteurs peuvent l’utiliser en forme de prêt pour les dépenses qui leurs empêches souvent d’être autonome (paiement des salaires des bucherons, débardage, le transport vers le lieu de commercialisation…) et le rembourse une fois les produits sont écoulés.

Pour encourager les petits producteurs dans le cadre individuel à reboiser et à produire d’avantage, la législation prévoit des mesures incitatives suivantes :

• Les avantages en nature consistent en des incitations foncières et en des incitations techniques

• Les incitations foncières tendent à faciliter l’accession à la propriété ou à la sécurisation foncière au moyen :
  o de création de réserves foncières pour le reboisement à l’intérieur desquelles l’accession à la propriété sera réglementée par l’Administration forestière et l’Administration domaniale, de cession à titre onéreux au profit des nationaux de terrains domaniaux à vocation de reboisement identifiés par la commission forestière,
  o de bail emphytéotique des terrains domaniaux à vocation de reboisement identifiés par la commission forestière.

• Les incitations techniques consistent :
  o d’une part à réaliser des campagnes de sensibilisation et de vulgarisation,
  o d’autre part à fournir des conseils, encadrements et suivis techniques aux acteurs de reboisement.

Ces incitations techniques seront assurées par les agents de l’Administration forestière.

• Les avantages financiers peuvent consister en :
  o subventions provenant des fonds forestiers à titre de participation aux coûts de préparation des terrains, d’entretien et de protection des surfaces reboisées ;
dispense du paiement des redevances forestières sous réserve de la soumission du terrain à reboiser au régime forestier conformément à l’article 27 de la Loi n°97-017 sus visée.

En outre, l’administration forestière peut donner un avis technique sur la faisabilité des projets de reboisement élaborés par des pépiniéristes ou des opérateurs de reboisement. Malgré ces différentes mesures incitatives, la plupart des plantations sont de propriétés des riches particuliers. Ces propriétaires sous-traitent souvent l’exploitation de leurs parcelles à des tiers et ces derniers embauchent des bucherons pour faire l’exploitation et ils s’occupent seulement de la commercialisation. Souvent détenteurs des points de vente au niveau de grandes villes et favorisés par les différentes mesures incitatives citées ci-haut, ils n’ont pas trop de soucis pour accéder au marché.

Renforcement institutionnel
Sur cet aspect, des initiatives de mettre en fédération des associations des petits producteurs ont eu lieu mais malheureusement pour diverses raisons ils n’ont pas survécu.

Des institutions souvent créées uniquement pour le besoin de mise en œuvre des politiques et la mise en œuvre de prestations de service :
Depuis la mise en œuvre de la politique de gestion locale des ressources naturelles renouvelables à Madagascar en 1996, les CLB ont été créées. Plusieurs ONG, Associations voire bureaux d’études se sont spécialisées pour accompagner le processus de sa mise en œuvre notamment la mise en place de contrats de gestion. D’après nos constats, malgré les textes, ces CLB sont rarement considérées comme acteurs de cette gestion, mais souvent comme des exécutants. On les forme pour les besoins de la politique sans grande considération des critères d’appropriation.
Ainsi, pour inverser cette tendance, le renforcement de ces CLB regroupant les petits producteurs est nécessaire pour qu’elles puissent à tous les niveaux, être des acteurs, partenaires de développement et puissent mener des dialogues pour influer sur la mise en œuvre de ces politiques.

Ainsi, on peut dire qu’à Madagascar, la mise en œuvre de cette nouvelle politique forestière n’a pas réellement permis de favoriser un accès au marché aux petits producteurs de BO du fait d’une part :
- que ces petits producteurs, malgré les différents textes devant leur permettre d’accéder à une sécurisation foncière de leur zone de production, dépendent encore trop souvent des exploitants forestiers propriétaires et acteurs dans la chaîne de la filière à différents niveaux (propriétaire du BE, éventuellement acteur de la commercialisation…)

d’autre part :
- le marché couvert par le bassin de production de PLNF et BO n’est pas complètement couvert par le système CFD, et les produits illicites prennent une place importante du marché…

En effet, lorsque le CFD est pleinement fonctionnel, l’accès au marché par les petits producteurs est facilité par leur insertion dans le système. Cependant, à l’échelle du pays, la mise en place d’un CFD dans tous les bassins de production reste une douce utopie, que seule une forte volonté politique pourra contribuer à réaliser.

Questions de débat :
Cette question de la volonté politique de réellement contribuer à opérationnaliser un
contrôle forestier décentralisé – qui à notre sens est une des conditions de développement du marché pour les petits producteurs – est un point crucial que je vous invite à débattre ici : y-a-t-il des exemples similaires où la régulation qui doit accompagner tout effort de développement de marchés est effectivement portée par les pouvoirs publics, et soutenus par les collectivités et la déconcentration ? Quels sont les efforts à mettre en œuvre pour davantage professionnaliser les organisations de petits producteurs, au-delà des besoins de la politique mais à leurs profits ? plus clairement, quel appui apporter à ces organisations pour que cette politique forestière serve à les professionnaliser en tant qu’acteurs d’une Gestion locale des ressources forestières ? De même, dans les autres pays et cas portés ici, la sécurisation foncière, ou l’accès à la propriété ou à l’usufruit d’une parcelle constitue-t-elle une condition d’accès au marché par les petits producteurs ? Y-a-t-il des exemples où le fait d’apporter cet avantage a permis aux producteurs de développer leurs activités marchandes ?

3.2 Roundtable discussion
Delegates were requested to discuss challenges and possible solutions to market access. The major points arising are summarized below.

Challenges
- Competition between illegal and legal traders in the markets.
- Low valuation of forestry products by governments.
- Poorly organized farm organizations that have low bargaining power in the marketplace.
- Exploitation of producers by middlemen and brokers.
- Low value adding on forest products at the production level due to the use of inadequate technologies.
- Insufficient market information for producers.
- Insufficient knowledge of business entrepreneurship.
- Individual producers are against collective actions.
- Traditional knowledge does not provide information linked to markets.
- Planting of trees is done without market information, affecting the price of final products.
- Artificial marketing costs for forest produce.
- Lack of expertise in the certification of forest products.
- Poor infrastructure such as roads and transport to markets, leading to reliance on middlemen.
- Poorly developed market facilities.
- Perennial bans affect the market and may lead to corruption.
- Unbalanced focus on large-scale forest produce.
- Bias in the categorization of forest products.
- Trade barriers and restrictions (regional and international), and high taxation costs.
- Access to finance – collateral financing.
- Lack of adequate extension services.

Solutions
- Implementation of existing policies and regulations.
- Adequate research to get the right price in the market for specific products.
- The formation of viable cooperatives, and promoting alliances among them.
- Improving technologies to enable the production of good-quality forest products.
• Training forest producers on value adding and establishing strong relationship among actors in product value chains.
• Dissemination of market information by FFPOs to their members.
• Training FFPOs on enterprise development planning.
• Sharing knowledge on business development and market information among producers.
• Forest departments to provide regular information on market prices for forest products.
• The formation of regional networks of FFPOs on the marketing of farm/forest products.
• Government to assist e.g. via mobile phone.
• There is a need for business skills among forest/farm producers to enable them to investigate market requirements.
• Quality management of forest/farm products for competitive markets.
• Support value adding through appropriate technologies.
• Producer organizations to organize themselves to bargain with middlemen and market associations.
• Form organizations and marketing bodies to guide producers so they can eventually sell their own products and reduce middlemen (stronger associations).
• Governments to improve the capacity of producers/farmers.
• Buy certified products from the KFS or the Kenya Forest Research Institute (KFRI) to ensure product quality.
• Standardize prices through associations.
• Reach for outside and far-away markets through associations and societies that do market-based research on behalf of farmers.
• Incentives from government.
• Facilitate partnerships between organizations, associations and banks to provide loans and technical support.
• Group marketing to address quantity, bargaining and access to information.
• Provide standard market structures.
• Support the dissemination of market information through local radio and mobile communication.
• Support the networking of producer groups and strengthen existing ones.
• Capacity building (formation of associations and trainings of small producers).
• Value adding at the farm level with the introduction of appropriate technologies.
• Come up with better conservation measures to avoid bans.
• Creating an enabling environment to accommodate all players – e.g. Liberia’s policy regulations on NWFPs, which define market access at all levels.
• Remove trade barriers.
• Encourage the private sector to support smallholder producers.
• Encourage micro-credit and union formation at the local level.
• Introduce appropriate technologies.
• Build the capacity of small forest producers.
• Provide premium prices for value added, e.g. through fair trade.
• Encourage the formation of forest associations.
• Use the market analysis and development tool to prioritize forest products and establish enterprise development plans for FFPOs.
• Information for the real quantification of NWFPs.
• Enhance access to market information e.g. costings.
• Formation of formal federations and associations.
• Use multitask extension services approach, for example to provide information on agriculture as well as forestry.
4. Forming and strengthening effective organizations/federations

4.1 Introduction by Makweti Sishekanu, ZNFU

There are active associations for managing forests in Zambia. They are found in information centres; they are linked to district associations, and there is an apex organization (ZNFU) at the top. The National Farm Forestry Commodity Committee, formed by people from the grassroots (see figure), take care of the interests of commodity producers.

![Diagram showing the structure of forest management organizations in Zambia]

4.2 Plenary discussion

How can we strengthen effective producer organizations/federations?

The charcoal sector in Liberia is: improving production technology to provide more output with less input; encouraging people not to compete for trees but to make use of those already cut; and identifying alternative sources of production, for example using biomass to produce charcoal rather than just cutting trees. In these ways, they can maintain their forests.

Consumers play a significant role in forest sustainability; the more they consume, the more we deplete the forests. So the aim is to target consumers to use minimum energy to cook food. “Eat some, leave some, and grow some”.

African Farm/Family Forestry Producer Organizations Conference
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Build the capacity of producer groups so as to boost their survival, for example in management, recordkeeping, financial management and entrepreneurship. Producer organizations should be demand-driven and have a strategy and a proper structure; they should develop a tool kit for developing skills. At the national level, FFPOs should lobby for effective policies. At the regional level is a mix of federations; at the lower level, farmers are organized in various village groupings. FFPOs should have different skills for the various levels with which they deal, such as donors, professionals, associations, farmer groups and entrepreneurs.

FFPOs need the skills to grow and improve. They must choose the right people to represent them and to steer their organizations forward. There is a need to transfer knowledge to the people addressing the problems at the ground level, and to empower and legalize grassroots organizations to be self-sufficient in times when there is no donor funding to support them.

Organizations can become self-sustaining if they are run by professionals with the necessary management skills. Managers should be trained in administration and finance. FFPOs should be represented in umbrella organizations and forums in order to exert influence at the policy level.

FFPOs should give consideration to the marginalized members of communities, such as small communities, women and children, by allowing them into producer groups where they may benefit from the profits.

Put in place mechanisms for the registration of community producer groups, such as community-based associations, sole proprietorship organizations, and cooperatives. For example, if farmers want to do business, it is better to form a cooperative because it enables them to focus on producing while the organization works on marketing, bargaining, etc. Form cooperatives and let them be accountable to their members. In addition, cooperatives can encourage a diversity of products, each with its own requirement in the market.

Avoid situations in which intermediary institutions or individuals intervene on behalf of producer organizations. In most cases they are the genesis of conflicts and do not represent the wishes of producers and grassroots organizations.

Organizations need to have a common bond and goal, such as a common understanding on the products they want to take to the market. A wide variety of products brings marketing challenges.

Associations should have clear, specific and concise objectives and targets, and they should avoid broad objectives that are difficult to achieve. Strengthen small institutions at the grassroots and empower them. Let them have a collective voice and form organizations and associations to represent their interests in formal settings, empower and train the farmers, consult them and assist them through extension services to make them more competitive nationally. Farmers should be empowered to own emerging producer organizations in order to be truly represented in policy platforms and to be business oriented.
5. Field excursion

5.1 Kiambu County

5.1.1 Background

Kiambu County is located in the Central Highlands of Kenya in the former Central Province, close to Kenya's capital, Nairobi. Covering an area of about 2,500 square kilometres and with a population of 1.6 million people, it is also one of the wealthiest counties in Kenya. There are several theories for the origin of the name kiambu. One is that it was derived from a prominent Kikuyu clan known as “mbariyambuu”, who used to live near the current-day Kiambu town. Another theory suggests that the area used to experience constant rain showers, hence the kikuyu phrase ‘kiambuu’ meaning the “place of drizzles”.

Kiambu County enjoys a warm climate, with temperatures ranging between 12 °C and 18.7 °C. The rainfall aggregate for the county is 1,000 mm per year. The cool climate is conducive to farming. The country relies mostly on agriculture and industries to sustain its economy. The majority of residents are small-scale farmers growing tea and coffee, but there are also several large-scale coffee and tea farms, which are serviced by local industries.

5.1.2 Ms Rose Makimei’s private farm

Group 1 participants visited Rose Makimei’s farm at Kirenga Location, Lari Sub-county, Kiambu County, on 10 June 2015. KFS forester Mr James Muriuki was present to explain the extension services they have been offering farmers at the locality.

Farm helper Mr Nicholas Denda explained to the group about the assistance they have been receiving from KFS in tree-planting. KFS has provided them with many tree varieties to plant on their 12-hectare farm.

Ms Makimei’s farm has various enterprises, such as a woodlot with pine and cypress trees, an apiary and dairy cattle. Tree species grown are: blue gum grown on 3 acres; cypress trees on 2 acres and pines on 2 acres. In addition, Ms Makimei has planted pear trees on 3 acres and plums in a quarter-acre area, and she also grows napier grass, maize and other food crops.

The property has been in existence since the 1960s, when it was part of a settlement scheme, and it has been passed on through inheritance and subdivisions.

The woodlot of pine and cypress trees was established in 2009. Before that, the land was used for grazing animals and growing crops. The woodlot has been pruned and weeded from time to time over the years.

The farm has 36 beehives, and when weather is favourable the hives are harvested about every 2–3 months (i.e. about four times per year). The government supplies Langstroth and top bar beehives; of the two types, the Langstroth hive is preferred because it produces more honey. The farm obtains about 25 kg of honey from one hive in a good season and about 10 kg in a poor season.

The farmer packs the crude honey into containers and sells it to the local market. The tree species that attract bees for nectar are called “dombeya goetzenii” (“mukeu kikuyu”). A
beehive cost 5 000 Kenyan shillings (US$50), and Ms Makimei’s farm purchased three beehives from the Ministry of Agriculture. The farmer sells the honey at 600 shillings per kg. Therefore, the farm earns 600 shillings x 36 hives x 25 kg = 540 000 shillings every three months (assuming a good season).

Country agricultural officers determine honey quality. The Government of Kenya also monitors quality control for any food production in the country through the Kenya Bureau of Standards.

Ms Makimei belongs to a women’s group in the area that farms vegetables such as coriander. The group consists of about 50 women, and they collect the proceeds and share it among themselves. The women’s group sell one bunch of coriander for 1 shilling, and one gunia of coriander for 1 000 shillings (US$10) in outside markets such as Kongowea in Mombasa, Kenya. Ms Makimei keeps records of all the enterprises on her farm.

Among the benefits she obtains are a supply of wood from prunings, climate-change adaptation, a reduction in the cost of production, and poles for building construction.

The KFS and the Ministry of Agriculture both offer extension through collaboration. For example, the Ministry of Agriculture provides the specifications for beehives, and the KFS delivers the beehives to farmers.

The group learned that most farmers do not take out loans from banks for their tree-planting activities because it is a fairly untapped market and not well understood. The selection of farmers for extension services is done through the following procedure:
• The KFS requests farmers in the area to apply for extension services.
• The KFS visits the farm to assess whether the person will be able to take care of the tree seedlings, once issued.
• The KFS extends expertise to farmers in terms of pruning and weeding.
• The farmers get the extension services for free from the KFS.

5.1.3 Kijabe Environment Volunteers
The Kijabe Environment Volunteers (KENVO) is a community-based organization in Lari Sub-county, Kiambu County, with membership drawn from local residents bordering the Kereita Forest. KENVO works with Nature Kenya as a site support group for the Important Bird Areas programme in the Kikuyu Escarpment Forest.

KENVO works with donors, various stakeholders and CFAs and runs a programme on environmental conservation and livelihoods. Its projects include:
• Community empowerment through CFAs.
• Training in forest management.
• Forest rehabilitation.
• Environment education in schools.
• Natural enterprises such as beekeeping and honey production for sale.
• Mobilizing funds from the donors.
• Ecotourism.
• Ecolodges.
• Work with farmers in improving agricultural production, horticulture and dairy farming.
Bottling water from the forest funded by Danida – KENVO will soon commission a water-bottling enterprise.

**Natural water-bottling site**

KENVO demonstrated to participants how they bottle water from streams in the Kereita Forest. The process involves directing water from the stream to water tanks, filtering it and treating it for chlorine. The treated water is directed to a water-processing unit and further treated by an ultraviolet system and more chlorine to remove microorganisms. From there, the water is bottled and capped and is then ready for sale and distribution.

**Kereita Community Forest Association**

The Kereita CFA was formed in 2000 for the purpose of ecosystem rehabilitation and conservation. The community had been facing major challenges, such as forest destruction and charcoal burning, and the CFA was formed to find solutions and to help educate the community on the need for conservation.

The CFA operates in five villages and manages 4,723 hectares of forest. It is involved in beekeeping, grazing and tree-pruning. Since its formation, forest destruction has reduced, and water is available from a stream coming from the Aberdare water tower.
5.1.4 Kariminu nurseries

Group 1 participants visited a bamboo farmer, Mr Mucheru, at his farm in the Kieni Sub-location. Mr Mucheru showed how he grows giant bamboo (Dendrocalamus giganteus) on his farm, and how he prepares bamboo cuttings to produce sprouts used in propagation. The process involves using a root hormone on the cuttings to produce roots. The cuttings are transferred to polythene bags or pots, and kept for three months while they develop. A giant bamboo takes about seven years to mature. Mr Mucheru sells one bamboo seedling for US$5. He has been planting bamboo for nine years and is the founder of bamboo in the area.

Mr Mucheru and KFRI officials explained the economic benefits provided by bamboo. Bamboo is used to hold the soil together on steep lands, to generate income, and as food (e.g. bamboo crisps) and fuel.

Mr Mucheru has branded his enterprise “Kariminu Nurseries”. He has produced DVDs on bamboo practice and promotes bamboo practice at schools.

5.2 Murang’a County

Group leader – Geoffrey Wanyama

5.2.1 Background

Murang’a County lies approximately 85 km northeast of Nairobi and covers 2,558 km². The name Murang’a is believed to have been used by the Kikuyu people, who referred to going for a visit in the area as “kurang’a”, later changed to “murang’a”. The county is in the former Central Province and has seven constituencies (Kangemi, Mathioya, Kiharu, Kigumo, Maragwa, Kandara and Gatanga). The county has a population of about 943,000 people (52% female and 48% male). Most residents engage in mixed farming for staple foods such as maize, beans, cabbages, sorghum, millet and cassava.

The backbone of Murang’a County’s economy is agriculture, and residents also engage in small-scale farming and livestock keeping. Over 60% of small-scale farmers grow cash crops, mainly tea and coffee, and sell their tea to six tea factories. Other agricultural activities supporting the county’s economy are macadamia- and avocado-growing and dairy farming.
5.2.2 Gatare CFA

Gatare Forest also lies within Murang’a County. It was gazetted as a forest in 1932 and covers 10,760 hectares, of which 1,394 hectares is plantation forest and the rest is indigenous forest. The dominant tree species in the plantations are pine and cypress, while the indigenous forest is dominated by meru oak. For ease of management, the forest is divided into five beats. A number of rivers run through the forest and feed into the Tana River, which, in turn, empties into the Indian ocean.

The Gatare CFA was registered in 2007 to cater for community members residing within a radius of five km of the forest. It has a membership of more than 50, headed by Mr Kinuthia, who was elected chair in 2012.

As mandated by the Forests Act of 2005, the Gatare CFA has been undertaking participatory forest management (PFM) in close collaboration with the KFS. The CFA has been engaged mainly in forest protection duties to supplement the thin numbers of KFS rangers on the ground. CFA members also assist in firefighting in the dry season. In return, they benefit from being allowed to graze their cattle in the forest, collect woodfuel, fetch water, hang beehives and harvest wild herbs. Grazing is charged at 100 shillings per cow and 40 shillings per goat per month. Those collecting woodfuel are charged 100 shillings per month, although this is restricted to head-loads only. All these benefits and responsibilities are specified in the management plan signed by the CFA and the KFS.

Charcoal-burning and hunting are prohibited as measures to help conserve the forest, and woodfuel collection is restricted to dead branches and twigs. CFA members assist in site preparation and planting, pruning and firefighting. In areas needing rehabilitation, CFA members assist in replanting. The CFA feels, however, that the benefits they obtain are not commensurate with the efforts they put in. For example, concessions to harvest timber in the plantation forests are given to large saw millers, not locals. The forester explained to the visitors that while this had been true in earlier days, arrangements were being put in place for locals to benefit in addition to the abovementioned fringe benefits.

Group 2 participants were informed that the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA) – of which the Gatare CFA is a member – has been agitating for more benefits to accrue to local communities, and these are to be reflected in the next management plan. Gatare CFA members explained that they also have trees on their farms, over which they have full control. This is in contrast to the experiences shared from Kajiado and Kwale, where some participants said they were not allowed to harvest trees on their own farms. The forester explained that, in some areas, a private forest can end up being an important ecological site and hence the decision by authorities to step in and prevent clearfelling if proper rehabilitation structures are not in place. The forester agreed, however, that incentives are needed for private farm foresters to encourage them to maintain their forests.

It emerged in discussions that initially there had been incidences of human–wildlife conflicts, mainly concerning big game like buffalo and elephants, but that these had been abated by
the installation of an electric fence. Nevertheless, monkeys remain a menace because they are able to manoeuvre around the fence. There were also isolated incidents of poaching, but these had been eliminated through cooperation with local communities.

Discussions addressed the process of registering a CFA. While some residents felt that the process was too tedious, officials from FF-SPAK explained that it is easy and offered to assist those who needed to register. It was explained that, under the Forest Law, only those people in a registered CFA could benefit from arrangements and thus it was important for community members to register or join an existing CFA.

5.2.3 Smallholder farm forester
Group 2 participants visited Mr Kihoro, a smallholder farm forester in the Gatare area. His 5-acre farm borders Ndakaini dam, the water of which is piped to Nairobi. As the chair of the local WRUA, Mr Kihoro knows the importance of trees in the water catchment, particularly along the edges of the dam. Mr Kihoro has planted a wide assortment of trees on his farm, including: *Prunus africana* and neem trees, which he uses for medicinal purposes; avocado, guava, tree tomato and custard apple trees, which he harvests for commercial sale; and three stands of giant bamboo, which he uses to conserve the area around the dam.

It was evident that Mr Kihoro is a model farmer in the area. He indicated that various donors and partners, including Fair Trade International, the Rainforest Alliance, the Green Belt Movement and the KFS, have previously supported his group, which has planted over 500,000 trees in the region since 1982. The group has a 5-year sub-catchment plan. The greatest challenge the group faced was that members had to be coerced to participate in conservation efforts because they did not obtain direct benefits from such efforts. A number of partners had initiated livelihood projects in the area to address this, with varying levels of success. For example, Mr Kihoro planted his giant bamboo in 2007 but is yet to find a market for it.
The lack of a market for bamboo has left many group members disillusioned. Participants were shown around the group’s greenhouse, which at one time had housed over 1,000 giant bamboo seedlings. More than 50% of these had died, however, with the majority of the remainder yet to find a market two years later. It was noted that recently there has been a shift in the type of trees planted on people’s farms. While, initially, farmers were keen to plant indigenous trees, this trend has been reversing slowly, and exotics were now preferred. Reasons advanced for this change include the slow growth rates of indigenous trees and a lack of commercial value – aside from the few with medicinal value. Thus, many farmers in the neighbourhood had planted *Grevillea robusta* and *Eucalyptus*. Both are fast-growing trees, with the former used mainly for timber and the latter marketed to local tree factories as a source of wood fuel.

Tree farmers in the area are not part of marketing cooperatives or savings and credit cooperative organizations, so most tend to market their produce individually. As a result, many farmers do not obtain good prices for their fruits, such as avocados, guavas and tree tomatoes, even though these fetch tidy sums in the markets in Nairobi. So far, farmers have been unable to add value to medicinal tree products such as those harvested from *Prunus africana*, which are mainly used domestically or sold in small quantities.

### 5.2.4 Kiarutara Ragia water project

The Kiarutara Ragia water project services an area of 11 km² through a financing arrangement with the World Bank and K-Rep Bank worth 8.1 million shillings. According to the chair, Mr Peter Mwangi, the membership of the project began at 170 but has grown to over 1,200 – all of whom are supplied with water by the project. The group gets its water from Kiarutara dam, which is on government land. Farmers conserve the area around the dam by planting trees and clearing debris, although they say they do not have an agreement on how to share the associated benefits. The group benefited from a government grant of 1.9 million shillings in the form of pipes in 2014, which could be seen as a form of incentive for their conservation efforts.

To sustain their project, the Kiarutara Ragia group engages in a number of income-generating activities. It began with a tree nursery, which started with more than 50,000 tree seedlings and has grown over the years to the current stock of 150,000 tree seedlings. The main tree species is *Eucalyptus* because of the ready market in the area: tea factories use woodfuel from mature eucalypt trees to cure their tea. Other species used include *Grevillea robusta*, avocado and, to a lesser extent, ornamental trees such as bottle brush. The group supplies neighbouring farmers with more than 15,000 tree seedlings free of charge during the rainy season as a way of ensuring adequate tree cover in the area. In a calendar year, the
group sells more than 260,000 tree seedlings, the proceeds of which are used to pay tree-nursery attendants and cover overheads.

The Kiarutara Ragia group supplies piped water to more than 1,200 members from the Kiarutara dam; previously, community members trekked long distances to fetch water from the dam and others did their cleaning in the dam, which ended up polluting the water. The group earns more than 250,000 shillings from the metered supply of water; this money covers overheads and also pays the wages of a manager and a number of plumbers. The water is not treated with chemicals but rather goes through a sedimentation tank to remove impurities. Payment for the services provided are made through mobile money transfers or bank deposits, which are convenient for end-users.

Group members complain, however, about the poor markets for most of their products. For example, there are many tree nurseries in the area and consequently an over-supply of seedlings, resulting in poor prices. The group is actively seeking new markets through a website and a national newspaper (Daily Nation), which runs a market segment for farmers at no cost. Demand for woodfuel to cure tea is quite high, and a number of farmers have been uprooting tea bushes on their farms and replacing them with eucalypt trees. The area now has many eucalypt woodlots, although the farmers say they do not benefit much from extension services offered by the government.

5.2.5 Karimunu nurseries
The final stop for Group 2 participants was the Karimunu nurseries in Kiambu County. These nurseries pioneered the introduction of the giant bamboo in the area. The giant or “dragon” bamboo is a giant dense-clumping species native to the tropics and subtropics of Southeast Asia and one of the largest bamboo species in the world. It is a very tall, large culmed, greyish-green bamboo, which grows in clumps consisting of a large number of closely growing culms and attains a height of 30–40m. Under favourable conditions, it can grow at a rate of 40 cm per day. It is cultivated at low and high altitudes, commonly along riverbanks. The species is relatively new to Kenya and is yet to be fully exploited.

In Kenya, bamboo became a protected species after it was overexploited in the 1980s. However, owners can use bamboo grown in private woodlots for commercial purposes, as long as a certificate of origin is obtained from the local forester. The KFRI has been making efforts to popularize the giant bamboo through sensitization sessions. Indeed, on the day of the field visit, KFRI officials led by Samuel Wakori were at the Karimunu nurseries conducting a training and sensitization session on giant bamboo. They promised to assist Mr Kihoro from Gatare to find markets for his mature bamboo as well as the more than 100 seedlings in the group greenhouse. The KFRI has been training artisans in how to work with bamboo, because it requires a different skill-set to that involved in wood carpentry.

Participants were informed that value could be added to bamboo with the aim of achieving higher prices in the market. Uses include processing to make furniture, cutlery, food, briquettes and charcoal. It is also possible that investors could be attracted to the area to set
up a bamboo-processing factory, but a critical mass of farmers would need to be involved in growing bamboo to ensure sufficient raw material.

Concerns were raised that bamboo may be over-hyped and that it could go the way of jatropha. In Kenya, jatropha had been marketed heavily as a source of biodiesel, and many farmers put their farms under the crop. However, the promised factories and markets never materialized, leading to farmer disillusionment. KFRI officials gave assurances that this was highly unlikely in the case of giant bamboo, which had numerous uses and could be consumed at the local level. Assurances were also given that bamboo seedlings were highly marketable, although prices varied based on demand. Even if the price was as low as 100 shillings, farmers were assured that they would still turn a profit.

Questions were asked about how well bamboo would grow in other areas of the country and indeed the continent. Mr Wakori assured farmers that the giant bamboo does well at high altitudes and is good at conserving riparian regions. There are also many other species of bamboo that do well at high altitudes. The KFRI is conducting 25 provenance trials to assess the suitability of the various species in different regions of the country.

5.3 Nyandarua County

Group leader – Oscar Simanto

5.3.1 Background

Nyandarua County is an agriculturally rich zone located in the northwest of the former Central Province, west of the Aberdare Mountain Ranges and about 100 km from Nairobi. It covers an area of 3,245 km² and has a population of about 694,000 people. “Nyandarua” means “pegged hide” in the Gikuyu language and perhaps was used for the area because of the resemblance of the Aberdare Mountain Ranges to an animal skin pegged out to dry.

Nyandarua County has predictable weather patterns, with temperatures ranging between 12°C in the cold season and 25°C in the hot season. The country receives 700–1500 mm of rainfall annually, and it is reliant on agriculture to sustain its economy. It has many smallholder farmers, who produce potatoes, cabbages, maize, beans, carrots, kale, tomatoes and peas. In the 1990s, the county was a leading producer of pyrethrum, but the production of this crop has since declined due to the poor management of the subsector. In recent years, Nyandarua has attracted floriculturists, who have established large flower farms there. Small-scale farmers are yet to make an entry into this subsector, however, due to its high costs. Livestock rearing is a major economic activity in Nyandarua: farmers engage in dairy farming, sheep rearing, beef production and poultry.

Forests in Nyandarua County are part of the Abardare Forest Range, which also covers Nyeri, Kiambu and Muranga. The county has about 50,000 hectares of forest area, distributed in
five forest stations in the west, namely: South Kinangop, North Kinangop, Geta and Ndaragwa; Olbolossat Forest Station is detached from the others and surrounded by settlements. All are gazetted forests and represent about 16% of the county’s land area. The table below shows the distribution of forests, by station. Forests are categorized according to the following vegetation types: plantation, grassland, bushland, natural forest and bamboo forest.

### Forest zonation, Nyandarua County (ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Natural forest</th>
<th>Bamboo forest</th>
<th>Bushland</th>
<th>Grassland</th>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ndaragwa</td>
<td>4 971.5</td>
<td>4 699.5</td>
<td>3 948.6</td>
<td>614.0</td>
<td>14 233.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbolossat</td>
<td>1 222.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>867.9</td>
<td>1 140.0</td>
<td>3 326.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geta</td>
<td>8 848.6</td>
<td>1 939.5</td>
<td>1 596.5</td>
<td>3 126.9</td>
<td>3 372.8</td>
<td>18 884.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kinangop</td>
<td>921.6</td>
<td>2 057.0</td>
<td>2 040.0</td>
<td>1 793.2</td>
<td>6 811.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kinangop</td>
<td>1 277.5</td>
<td>4 321.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>972.2</td>
<td>6 660.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 241.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 317.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 521.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 943.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 892.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>49 916.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Visit to smallholder farm: Daniel Maina

Daniel Maina’s farm is in Museveni Village, Weru Location, Weru Ward, Nyandarua West Sub-county. Mr Maina planted his 50-acre *Eucalyptus* plantation in December 2004. The land was ploughed and harrowed using a tractor, and planting holes were dug and seedlings planted using local labour. Mr Maina later engaged neighbouring communities to plant crops while taking care of his seedlings for a 2-year period. At the same time he established a perimeter fence around the land to keep animals away. In year 4 he thinned nearly 10 000 poles, which he sold for 100 shillings each. In year 6 he harvested 6 000 fencing posts, which he sold for 250 shillings each. In year eight he harvested 10 000 trees for electric transmission poles, which he sold for 3 000 shillings each.

**Question-and-answer session with the farmer**

Mr Maina was inspired to start tree-farming after meeting someone selling mature trees. He purchased land from the government and raised investment capital of 2 000 000 shillings by
selling his commercial plot in Nairobi. The KFS is the source for his seedlings. He does not have a specific rotation age but harvests trees depending on market-use requirements, including for transmission poles. It later emerged that the KFS has a recommended rotation age for all the major plantation species in Kenya.

Close to 17 000 stems remain in the first rotation of Mr Maina’s plantation, which he plans to let grow to maturity. He has also started thinning the coppiced stems on harvested stumps. He uses tractors to extract logs for the market, with buyers meeting the transportation costs. The KFS does not validate harvesting on his farm, but he must register with the KFS to receive technical guidance. Mr Maina said that the business is profitable, and he has bought another piece of land with his income. He has a ready market for his trees, and he thinks he does not have enough trees, given the high demand for logs.

Mr Maina is also a sheep farmer. He is in possession of a title deed for the land, which he bought from the government at a price of 25 000 shillings. He does not pay taxes on his income from tree sales; however, he pays 2 000 shillings for a KFS permit for each lorry, and cess to the county government. His business employs close to 20 people, who are paid 500 shillings per day. He does not carry out environmental impact assessments (EIAs) during harvesting, although this is a requirement under the Environmental Management and Coordination Act 1999. His investment benefits the surrounding community, who obtain free woodfuel, wildings and seeds. Mr Maina is not a member of any organization or association, but would like to join one.

**Challenges facing Mr Maina**
1. The 3 000 shilling selling price for transmission poles is low; these poles fetch 12 000–16 000 shillings after treatment.
2. Ensuring the security of the young seedlings from domestic animals is a huge task.
3. The farmer has to wait for quite some time to start getting benefits because trees take a long time to mature.

5.3.3 Visit to small-scale farmer: Mwangi Nderitu

Mr Nderitu is a retired civil servant and is now practising mixed farming by growing trees, rearing dairy cows and growing food crops. He bought the land from an individual, and the KFS provided the seedlings.

Seven years ago, the KFS assisted Mr Nderitu to plant *Eucalyptus grandis* on his 10-acre farm. He hopes to start harvesting in the next five years, when the trees are about 12 years old. The KFS provides technical support, especially as a source of certified seeds. Mr Nderitu does not belong to any group.

**Question-and-answer session with Mr Nderitu**

Mr Nderitu bought his land from an individual. The KFS supplied him with tree seedlings and also provide technical support. Tree spacing is 2.5 m x 2.5 m and 3 m x 3 m. He has not yet
spoken to anyone about pricing in preparation for harvesting, but he plans to harvest his plantation for transmission poles (for sale to Kenya Power) in five years’ time, with the tops sold for woodfuel.

Mr Nderitu is not worried if Kenya Power decides to switch to concrete poles because there are other market options for these poles. He was of the opinion that he would be contacting the customers himself. He plans to harvest his trees in stages by first removing mature trees. The KFS is not just promoting the growing of exotic trees; it also promotes native species such as podo, but the challenge is that they grow very slowly. The KFS also does species–site matching for farmers. Some farmers plant fruit trees.

Challenges facing Mr Nderitu
1. Some seed varieties don’t do well here.
2. Marketing is yet to be done.
3. The expected price in the next five years is 4 000–5 000 shillings.
4. Site–species matching is a big challenge, affecting growth rates, size and time to maturity.

5.3.4 Visit to smallholder farmer: John Karari
Mr Karari was away on training in Nanyuki, but the forest manager, Muigai Reuben, showed participants around the farm. Mr Karari is a member of the KFS farmer field schools (FFSs) and also a model farmer. He has planted both indigenous (cedar, juniper, olea) and fruit trees (tree tomatoes, plums, avocado, peas, bananas and vines) on his 2-acre farm, and he has established a small orchard for experimental purposes. The fruits are earning more than the tomatoes and potatoes. The KFS supports about 100 FFSs across the county, and more are being established.

Question-and-answer session
Through the FFS initiative, the KFS provides financial support to participating farmers. Close to 25 farmers in the region belong to FFSs, including Mr Karari. In selecting farmers to participate in an FFS, the KFS first identifies their needs and invites them for a field school session. There is documentation and a curriculum to this effect.

5.3.5 Visit to Olobolosatt-Nyakariang water project
The area visited by participants is a permanent natural water catchment. The land on which the water spring is located belongs to the local communities, who now conserve it jointly. Communities living around the Olobolosatt-Nyakariang water project work as a cooperative through their WRUA in managing the water project. They usually pump water to the storage tank and supply it to villages for a small fee.
Later in the evening, Group 3 participants were privileged to visit the Thomson Falls in Nyahururu town.

Conclusions and recommendations of Group 3
Group 3 participants were of the view that farmers in the county are progressing well, as evidenced by their lifestyles. The KFS is providing good support to farm forestry farmers and should keep it up.

There is a need for these farmers and others to join existing organizations or to form new cooperative societies to provide farmers with a voice and bargaining power at the policy level. These farmers and their organizations urgently need marketing facilities.

The Kenya Forest Growers Association needs to establish a wood-treatment plant in the county to enable growers to capture more of the value of their trees. This has worked well in Liberia, where coffee farmers buy and sell their coffee directly to the market as middlemen.
6. Role of government, including state forest services (from policy to extension)

6.1 Kenya Forest Service

Patrick Kariuki

Forestry is very important in the broader scope, and especially in agroforestry. Kenya formulated its first policy in 1968, and farm forestry is clearly outlined in that document. The Forests Act 2005 clearly highlights community participation in forest management and forest development outside state forests, and there is also a chapter on incentive structures for farm forestry and private forests. The Forests Act spells out a forest management and conservation fund and how private forest owners can access this fund so as to establish or improve their forests.

The KFS is a service-delivery organization, dealing with:
- Plantation forestry development
- Natural development
- Farm and dry land development
- Extension service delivery.

Under the 2010 Constitution, Kenya is divided into 47 administrative units known as counties. Forestry was one of the functions devolved to the counties, and the KFS has identified clear areas of collaboration in terms on farm forestry and community forestry development.

The KFS has provided leadership in the mobilization of communities through:
- CFAs.
- FFSs – which have been a direct platform for engaging communities since 2004. There are more than 800 FFSs, which provide learning on forest enterprise development and financing, capacity building and rural investment.
- Charcoal producer associations – currently there are 300 registered associations, and a set of forest charcoal rules has been developed. Charcoal producer associations assist farmers to obtain their full share of proceeds from sales, technology transfer and acquisition, and encourage them to cut less wood and yet produce more charcoal.
- The Kenya Forest Growers Association, which mainly comprises large-scale holders interested in forestry.

The KFS is keen to work with various associations to ensure that all stakeholders are represented in decision-making.

6.2 FDA – Liberia

Andres Kamara

Liberia’s Forest Development Authority (FDA) is concerned with the sustainable management and conservation of forests. Liberia is endowed with large tracts of forest, and there is a need to protect them from degradation. Before reform, Liberia had a policy on reforestation and a social farming system. The government cleared the land and agreed that agriculture would take place, and that trees would be planted among crops, with the trees...
remaining after the harvesting of the crops. Reforestation was also undertaken with a view to supplying the European market with pines and cypress for pulpwood; over time, however, the European market became flooded with products from all over the world.

The FDA is involved in forestry at three levels:
- Commercial forestry – when concessions are given out, an agreement is signed with communities within 6 km of the forest, who are compensated by the provision of schools and other social amenities.
- Conservation forestry – this tends to be complicated, and most government support is focused here.
- Community forestry – there are no plantation forests in Liberia, but transition forests may cover several thousands of hectares, and communities manage such forests within their vicinity, with any revenue generated, such as from timber harvesting, going to community development. The government does not interfere in the day-to-day management of such forests.

There are more rubber and cocoa plantations in Liberia than forest plantations. The government is solely responsible for reforestation and afforestation programmes. A new policy is in place to regulate forest plantations and coordinate efforts.

6.3 Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Forestry – the Gambia

Lamin Jawara

In the Gambia, all natural resource sectors had their own policies up to 2005. Since the establishment of the agricultural resource working group, however, all sectors have had multisectoral teams that coordinate extension support. The Gambia’s forest policy includes the PFM concept and a community forestry initiative, in which ownership is transferred to communities, generating many positive outcomes for forest management.

The government is particular on conservation and has an annual planting target of 1 million trees. Forest extension workers work closely with community groups, such as those running anti-forest fire campaigns. Individual forest areas have unique management plans.

The Gambia faces several challenges in forest management. They include:
- low capacity to provide forest extension services;
- encroachment onto forestland due to agriculture and population growth, putting forests under great pressure;
- forest fire; and
- illegal logging.

The government is keen to partner with organizations like FAO to address these challenges. It is conscious of the vagaries of climate change and therefore is focuses on maintaining forest cover. Reforestation is also a key activity, particularly in areas that had previously been over-exploited.
6.4 Forest Department – Zambia
Ignatius Makumba

The Government of Zambia has a role in providing an enabling environment in which its people can prosper, and it responded to the needs of the people by establishing forest plantations. When the population was 3 million, demand for forests was not high. In the 1960s, however, the government developed policy statements specifying the establishment of forest plantations, the control of forestry reserves, and the provision of research and extension services.

In the 1980s, as the population grew, demand increased for forest resources, including building materials. At this point, community participation started extending beyond training to forest establishment. The forest policy unveiled in 1988 included elements of community participation.

In 2007 the government embarked on the development of a new policy to take on board new and emerging issues, PFM and joint forest management. Other emerging issues, such as climate change and REDD+, brought about further reviews.

In the new (2014) policy, the government has moved closer to establishing more forest management, such as private forests and recognizing community user groups so that communities may benefit from the forest. There is much more involvement in managing forest resources, stemming from the realization that the government cannot manage these resources on its own.

In the post-colonial era, the policy was to prohibit people from accessing resources. In recent times, however, the policy is to encourage the community and to provide an enabling environment in which communities can co-manage forest resources with the government. Other programmes include the decentralized forest management programme, which aims to devolve power for forest management to local authorities. The government has a forest management project with the Government of Finland, the main aim of which is to devolve power to local authorities and local communities to manage forests, and in which government will provide technical and extension services. In this way, the community can take more control of the resources they are collecting from the forest.

6.5 Plenary session

Questions and comments for the KFS

Q. Why does it take so long to register a private forest?
A: The KFS started collecting data to assist in the registration of private forests, which is a requirement by law. It is important in generating a registry to know what private players are doing in the market. So far, a framework for implementation has been developed. The KFS has all the data it collected previously and will soon roll out rules for authentication. The service has allocated a budget for this exercise and will soon be contacting farmers formally. A board of trustees will oversee a trust fund that will support this process.

Q. The provision of licences for producing charcoal exists only on paper. It is difficult to get such a licence, yet those who apply for transport permits get them readily. Could the KFS clarify if this is a policy against charcoal producers?
A: Charcoal is a key source of energy, and the KFS is looking at how to legalize the trade. Forest charcoal rules have been developed and adopted by government. The rules allow the
KFS to directly support charcoal producer associations. Communities should therefore come together and form associations with a code of conduct, reforestation plans, etc., and thereby avoid being exploited by middlemen. Licences are issued for all tree species, whether indigenous or exotic, as long as they are on private farms and as long as the species is not on the protected list. A transport permit is only issued to a transporter who has obtained charcoal from a charcoal producers’ association. It is a key for providing government and communities with full information and for ensuring sustainable production.

Q. Who monitors charcoal-burning in Kenya?
A. All 47 county governments and the KFS have tools to monitor, including the forest produce movement permit issued to transporters who obtain produce from charcoal producers’ associations. Certificates of origin are issued, and county officers issue forest product movement permits.

Q. Does one need a licence to sell timber? It is difficult to get a license to sell timber from a private farm. There also seems to be a silent policy on licensees, giving preference to exotic trees over indigenous ones.
A. A certificate of origin is required, just as with charcoal. The KFS supports the planting of all tree species.

Q. How do you monitor tree-planting, timber value-chain development and charcoal value-chain development?
A. The KFS uses its foresters to support grassroots efforts. Many species are promoted, in addition to eucalypts and Grevillea spp. The KFS also supports harvesting and value adding for gums, resins, fruits, etc., through the application of market analysis and development. Local products are being developed with their home areas in mind, so as to create markets.

Q. How does the KFS promote charcoal producers’ associations? Good work has been done so far in terms of charcoal regulation. In Burkina Faso, they are fighting illegal charcoal but have not yet succeeded. What can be learnt from Kenya?
A. Kenya is working hard to encourage private owners to plant trees. Imports occur when there are deficits. Population growth is also a challenge, and demand has increased for some of these products. Forest extension services were established in the 1970s to respond to this, so perhaps Burkina Faso could adopt a similar model.

Q. Does the KFS have advocacy initiatives? Many people who burn charcoal are illiterate. How will they be made aware of charcoal rules and other regulations?
A. The KFS is trying to reach people at all levels. Being part of a charcoal producers’ association will ease the process for most.

Questions and comments for FDA, Liberia
Q. Charcoal is a serious issue in Liberia, especially in concessions and for logging companies, which cut down large areas. What is the FDA doing to ensure that access is limited?
A. A process for timber product certification is in place. The government has outsourced the chain-of-custody process and signed a voluntary partnership agreement with the European Union, so all timber leaving Liberia must have a timber legality verification document. The forest sector is divided into three – commercial, conservation and community – so as to ensure that everything has a legal process.
Questions and comments for Forest Department, Zambia
Q. In the background documents, there was mention of socioeconomic opportunities in Zambia. Is marketing a policy, or just a tool?
A. Zambia adopted a new forestry policy. We want to encourage value adding on forest products, rather than allowing the export of raw timber. Investors are invited to the country to add value, and we export finished products. This is to be implemented at the policy level as well.

Questions and comments for all panellists
Q. What is the role of independent forest certification bodies in monitoring and implementing sustainable forest practice? (For example, following production laws, providing proof for sustainable production?)
A. In Liberia, the government does not control the harvest of forest products. It signed a memorandum of understanding with the European Union, which assists in this monitoring; not just any product is allowed into the European Union.
A. In Zambia we have a programme supported by FAO on forest certification. It is a very demanding tool because of challenges such as a lack of guidelines that can be used at the local level. The idea would be to take a flexible approach to the guidelines rather than to follow the rigorous international certification version.
A. In the Gambia, producers and associations do not have enough capacity. Certification is an interesting concept, but it is not a priority in farm forestry. We are building capacity at various levels in terms of forest policy; the time is not yet ripe for certification; the markets and enabling frameworks need to be put in place.

Q. Policies in many countries leave a bit to be desired. Where is a policy on the internal consumption of these products? Every year, 20 million US dollars go into producing forest products. If there is no local policy on consumption, it will create a marketing problem. Is there a country with a policy on local product use? Are there cultural rights and modern rights that prescribe how to deal with the use of local resources?
A. Most African countries have not done well in that respect. The free market exists and hence local markets often suffer.
7. Linkages with other important programmes in Africa

7.1. African Forest Forum

Yonas Yemshaw

The AFF is an association of individuals who share the quest for and commitment to the sustainable management, use and conservation of forest and tree resources in Africa for the socioeconomic wellbeing of its peoples and the stability and improvement of its environment.

The AFF exists because, in the last several decades, much of Africa’s forest estate has been lost to deforestation and degradation, prompting numerous policy, legislative and institutional reforms as well as initiatives, programmes and projects. The effective management and use of Africa’s forests is a priority for public and private actors, but there has been only limited success in analysing lessons in a systematic and unbiased way to support these efforts.

The purpose of the AFF is to provide a platform for information sharing and expertise and to create an enabling environment for independent and objective analysis, advocacy and advice on policy and technical issues pertaining to the sustainable management, use and conservation of Africa’s forest and tree resources as part of efforts to reduce poverty, promote economic and social development and protect the environment.

The AFF plays a prominent role in generating high-quality, up-to-date information to support evidence-based decisions in forestry as well as in updating stakeholders on developments in the sector.

The AFF provides collaborative opportunities through its rapidly growing membership, currently comprising over 1 000 individuals from academic, governmental, non-governmental and commercial institutions, the private sector, farmer organizations, and other bodies committed to the sustainable management, wise use and conservation of Africa’s forest and tree resources. Of their own volition, members are actively sharing contacts, expertise and publications on the AFF intranet. The AFF’s website (www.afforum.org) has had more than 1 million page hits and receives over 5 000 unique web visitors per year. The website shared over 25 000 forest news articles in 2014.

The AFF has developed key knowledge products in areas that are fast gaining currency, not only in the forest sector but also in the broader areas of rural development and livelihood support. One such product is a compendium of “non-timber forest products and services” crucial for supporting rural livelihoods. The compendium is for training professionals and technical staff (those offering diploma and certificate training) in several areas, including the harvesting, processing and marketing of these products and services.

Another product is a book on climate change, African forests and wildlife. As well as providing a better understanding of the link between forests and climate change, the book is widely used by African universities and technical colleges as a key reference text.

The AFF provides policy and other advice to regional economic communities in Africa. It has worked closely with parliamentarians in the East African Community in drafting the “EAC Forest Management and Protection Bill” for countries within the community. The AFF also contributed to the development of the forest policy of the Economic Community of West
African States (ECOWAS) and the ECOWAS Convergence Plan for the Sustainable Management and Utilization of Forest Ecosystem in West Africa.

The AFF assisted Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Mali and Niger in developing, for the first time, national strategies and plans for implementing relevant activities within the GGWSSI belt, with a view to improving the livelihoods of rural people by combating land degradation and desertification. These countries are now implementing projects aimed at putting their national strategies and plans into effect.

The AFF collaborates with the AU, FAO, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, the Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel, and SOS Sahel in events held to mark African Drylands Week. It also continues to strengthen African participation in international dialogues related to forestry, which has led to the creation of a vibrant, well-organized, articulate and strategic African Group at various negotiations.

The AFF has developed training modules on forest-based climate-change adaptation and mitigation, carbon trading, and payment for other environmental services that are used widely by professional, technical and informal groups. The AFF has built the capacity of 357 trainers in ten African countries in rapid carbon estimation in forests, as well as in marketing and trading forest carbon, guided by these modules.

7.2 Needs of tree-growers, farmers and tree-grower associations

Ismail G. Mukombwe

Mr Mukombwe, representing Matembwe tree-growers, presented the needs of tree-farmer associations in the United Republic of Tanzania. He explained that tree-farming is done in the southern highlands zone.

The needs of the Matembwe tree-growers are divided into four categories: 1) the availability of seeds; 2) education in nursery practices and good husbandry; 3) woodlot and harvesting management; and 4) improvement to products resulting from forestry.

On seed availability, southern highlands farmers generally lack a supply of improved seeds to boost their productivity. The of people still use the old technology of preparing seeds from the old breeds, which are now not performing well in terms of growth rates and size. The farmers are in need of seeds with the following pick points: high-breed seeds with low maturity period; a variety of seeds like pine, eucalypt and others; and reasonable-priced seeds, so that every farmer can afford them; and suitable seeds that are resilient to disease.

Good nursery management is the foundation of high-quality seedlings. For example, poorly managed nurseries can promulgate tree diseases. There is a need for farmers to be trained in the following: pre-nursery activities; nursery requirements and preparation; the timing of nursery activities; and the availability and reliability of nursery inputs like polythene tubes and seeds. Experts are needed to lead farmers in this regard.

Farmers use primitive methodologies in managing woodlots; they assume that trees are like other plants and not a business. So these farmers need to be transformed from where they are now to a new way of thinking about trees – the way they think about other products, like maize. We need to set timeframes, from planting to harvesting, for each tree species so that farmers are informed and regulated. This is a difficult scenario, but it is essential for
producing high-quality forestry products and increasing the value of forest products, especially timber and poles.

Regardless of the quality of the wood, the furniture produced from it is often poor because of a lack of carpentry technology sufficient to meet national and international market demands. Forestry has led to the creation of a large number of carpentry workshops, but with very low processing technology. As major producers we need to be leading by selling final products of amazing quality. This sector employs a great number of youths, who should be trained well to have an exceptional knowledge and to add value.

7.3 Using PEFC forest certification to support locally controlled forestry
Sarah Price

Group certification enables many forest owners to become certified under one certificate and to share responsibilities, costs and benefits. It uses principles of internal monitoring and sampling for audits.

Forest certification delivers sustainable wood raw material that is:
• **legal** – wood is harvested in compliance with local legislation and international agreements;
• **from well-managed forests** – safeguarding social, economic and environmental values; and
• **traceable** – the raw-material supply chain is verified, from the forest to the finished product.

Other benefits include the development of a dialogue among national stakeholders on developing sustainable forest management requirements; third-party, internationally recognized “proof” of sustainable management; market access; product recognition; branding; access to investment; rights recognition; benefit sharing; and empowerment.

The Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC) is a global, not-for-profit non-governmental organization based in Geneva, Switzerland. It provides independent third-party certification of good practices, alliances with national forest certification systems, and an international chain-of-custody standard. It is also the world’s largest forest certification system, accounting for 60% of the world’s certified forest area, and it is a certification system of choice for small family forest-owners.

Certification strengthens the capacity and function of producer organizations and an additional service such organizations can offer their members. A group certification mechanism helps smallholders build the scale required to create “suppliers’ markets” and makes certification affordable. Involvement in, or initiating, a national certification development process can ensure that farm-forestry perspectives are considered.

7.4 Link between FLEGT processes and small forest producers (community forestry)
Justin Kamga – FODER, Cameroon

FODER is located in Yaoundé, Cameroon, and has existed for 13 years. It works with forest communities, especially in relation to the monitoring of forest activities, corruption and
governance. It works on forestry governance and capacity building for different actors in Cameroon.

Forests are a reservoir for local communities of yams, animal fodder and medicines. Moreover, people use water and wood for domestic purposes. Forest policy in West Africa has been changing for 20 years, and it now allows community participation and management, thereby bringing development to the local level.

Not all countries in the Congo Basin are at the same level, with Cameroon and Gabon ahead in their laws and policies for involving communities. Other countries are in the process of developing such approaches.

The aim of community forestry is to promote community cohesion in a sustainable manner and to enable the sustainable harvesting of medicinal plants, other NWFPs, timber, and wildlife.

In Cameroon, the state gives space to communities that require it. A community applies and can receive a maximum of 5,000 hectares to manage over a 25-year period. On receiving an application, the forest authorities check that there is no conflict with other groups. A management plan is developed that sets out how the government and community will work together.

Ministry of Forestry statistics show that, between 2006 and 2014, over 1.7 million hectares were under community forestry in Cameroon, with 379 agreements signed. Community forests produced 32% of the country’s timber volume in 2014.

FODER deals with all sorts of marketing in Cameroon. There are groups managing community forests that meet the requirements contained in legal guides; for example, they must conform with management expectations on forest use and undertake various timber ruses; and they must adhere to rules on the transportation of timber.

Environmental protection is an important consideration. EIAs must be carried out, but local communities often lack the skills and resources to meet this requirement. Most of the criteria in the legal documents do not consider the capacity of local communities. It is important, therefore, to simplify regulations to allow community participation within their capabilities.

7.5 The contribution of Tiipaalga to the implementation of the GGWSSI in Burkina Faso: Djibo farm-forestry case study

Serge Zougba

Issues facing Burkina Faso in the forest sector include land degradation, loss of vegetation cover and biodiversity, high population growth, which results in irrational practices of natural resource exploitation, and climate change and erratic rainfall.

Convergence of objectives between Tiipaalga and Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative

The GGWSSI (launched in 2007) involves 20 countries; it is a mosaic of interventions for the sustainable management and restoration of sustainable production systems in Africa’s
drylands. The GGWSSI aims to foster solidarity among African countries and between users, managers, civil society and local communities.

The objectives of the GGWSSI include awareness of dryland development issues; improving the resilience of human and natural systems; and the development of long-term solutions for problems of desertification, land degradation, climate change and biodiversity loss.

The objectives of Tiipaalga include promoting the restoration and sustainable management and use of natural resources; valuing trees through the collection, processing and marketing of NWFPs in Burkina Faso; disseminating efficient, adapted and secure technologies for domestic woodfuel; and mitigating the effects of climate change by sequestration in growing vegetation cover and reducing greenhouse-gas emissions.

Family forests can be created and managed sustainably by increasing community awareness; empowering households; and protecting family forests with woven fences.

The terms of partnership s for the creation of a family forest are: a land area 3 hectares in size, on which the land question has been settled; the provision of labour and the full protection of vegetation against all forms of degradation; guarding and maintaining fences; defining the objectives of the site; being available to develop the plot with Tiipaalga’s technical support; and, finally, respecting the agreement.

In formalizing such a partnership, the farmer needs to adhere to Tiipaalga objectives by organizing the delimitation of the field in the presence of technical services, neighbouring landowners and village leaders (land chief, village development council, village councillor, resource persons); produce a document on the socio-tenure security of the land to be managed by the municipality; sign a 7-year (renewable) partnership agreement with Tiipaalga; and accept in situ conservation and the specifications that accompany it.

Management work to be conducted at the site includes development and sustainable management activities involving all family members; water-saving techniques to restore degraded and crusted areas (zai, stone bunds, half-moons); sustainable agriculture/agroforestry on a perimeter strip of 12 m, or 25% of the parcel; kernel protection, corresponding to 75% of the forest; assisted natural regeneration of trees and the use of by-products by households; the production and planting of seedlings of useful native species (e.g. Adansonia digitata, Ziziphus mauritiana and Acacia macrostachya); and the creation of living hedges as defensive measures to replace the fence in due course.

Income-generating activities for the family include the harvesting, consumption, processing and sale of forest products such as fruits, seeds and leaves; the mowing and conservation of natural forage, which is sold or consumed; the transformation of balanite seeds for oil and soap; and beekeeping in the regenerated forests.

The results of this work in Djibo between 2003 and 2015 include: 162 family forests protected in 51 villages in Djibo, of a national total of 240; fences created for 469 hectares of degraded land, on which approximately 328 000 trees protected sustainably; clear improvement of woody and herbaceous biodiversity; 52 saved local species in their natural environment; 50 000 trees planted in 2014 in 64 family forests, with a success rate of 85% or more; the application of agricultural practices adapted to climate change within the protected sites; and capacity building of partners in various skills related to the sustainable management of natural resources.
Difficulties encountered include a lack of organization of family forest partners; insufficient support structures for forest companies; insufficient integration of agroforestry and pastoral systems; difficulties associated with implementing laws regulating rural land, especially for the creation of agroforestry farms; and a low level of entrepreneurship among partners.

In conclusion, Tiipaalga has supported the creation of 469 hectares of family forests in Djibo on formerly degraded land. A household approach has achieved better results than a community-based approach. Despite these achievements, enormous challenges remain related to, among other things, land tenure, the processing and marketing of NWFPs, organization and financing.

More than 200 applications for the creation of family forests in Djibo have been received that cannot be honoured. Large financial resources do not necessarily guarantee good results — willingness, good organization and determination are essential. Developing solidarity among actors and sharing experiences and achievements can produce miracles; it is the ideal way of winning the battle against the degradation of natural resources and the poverty of rural households.

7.6 Plenary session

Sarah Price – using PEFC forest certification to support locally controlled forestry

Q. Currently, there is almost no certification in Africa. Who or what organization is responsible for certification certificates, and how long does it take to get one?
A. PEFC has a grassroots, bottom-up approach, and local stakeholders can conduct the certification on behalf of the PEFC in their respective countries. There has to be a demand for the service: in Malaysia, for example, there is demand from the government; in other areas it comes from forestry companies or forest owners. The PEFC’s approach is to respond to needs and local demand. In Africa, there are vibrant stakeholders who want to develop their own national certification systems, for example in Gabon and Cameroon. Discussions are going on in DRC and Ghana about starting their own national certification systems. The PEFC gives guidance and examples of the process. They give capacity. It takes about 2–3 years to obtain a certification certificate.

Q. What makes certification expensive for smallholders is the audit. Is it possible for certification bodies to allow local certification companies to undertake audits on their behalf in the respective countries?
A. PEFC looks forward to developing procedures, accreditation processes and capacity in countries so they can create their own national certification bodies and cut the cost.

Q. Can Africa develop its own certification body instead of relying on international bodies?
Yes, Cameroon and Gabon have developed the Pan-African certification system.

Yonas Yemshaw, AFF
A. We are developing capacity building for training in certification. We are of the opinion that the benefit of certification must exceed the cost. In Africa, the cost is higher than the benefit, and that’s why there is little interest. There is a big push for inter-Africa trade, and therefore the rate of certification is low.
Intra-Africa trade is low, but there is therefore a push to merge the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) East African Community (EAC), Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) to increase trade, including of forest products. There has been an increased push for economic integration.

Farmers and farmer groups are members of the AFF. We are pushing for more membership because communities are important stakeholder groups. By joining the AFF, communities can appoint their own representatives.

**Justin Kamga, Cameroon**

Q. Communities do not have an adequate understanding of policies. How can they conduct EIAs when they are not informed about policies?

A. 150 euros is available to carry out EIAs. The community can subcontract the assessment to firms. For communities that do not have capacity for EIAs, we are working with government to waive the requirements on the part of the community and replace them with social impact assessment reports.

Q. Illegal timber trade: is it a problem in Cameroon?

A. A study has shown that illegal activities are present and that Cameroon loses 20 million euros per year to them. Therefore, the country is putting in place legalities to reduce the rate of illegal trade.

Q. With regards to community forestry, Cameroon was giving concessions for 25 years to enable the security of these communities.

A. Every year the community has to break down what it has done with the concession land. This has a double objective in that it makes forestry a booster of development and ensures that the society adheres to its obligations.
8. Moving family farm forestry ahead: next steps for practical information exchange and networking

Facilitated by George Onyango

8.1 A summary of key workshop presentations

Mr George Onyango presented a summary of the presentations made during the conference as a way of guiding participants in developing a way forward and an action plan. In his presentation, Mr Onyango noted that the development of locally controlled forest enterprises was a key to unlocking development opportunities. For this to happen, a combination of factors must work in tandem: secure tenure, fair markets, effective FFPOs, clearly defined government roles, and linkages with other programmes.

On securing tenure, Mr Onyango noted that property rights and categorization remain a big issue in Africa. Most of the insecurity plaguing the continent is due to tenure issues. In most African countries, there is a need to reform laws, policies and modes of implementation to ensure security of tenure.

On fair market access, Mr Onyango pointed at the reforms that had taken place in Madagascar. He noted that, initially, activities to exploit forest resources were presented as degradation factors affecting development. Exploiters tended to dominate the market and left little space for small-scale players. New reforms give a glimmer of hope for small-scale players. The objective of the reforms is to increase the offer for wood from natural forests because the market is flooded by illegal wood.

Extension services remains one of the key building blocks for ensuring that farm forestry thrives. In Madagascar, extension services are meant to support small-scale producers in community forests, with specific policies put in place and experimented with. These include: value adding for products; putting in place an evaluation system; a funding system to encourage small-scale producers to reforest their land; financial subsidies for reforestation; technical support; advice on reforestation; financial advantages through payments; and subsidies for forest activities. Despite these measures, most plantations are owned by rich people, whose only concern is to commercialize production to supply urban centres. Many initiatives to support small-scale producers do not see light of day. Local efforts to bring together local organizations are considered undesirable. In Madagascar, new policies do not benefit small players, and the market is not fully geared towards community-based efforts. Marketing efforts by small-scale farmers thus end up being affected negatively.

Mr Onyango said that forming and strengthening effective FFPOs was important, and he shared experiences from the ZNFU in dealing with conflicts between farms and forests. Organized groups are already active in Zambia; they are linked to district forest associations, which in turn belong to the apex organization, ZNFU. The National Farm Forestry Commodity Committee takes care of the interests of the commodities, with a membership that includes people at the grassroots. This is a blueprint for how effective producer organizations and federations can be strengthened in Africa.

Mr Onyango concluded by saying that the government, including the state forest services, has a hugely important role to play in moving family farm forestry ahead through policy formulation and execution and by providing extension and support services to FFPOs.
8.2 Lessons from Hanoi – AFECONET

Mr Oscar Simanto from the KFS shared with participants his experiences at the fourth International Forest Connect workshop held in Hanoi, Viet Nam, on 15–18 January 2015. According to Mr Simanto, these experiences and informal discussions led to the birth of Africa Forest Enterprises Connect Network (AFECONET).

The rationale for forming AFECONET was that developing locally controlled forest enterprises offers the greatest opportunity for communities to fight poverty, improve livelihoods, generate household incomes, and create employment and a pathway for women and youth to participate in natural resource management in Africa. As such, AFECONET will:

• be committed to the development of locally controlled forest enterprises for livelihood improvement in Africa;
• place community empowerment and economic incentives at the heart of its approach;
• consistently develop, consolidate, institutionalize and advance approaches and strategies that promote community-based enterprises and value chains;
• promote cross-sectoral collaboration and networking to enhance public–private partnerships; and
• connect locally controlled businesses across Africa to share experiences.

The vision of AFECONET is that African communities locally control their forest enterprises and have the right to exploit their natural resources sustainably to produce food, fuel and fibre products in ways that improve local livelihoods and sustain the environment. AFECONET will be a pan-African knowledge network of like-minded professionals, support institutions and practitioners of locally controlled forest enterprises drawn from FFPOs, government, non-state actors and the private sector. The vision includes creating a mosaic of forest businesses controlled by local communities with a view to diversifying rural economies and sustainably managing forest resources in Africa.

AFECONET’s mission is to generate, connect and upscale innovative locally controlled enterprise-oriented solutions across Africa aimed at improving the livelihoods of the poor while bolstering national economic development. The objectives of AFECONET will be to:

• create multifunctional stakeholder platforms and networks for locally controlled forest enterprises to support small and medium-sized micro-enterprise development in Africa;
• provide advocacy to influence policy that supports locally controlled forest businesses and the sustainable use of natural resources in Africa;
• create regional resource centres for knowledge sharing and capacity building in communities to develop locally controlled forest enterprises;
• develop strategies that enhance interactions among and create a popular movement to enabling smallholder forest and farm producers and the private and public sectors to do business across Africa;
• promote viable forest enterprise development models beneficial to the people of Africa; and
• strengthen the governance/institutional capacities of FFPOs for business development and gender equity in Africa.

AFECONET will be affiliated to the Global Forest Connect network and other African natural resource management and governance bodies. It will aim to establish and strengthen regional networks in western, southern, eastern, central and northern Africa. Thematic areas focusing on the following areas are being developed:
locally controlled forest businesses and related value chains, enterprise planning and
development;
- policy advocacy for secure tenure rights;
- forest certification businesses;
- sustainable natural resource management;
- information and communication technology suitable for locally controlled business
  practitioners across Africa;
- risk management in locally controlled forestry businesses;
- connecting locally controlled forestry businesses to support institutions across Africa;
- institutional capacity strengthening for community-based enterprises;
- technology development, sourcing and dissemination;
- advocacy for equity;
- establishing and strengthening information- and knowledge-sharing hubs; and
- capacity building and services for FFPOs.

8.3 Action plans to secure tenure, fair markets, extension services and
promoting effective FFPOs

Participants from the various countries – Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, the Gambia,
Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Nepal, Rwanda, Uganda and Zambia – held roundtable
discussions and came up with action plans on what they intended to do to promote secure
tenure, fair market access, extension services and effective FFPOs. Below are some of the
actions presented in the plenary, some of which are country-specific.

8.3.1 Securing land tenure
- Lobby governments to create/endorse land-use plans.
- Push for land tenure to be secured by land-use policies for proper ownership.
- Lobby for customary rights of ownership to be included in policies and laws.
- Lobby to streamline the processing of land ownership documents and to reduce the
time taken to register land.
- Push for expeditious land adjudication in areas where this has not been done.
- Lobby for free access to those on community land.
- Use existing laws to see how best to advance tree-growing.
- Lobby for the amendment of laws to allow the harvesting of indigenous tree species
grown on private land. As an alternative, lobby for incentives for farmers who have
indigenous species so as to encourage conservation.
- Push for the drafting of standards to guide the use of endangered indigenous species.
- Strengthen the capacity of the regional task force to better engage the ministries in
  charge of land tenure transfer, with the National Farmers Platform Gambia to facilitate
  the engagement process.
- Build the capacity of line ministries responsible for land designation processes as well as
the regional task force on tenure transfer process.
- Build capacity of FFPOs through the market analysis and development approach.
- Develop a market information system and create linkages at the local, national and
  international levels.
- In Uganda, lobby civil-society organizations to advocate for a review of the land law to
  enable sitting communities to access and use land without fear of eviction by landlords.
- In Zambia, advocate for the legal recognition of access and user rights on customary
  land.
• In Rwanda, sensitize the community on policies and regulations to enforce their implementation.
• Facilitate dialogue between community members and the government to develop a common understanding on the land-use plan set up by the Rwandan government.

8.3.2 Fair market access
• Advocate for functional and feasible forestry policies to support producers.
• Endorse market information systems.
• Build support for an African forest producers’ website to share forest product cost and benefits and other market information.
• Push for the creation of market linkages so as to avoid brokers.
• Encourage value adding for forest products among farm foresters.
• Encourage and harmonize cross-border trade to assist tree-grower associations in exporting their products and increasing their profits.
• Include access to finance the agenda of farm forestry cooperatives.
• Form cooperatives and train farmers on value-chain entrepreneurial skills. Also use these structures to conduct market research, sell products, increase the bargaining power of producers and raise profit margins by eliminating middlemen. This will include the development of training modules, certification and the standardization of prices.
• Establish low-cost market information systems.
• Train FFPOs on enterprise development planning.
• Encourage information-sharing among FFPOs.
• Conduct a contact and collaboration fair for FFPOs.
• Lobby governments to reinforce regulatory mechanisms in apprehending those trading in illegal forest products in tandem with encouraging community collaboration in stopping illegal forest activities.
• In Liberia, create awareness of the draft Land Right Act at the local, national and international levels.
• Develop practical voluntary guidelines on the responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests at the local, national and international levels.
• In Uganda, engage government procurement agencies to source legal timber (review procurement guidelines) and organize timber traders into associations.
• In Zambia:
  o provide a framework for local investment in forest products
  o recognize the need for subsidies for farm forest products.
• In Rwanda –
  o encourage producers to produce products of high quality and look at how to add value to their products
  o sensitize on production diversification, especially in forestry plots, to maximize the benefits (e.g. beekeeping with timber production)
  o advocate for the establishment of an information system that allows farmers to access market information
  o advocate for the improvement of infrastructure such as roads and market facilities
  o boost entrepreneurship skills among youth to promote bamboo as a new species with a proven high value and many uses.

8.3.3 Extension services
• Lobby for revision of the education curriculum, from childhood, to include better knowledge on forestry as a culture.
• Advocate for the design of forest regulations in line with extension research based on the interests of communities.
• Package extension messages for farmers to maximize value for money.
• Establish a cooperative tree alliance to enable organizations such as FF-SPAK to provide extension services.
• Strengthen multidisciplinary facilitation teams at the grassroots level.
• Revive and promote the village promotion concept.
• In Kenya, request the national government to improve extension services for FFPOs.
• In Uganda, lobby for the operationalization of the tree fund that is provided for in the Forest and Tree Planting Act 2003.
• In Zambia, lobby for the creation and strengthening of community structures that can support the extension system in the forest sector.
• In Rwanda, advocate for the government and other stakeholders to support extension services and ensure they are effective and efficient.

8.3.4 Promoting effective FFPOs
• Build the capacity of tree-grower associations/FFPOs to provide training on management and strategic planning.
• Implement frequent support and evaluation for farm forestry groups.
• Facilitate experience-sharing/study visits to put into action and expand the scope of farm forestry.
• Encourage the registration of FFPOs to national apex bodies.
• Facilitate the involvement of FFPOs in policy dialogues.
• Link national apex bodies to sub-regional and regional bodies.
• Organize FFPOs into cooperatives and encourage networking and linkages at the local, national and international levels.
• Build the capacity of producer organizations in governance, accountability, resource mobilization and value adding. Further link them to relevant institutions for technical guidance on production, processing and marketing.
• Encourage producer organizations to form savings and credit cooperative organizations to address funding requirements.
• In Zambia, establish linkages between programmes/initiatives that promote and upscale forest and farm initiatives.
• In Rwanda, sensitize FFPOs on the formation of cooperatives so as to increase their bargaining power, linkages and networking with other cooperatives at the national, regional and worldwide levels.
9. Messages from farm forestry to the XIV World Forestry Congress

Facilitated by Dr Dominic Walubengo

9.1 Overview
Dr Walubengo pointed out that the WFC, which takes place every six years, will be convened in Durban, South Africa, in September 2015. It may be a considerable time before such an event is held in Africa again, and Dr Walubengo urged those people with a capacity to attend to do so. He encouraged those who would be unable to attend to add their voices by using this forum to send messages to the Congress. He clarified that these messages needed to be clear and concise because delegates are usually overwhelmed and may not have time to go through mountains of vague messages.

9.2 WFC messages – expectations
Jeff Campbell was of the view that conference participants, including traditional leaders, senior government officials, technocrats, civil-society representatives, etc., had the power to make things happen. He pointed out that the timing of the conference was strategic, with several key events taking place at around the same time: the development of the Sustainable Development Goals; a climate-change conference in France; increasing recognition of the role of smallholder farms; the evaluation of strategic plans by various countries; and smallholders becoming key players in improving forestry.

Mr Campbell briefed the gathering on the WFC, the theme of which is, “Forests and people: Investing in a sustainable future”. It has six sub-themes:

1. Forests for socioeconomic development and food security (enabling economic environment, role of smallholders, forest and family farming and strengthening forest and farm producer organizations).
2. Building resilience with forests.
3. Integrating forests and other land uses.
4. Encouraging product innovation and sustainable trade.
5. Monitoring forests for better decision-making.
6. Improving governance by building capacity.

There will be a pavilion for displays, meetings, etc., at the Congress. A number of side-events, including networking events, launches, performances and regional events, will be held with a view to sharing experiences and innovations and providing opportunities for dialogue among Congress participants. Two publications will be launched: “Cases of successful locally controlled businesses” and a special issue of “ETFRN News”.

Mr Campbell informed participants of some of the preparations being undertaken, including a pre-Congress event set to take place on 5–6 September to build momentum towards the Congress. The pre-congress event will bring together forestry practitioners, smallholder farmers, etc., and enable them to bring forth their issues. Given the high-level deliberations expected to take place in Durban during the WFC, the messages should be:
• concise and to the point;
• punchy to maximize effect; and
• have clarity of meaning.
9.3 Messages for the XIV World Forestry Congress
During plenary, participants proposed the following messages to be delivered to the WFC.

1. Make funds available for research into and the documentation of NWFPs.
2. Promote the use of native species.
3. Do not think of gains in our lifetime. Encourage a culture of nurturing nature for future generations.
4. Bring global awareness to the village. Bring technology to the village level for sustainable production.
5. Counterbalance power-plays at ground level by empowering smallholder organizations so they can fight for their rights.
6. Governments should support small-scale forest producers.
7. The forest knows me and I know the forest. Let me benefit from the forest and the forest benefit from me.
8. Look for alternative investments using carbon financing mechanisms.
9. Deliberate improvement in funding for farm forestry programmes and organizations at the country, regional and global levels.
10. Africa has a growing private sector in primary forestry production, with whom you can engage.
11. Rejuvenate forest science to promote forestry in the region and beyond.
12. Unlock current barriers in policies to harness the full potential of forests in improving livelihoods and community participation.
13. Adopt laws that will protect local people and their rights.
14. Target the impunity of corrupt practices around illegal trade.
15. Adopt laws that will prohibit the production and importation of genetically modified organisms.
17. Land is our inheritance, and it is where our livelihoods will come from.
18. Need for proper recording and monitoring of tenure arrangements.
19. Governments should change mind-sets and focus on farm forests, develop accompanying policies and provide resources to develop the sector.
20. Indigenous people have a say in what is being discussed, whether on forests or land.
21. Compensation for those willing to set aside their land as natural forests because smallholders are very important in the bigger picture.
22. Governments should ensure that smallholder farmers have access to markets and financial support for their forest products.
23. People should speak their mind and come up with their action plan. Go to Durban and speak without fear.
24. Empowerment of youth and women to join farm forestry industry.
25. Partnership with FF-SPAK, which is a vibrant organization in Kenya.
10. Closing session

Facilitated by Dr Dominic Walubengo

Dr Walubengo hailed participants for a highly successful three-day conference. As part of the closing session, he invited representatives of various organizations to speak.

10.1 Remarks by Mr Hans Lind, We Effect
Mr Lind expressed his satisfaction at having been part of the conference and his gratitude for the collaboration that took place before the conference. He noted that this was the first conference bringing together such players and expressed hope for more in future. Mr Lind promised support from We Effect, where possible. He reiterated that delegates at the WFC should represent the voice of African people. He concluded by calling for a coordinated effort for a unified voice in Durban.

10.2 Lennart Ackzell, IFFA
Mr Ackzell was delighted that the first-ever pan-African farm forestry conference had been held. He believed that it was something for the other continents to follow. He thanked the Nairobi committee, with representatives from FAN, the FFF, We Effect, the KFS, FF-SPAK and FAO. He was grateful for the role played by donors. The discussions and plenary were very enriching. Mr Ackzell noted that in his previous experience in Kenya, government authorities had been reluctant to attend meetings. He pointed out the great strides that have been made, with Professor Wakhungu calling in her speech for a paradigm shift. Mr Ackzell lauded the cordial relationships between associations such as FF-SPAK and the KFS. He promised to bring Africa’s voice to other fora, including the WFC in Durban in September.

10.3 Serge Zoubga, Tiipaalga, Burkina Faso
Mr Zoubga said he was pleased to have attended the conference. He pointed out that Burkina Faso and the wider region represents a different reality, with less arable land, less forest cover and high levels of soil degradation, but nevertheless they are involved in farm/family forestry. Mr Zoubba wanted to be part of the conference to share experiences. He urged all participants to ensure that the solidarity continues, not necessarily in a big way but in their own small ways.

10.4 Professor Godwin Kowero, AFF
Professor Kowero informed the conference that he was a member of the global organizing committee for the WFC. The committee expects about 7 000 people to attend the Congress, with the South African government assuring there will be enough security. The committee has received 2 000 abstracts, of which more than one-third are from Africa, and 80 African authors have been encouraged to develop full papers. The WFC website shows that registration has started, with a reduced-fee period ending on 30 June. Professor Kowero pointed out that delegates from Africa have concessional fees compared with those from other regions. The problem limiting participation from Africa relates mainly to sponsorship. The organizers are working on ways of obtaining sponsorship for a few people, with discussions on the possibility of South Africa sponsoring some. This information will be communicated if and when it goes through.

Professor Kowero was of the opinion that there was a need to reach out to people from other continents and to make them interested in African affairs – there was a need to showcase the gains, not just the problems. This should be done hand in hand with skills and
capacity development, the provision of extension services, and assistance in unlocking constraints hindering access, such as tenure and inclusiveness. Professor Kowero challenged participants to express themselves clearly and to attract support in Durban.

He also took the opportunity to brief conference participants on the role of the AFF. The AFF has a memorandum of understanding with the AU to increase the participation of people in the WFC. Africa should take advantage of its rapidly growing middle class, which is investing in real estate and occupying land, with some putting trees on land to hold it.

On conference preparations, Professor Kowero informed participants of overlaps in planned pre-conference meetings on 4–5 September and 6–7 September. There was a need to avoid replication. The following themes are proposed:
- How climate change affects forests.
- Rehabilitation of degraded lands, including forests.
- Good governance and forest law enforcement.
- A session in which representatives of regional economic blocks – EAC, SADC, COMESA, etc. – share their forest-related experiences and the barriers in undertaking their work.

Professor Kowero revealed that there might be limited funds to sponsor about 100 people to attend the conference, with screening already in progress.

10.5 Oscar Simanto, KFS
For his closing remarks, Mr Simanto shared the following points:
- Kenya Forest Service is a state agency mandated by law to sustainably manage all forestry and allied resources for the socioeconomic development of Kenyans.
- The Kenyan Constitution mandates all Citizens to set aside at least 10% of their total land areas for tree growing. This constitutional clause has greatly profiled tree growing and hence farm forestry development in Kenya.
- Currently, Kenya is reviewing its forestry policy and law in order to make it more proactive towards the development of farm forestry sector and farmers enterprise groups.
- The new policy will be geared towards transforming landscapes and livelihoods of small farm forestry producers and their emerging organizations.
- From the discussions and field visits during the conference, we saw both opportunities and challenges which should be exploited and addressed respectively in order to develop and move forward the farm forestry sector in the continent.
- The challenges discussed during the workshop are not only unique to Kenya, but all African countries.
- In respect to farm forestry development, Africa has numerous opportunities to advance this agenda by organizing farmers into effective groups geared at improving marketing of farm forestry products.
- Africa should therefore seize this opportunity and create an enabling policy and legal environment for the advancement of farm forestry in the continent.
- The world forestry congress to be held in Durban, South Africa in September 2015 presents yet another opportunity for Africa to alert the world of the emerging small farm forestry sector in the continent and the opportunities it presents to address rural poverty, create employment for youths and women and improve household incomes for millions of land owners in the continent.
- Farm Forestry development is therefore a sure pathway towards the achievement of the goals stipulated in the African Union Agenda 2063 for sustainable forest management by all Countries in the continent.
• In moving the farm forestry agenda forward, African Countries should bring on board the private sector to actively invest in this emerging nascent small holder farm forestry producer organizations sector in the Continent.
• Once again Kenya Forest Service is greatly honoured to have participated in organizing this conference as a member of the organizing committee.

10.6 Jeff Campbell, FFF

Mr Campbell was of the view that landscapes and livelihoods can and are being transformed. He reminded participants of the need to diversify and at the same time to transform the environment for non-humans. About 2.5 billion people are dependent on woodfuel to prepare food, with the most influence exerted by small-scale producers.

There was a need to work together and to ensure that women and youth were involved. Mr Campbell challenged everyone to forget the “me first” culture to enable us to move further, especially with support from government and the private sector. He was delighted that issues of indigenous forests and cultural rights had been raised.

Mr Campbell said that even though the conference had a specific focus, the bigger picture was visible. In particular, the conference didn’t talk much of the relevance of producer organizations to emerging issues like climate change, but farmers were already proving their ability to adapt. Mr Campbell saw the need for a complex land-use system to help mitigate against climate change, with proceeds from REDD+ helping small-scale producers to manage farm forests.

Mr Campbell reminded everyone of the FLEGT Facility, which provides resources in many countries. He challenged countries to make the case that good governance and legality depends on those living near the forest and on well-functioning local organizations. He gave an example of Viet Nam, where 1 million farmers have planted 3.5 million hectares of trees, with timber for most of the furniture exported from the country sourced from small farms.

Value chains can connect local producer organizations to wider markets. We need to support FFPOs to develop both primary and processed forest producers.

Mr Campbell concluded by thanking all the sponsors and the conference organizing committee, especially Dr Walubengo and his team.

10.7 Dr Dominic Walubengo, FAN

In his closing remarks, Dr Walubengo thanked the conference organizing team, composed of more than 14 people from all over the world. He was very grateful to Jeff, Fred, Oscar, Peter, Shawm, Edna, Mwajuma, Geoffrey, Jonah, Leonard and Sarah for the roles they played in ensuring the conference was a success.
## Annexes

### Annex 1: Programme

**Day 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>Participants arrive</td>
<td>FAN / Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830hrs</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>FAN / IFFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HIGH LEVEL SEGMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0845hrs</td>
<td>Arrival of Guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900hrs</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
<td>Peter deMarsh (Chairman IFFA) and Geoffrey Wanyama (Director FF-SPAK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910hrs</td>
<td>Presentation of the Background Paper</td>
<td>Julius Chupezi Tieguhong and Jolien Schure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930hrs</td>
<td>Remarks by the Kenya Forest Service</td>
<td>Emilio Mugo (Ag. Kenya Forest Service Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0940hrs</td>
<td>Remarks by FAO</td>
<td>Luca Alinovi, FAO Representative in Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0950hrs</td>
<td>Remarks by Forest Farm Facility</td>
<td>Jeff Campbell (Manager of FFF Rome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remarks by African Union Commission</td>
<td>Dampha Almani, African Union Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0950hrs</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Lesiyampe (Principal Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000hrs</td>
<td>Official Opening</td>
<td>Prof. Judi Wakhungu, Cabinet Secretary, Minister of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1110hrs</td>
<td>Securing Tenure and enabling policies: Introduction</td>
<td>James Makori, Environmental Lawyer, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110-1145hrs</td>
<td>Roundtable discussions: Securing Tenure and enabling policies</td>
<td>Roundtable groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145-1230hrs</td>
<td>Plenary discussions</td>
<td>James Makori, Environmental Lawyer, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 – 1330hrs</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330 – 1340hrs</td>
<td>Gaining access to markets and effective service provision and organizational strengthening in the different African contexts: Introduction</td>
<td>Serge Razafimahatratra, Partage, Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340-1415hrs</td>
<td>Roundtable discussions: Gaining access to markets and effective service provision and organizational strengthening in the different African contexts</td>
<td>Roundtable groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415-1500hrs</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Serge Razafimahatratra, Partage, Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 – 1510hrs</td>
<td>Forming and strengthening effective organizations/federations: Introduction</td>
<td>Makweti Sishekanu, Zambia National Farmers’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510-1600hrs</td>
<td>Roundtable discussions: Forming and strengthening effective organizations/ federations</td>
<td>Roundtable groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1630hrs</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Makweti Sishekanu, Zambia National Farmers’ Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630hrs</td>
<td>Field trip logistics</td>
<td>Oscar Simanto / Geoffrey Wanyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645hrs</td>
<td>Coffee / tea break and end of day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Day 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Site/Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiambu County</strong></td>
<td>Ms. Rose Makimei’s private farm</td>
<td>Mixed farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lari, Kirenga Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural water bottling site</td>
<td>NGO – Kereita Nature Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kereita Community Forest Association (CFA)</td>
<td>Government and community collaboration in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conserving forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kereita Community Forest Association (CFA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kariminu Nurseries</td>
<td>Giant bamboo Propagation and uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giant bamboo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muranga County</strong></td>
<td>Gatare Community Forest</td>
<td>Government and community collaboration in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association (CFA)</td>
<td>conserving forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small holder farm forester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Kihoro</td>
<td>Mixed farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiarutara community water project group</td>
<td>Riparian conservation, water harvesting and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tree nurseries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kariminu Nurseries</td>
<td>Giant bamboo Propagation and uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giant bamboo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nyandarua County</strong></td>
<td>Small holder farm forester</td>
<td>50 acres of Eucalyptus – Already harvesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Maina</td>
<td>transmission poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small holder farm forester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Peter Mwangi Nderitu</td>
<td>Six acres of Eucalyptus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small holder farm forester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. John Karari</td>
<td>Mixed farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obbolosat Community Forest Association (CFA)</td>
<td>Government and community collaboration in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conserving forests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0815hrs</td>
<td>Arrival participants</td>
<td>FAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0830-0930hrs</td>
<td>Reflections on field trips</td>
<td>Oscar Simanto / Geoffrey Wanyama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1030hrs</td>
<td><strong>Role of government</strong> including state forest services (from policy to extension services)</td>
<td>Panel: Representatives of the Government Gambia; of the Kenya Forest Service, Zambia Forestry Department, Liberia Forest Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1100hrs</td>
<td>Coffee / Tea Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1100-1200hrs  | **Linkages** with other important programmes in Africa.                  | Yonas Yemshaw, African Forest Forum (AFF) 
Ismael G. Mukombwe, Matembwetreegrowers, Tanzania 
Sarah Price (PEFC): “Utilizing PEFC forest certification to support locally controlled forestry” 
Justin Kamga, FODER, Cameroon: “Le lien entre le processus FLEGT et les petits producteurs forestiers (Forêts communautaire)” 
Serge Zoubga, TIIPALGA, Burkina Faso: “Contribution de l’Association Tiipaalga à la mise en œuvre de la Grande Muraille Verte (GMV) au Burkina Faso: cas des forêts familiales de Djibo dans la province du Soum” |
| 1200-1300hrs  | **Roundtable discussions** Moving family farm forestry ahead: secure tenure, fair market access, extension services, effective FFPO’s and next steps for practical information exchange and networking | Roundtable groups with an introduction by George Onyango (WE-Effect) 
Lessons from Hanoi, AFECONET, Oscar Simanto (KFS) |
| 1300-1400hrs  | Lunch Break                                                              |                                                                        |
| 1400-1500hrs  | **Reporting back in Plenary:** Moving family farm forestry ahead: secure tenure, fair market access, extension services, effective FFPO’s and next steps for practical information exchange and networking | George Onyango (WE-Effect) |
| 1500-1600hrs  | **Roundtables discussions:** Messages from farm/ family forestry to XIV World Forestry Congress | Introduction by FAO followed by Roundtable groups |
| 1600-1630hrs  | Plenary: Groups present their findings / resolutions – Messages to XIV World Forestry Congress | Groups Leaders Facilitated by the African Forest Forum |
| 1630-1700hrs  | Closing session                                                          | Dominic Walubengo (FAN), Hans Lind (We Effect), Jeff Campbell (FFF), LennartAckzell (IFFA), Serge Zougba (TIIPALGA), Prof. Godwin Kowero (AFF), Oscar Simanto (KFS) |
| 1700hrs       | Coffee / Tea Break and end of Conference                                 | Mwajuma Abdi                                                          |
| 1800hrs       |                                                                           |                                                                        |
## Annex 2: List of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
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Annex 3: Resolution of the Africa Farm/Family Forest Producers Organizations Conference
Resolution of the Africa Farm/Family Forest Producers Organizations Conference  
Nairobi 9-11 of June 2015

An initiative of the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA)

WHEREAS 70 % of Africa’s population live in rural areas where wood and non-wood forest products for cooking, heating, building, food security, water availability and other uses are a daily necessity and one important element in our struggle for livelihood.

We the participants of Farm / Family Forest Producer organizations at our first Pan African meeting 9-11 of June 2015 in Nairobi, Kenya urge governments and other parties to:

- RECOGNIZE the key role of farms forests, and forestry producers’ organizations and the legal and institutional recognition we need to plant, care, protect and market our trees and forest products as significantly contributing to the broader sustainable development agenda and directly to most of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) currently under discussion.

- RECOGNIZE the necessity to include forest small holders, including youth and women, in national and global policy development to improve our landscapes, and the tree cover in particular, as well as our livelihoods.

- RECOGNIZE the members of the primary forest producer organizations as Small and Medium Enterprises and hence part of the growing private sector.

- RECOGNIZE the serious Climate Change threat to our lives as well as the great and large scale climate change mitigation and adaptation function our forest producer groups can provide by recovering the forest/agricultural landscape, promoting eco-system services and
improving the livelihoods and sustainable land management through Locally Controlled Forestry.

- **PUT IN PLACE** secure land tenure, freedom of association and legal and institutional recognition of farm/family forest producer organizations, supportive government policies and extension services, and access to markets and finances as indispensable pillars for an enabling environment for the success of farm/family forest producer organizations.

- **LEVEL the playing field by empowering smallholder organisations** so that they can claim their rights and access to markets and at the same time fill the gap between well intentioned political reforms and reality on the ground.

- **PROMOTE** production, processing, packaging, labelling and standardization, and related R&D of African forest products for national, regional and international markets, not the least among African countries.

- **ENCOURAGE** the establishment of partnerships between forest producer organizations and government forest services to leverage budgets and staff capacity as a model to be encouraged.

- **CHANGE mind-sets** and focus on farm forests and forestry producers organizations to develop accompanying policies and provide resources to develop the sector.

- **CLEARLY OBSERVE** the family forest producer perspective: “The forest knows me and I know the forest. Let me benefit from the forest and the forest will benefit from me.”
Annex 4: Résolution émanant de la Conférence des organisations de petits producteurs agricoles/forestiers africains
Résolution émanant de la Conférence des organisations de petits producteurs agricoles/forestiers africains
Nairobi, 9-11 juin 2015

Une initiative de l'Alliance internationale de la foresterie familiale (IFFA)

ATTENDU QUE 70 % de la population du continent vit dans les zones rurales où les produits ligneux et non ligneux, pour la cuisine, le chauffage, les constructions, la sécurité alimentaire, la disponibilité de l'eau et d’autres utilisations, sont une nécessité quotidienne et un élément important pour notre survie.

Nous, participants à la première assemblée panafricaine de la Conférence des organisations de petits producteurs agricoles/forestiers africains, tenue du 9 au 11 juin 2015 à Nairobi au Kenya, exhortons les gouvernements et autres parties à :

- RECONNAÎTRE le rôle clé des petites exploitations forestières, et des organisations de ces petits producteurs forestiers ainsi que le besoin de reconnaissance juridique et institutionnelle, nécessaire pour planter, prendre soin, protéger et commercialiser nos arbres et nos produits forestiers, comme contribution significative au développement durable et contribution directe à la plupart des Objectifs de Développement Durable (ODD) actuellement en discussion.

- RECONNAÎTRE la nécessité d’intégrer les petits propriétaires forestiers, y compris les jeunes et les femmes, dans le développement de politiques nationales et internationales pour améliorer nos paysages, en particulier la couverture forestière, ainsi que nos moyens d’existence.

- RECONNAÎTRE les membres des organisations de petits producteurs des forêts en tant que Petites et Moyennes Entreprises (PME) et donc comme une partie intégrante du secteur privé en pleine expansion.
• **RECONNAÎTRE sérieusement la menace du changement climatique** sur nos vies, mais aussi le rôle significatif et de grande ampleur que nos groupes de petits producteurs forestiers peuvent prendre dans la réduction et l'adaptation au changement climatique en restaurant le paysage forestier/agricole, en favorisant les services écosystémiques et en améliorant les moyens d'existence et la gestion durable des terres au moyen d’une foresterie contrôlée localement.

• **METTRE EN PLACE** la sécurité foncière, la liberté d'association et la reconnaissance juridique et institutionnelle des organisations de petits producteurs forestiers/foresterie familiale, les politiques gouvernementales de soutien, et les services de vulgarisation, et d'accès aux marchés et aux financements, comme piliers indispensables à un environnement propice à la réussite des organisations de petits producteurs forestiers/foresterie familiale.

• **GARANTIR une égalité des chances en rendant les organisations de petits producteurs aptes** à faire valoir leurs droits et leur accès aux marchés, tout en comblant l’écart entre des réformes politiques bien intentionnées et la réalité sur le terrain.

• **PROMOUVOIR la production, la transformation, l'emballage, l'étiquetage, la standardisation**, et la Recherche et le Développement (R&D) des produits forestiers africains pour les marchés nationaux, régionaux et internationaux, et pas le moindre entre les pays africains.

• **ENCOURAGER l'établissement de partenariats entre les organisations de petits producteurs forestiers et les services forestiers gouvernementaux**, pour mieux tirer profit des budgets et de la capacité du personnel, comme un modèle à promouvoir.

• **CHANGER les mentalités et se concentrer sur les organisations de petits producteurs paysans/forestiers et de foresterie pour élaborer des politiques d'accompagnement de ces organisations et fournir des ressources pour développer ce secteur.**

• **RESPECTER CLAIREMENT le point de vue des petits producteurs de forêts familiales**: «La forêt me connaît et je connais la forêt. Permettez-moi de bénéficier de la forêt et la forêt bénéficiera de moi. »