



IMPROVING THE LINKAGES BETWEEN NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES AND POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGIES IN AFRICA



WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

Food and Agriculture Organization
Forestry Department
Forest Policy Service

April 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Acknowledgements.....	1
2	Introduction.....	2
3	Opening ceremony.....	2
4	Strengthening collaboration.....	2
5	Calculating forestry’s contribution to GDP.....	4
6	Forestry in poverty reduction strategies.....	7
7	Priorities for follow-up and next steps.....	9
8	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	9
	Appendix 1 Concept note.....	13
	Appendix 2 Programme of work.....	15
	Appendix 3 Discussion paper.....	16
	Appendix 4 Opening remarks.....	27
	Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.....	27
	Assistant Representative, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.....	29
	Appendix 5 Keynote address: forestry reforms in Kenya.....	31
	Appendix 6 Presentations.....	34
	Presentation 1: Main Findings of the Study.....	34
	Presentation 2: Forestry-Poverty Linkages Toolkit.....	37
	Presentation 3: Natural Resources Accounting.....	39
	Presentation 4: Revised UN System of National Accounts in Malawi.....	42
	Presentation 5: Poverty Reduction Strategies for Joint Action in Tanzania.....	45
	Presentation 6: National Forest Programme Facility.....	48
	Appendix 7 Country priorities for follow-up and next steps.....	49
	Kenya.....	49
	Malawi.....	50
	Namibia.....	51
	Niger.....	51
	Nigeria.....	52
	Sudan.....	53
	Tanzania.....	54
	Tunisia.....	54
	Uganda.....	55
	Zambia.....	56
	Appendix 8 List of participants.....	57

1 Acknowledgements

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the National Forest Programme Facility (NFP Facility) express their appreciation to all countries which participated in the study and to the experts who willingly shared their ideas and insights throughout discussions at the workshop. They would also like to thank the Kenya Forest Service for hosting the regional event, in particular its Director, Mr. David Mbugua, and Mr. John Wanyiri who headed the Secretariat.

The organizers are grateful to Mr. Scott Geller of LTS International Ltd. as well, for the valuable assistance he provided both before and during the meeting and for his part in drafting the proceedings.

2 Introduction

Between November 2005 and July 2007, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) led a study in ten countries in Africa¹, in collaboration with the National Forest Programme Facility (NFP Facility), to examine the linkages between national forest programmes (NFPs) and national poverty reduction strategies (PRSs). The study revealed that the two processes were not well connected for the most part, mainly because central authorities are often unaware of the many ways in which forests and trees outside forests help to reduce poverty and because forestry officials are not generally engaged in national discussions on poverty. It also found that weak forestry capacity in all countries hinders efforts to strengthen collaboration within and outside the sector, including with central agencies responsible for developing poverty reduction strategies and for monitoring their implementation. (Detailed reports of findings and conclusions for each country are posted at www.fao.org/forestry/site/livelihoods/en/) under the heading “workshops”.

In partnership with the Kenya Forest Service and the NFP Facility, FAO organized a regional workshop in Nairobi from 20 to 22 November 2007. (The programme of work is found in Appendix 2.) The ten countries which participated in the study exchanged ideas on how to increase the presence and influence of forestry in central decision-making processes and, to this end, explored practical ways to make national forest programmes an integral part of national development plans and poverty reduction strategies. Discussions also took place on how forestry could better address poverty issues. More than 40 participants attended from government and international organizations, including ministries outside forestry – finance, planning and economic development, national statistics, environment, and agriculture, among others. (The list of participants is found in Appendix 8.)

Two facilitators guided deliberations to foster a fruitful exchange of information in which key concerns were raised, opportunities to overcome them were proposed, and potential areas of support from international partners were identified, including those which countries might seek to channel through the NFP Facility as part of partnership agreements. Sessions consisted of presentations and discussions in plenary, as well as work in smaller groups. Simultaneous interpretation in English and French was made available in plenary sessions and in select working groups.

3 Opening ceremony

Mr. David Mbugua, Director of the Kenya Forest Service, welcomed participants to Nairobi and encouraged their active engagement in discussions over the course of the workshop. Participants briefly introduced themselves before opening remarks were delivered by the Assistant FAO Representative and the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Appendix 4). Mr. Mbugua then gave the keynote address in which he highlighted the forestry reforms which Kenya had recently undergone (Appendix 5).

4 Strengthening collaboration

From the study findings and from country presentations, better collaboration across

¹ Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia

sectors and across levels of government emerged as a pre-requisite to integrating the forestry sector into broader socio-economic development. For work in groups, participants were divided into 4 teams: 2 made up exclusively of forestry staff and 2 others of non-forestry staff. Each group was asked to identify and propose solutions to the challenges and bottlenecks associated with improving collaboration.

Despite the groups examining the problem from two different perspectives, deliberations and conclusions were strikingly similar. One group from outside forestry made the point that no provision is made to cover costs related to collaboration when budgets are allocated – a situation which discourages ministries from taking the initiative, even when mandates overlap. The same group suggested that programmes to promote development or reduce poverty should be assessed and funded according to the extent they include collaboration across sectors in their design, in much the same way as projects are now screened based on the impact they are likely to have on the environment.

Presentations and discussion in plenary

When each group presented the main points of their deliberations to the plenary session, lack of planning across sectors was identified as the biggest constraint. They indicated that, in addition to establishing clear procedures to guide effective collaboration, informal approaches are necessary regardless of whether institutions have an explicit mandate to forge new partnerships beyond traditional arrangements. In this regard, participants emphasized that joint planning and programme implementation require time, money, and strong institutions that are both capable and receptive to adopting such approaches. They also held the view that building closer working relations with other stakeholders was essential not only to secure additional funding for the sector but to achieve other benefits as well, including:

- higher visibility and understanding of forestry issues
- knowledge of how forestry interventions can help other sectors meet their objectives
- improved information for decision making
- better integration of forestry with the management of other natural resources, including under various land administration patterns
- stronger partnerships to address the multifaceted dimensions of poverty
- more support to build stable forestry institutions
- a sharper focus on multi-disciplinary approaches to improve livelihoods
- planning that captures the views of poor people at community and household levels
- a more rational use of resources and less duplication
- the possibility of more forest revenue returned to the sector to finance operations
- greater involvement of local communities in forest management.

The importance of distinguishing between government and private sources for funding forestry was also raised, noting that the former remains marginal compared with the latter, which offers more flexible and innovative arrangements. Where forestry is funded at reasonable levels, participants felt that the first priority should be to conduct an inventory of resources to identify strengths and areas requiring urgent attention. They also recognized the need to differentiate between issues that are within their control to address and those which are not in order to focus on areas they can

change – for example, making procedures to assess the impact of PRS policy decisions across sectors more explicit so that non-foresters could see the cross-cutting dimensions of forestry in much the same way as they view the environment and gender.

5 Calculating forestry's contribution to GDP

The study and presentations by experts confirmed that lack of hard data seriously hinders efforts to integrate forestry into PRSs and similar national development plans because the sector's contributions to the economy, the environment and livelihoods are neither well recognized nor appreciated. For the same reason, forestry does not often secure a fair share of the national budget allocation.

After the presentation on the revised UN System of National Accounts in Malawi, participants made the following observations in plenary:

- Concerns were expressed that Malawi is using forestry estimates in national accounts because of inadequate data from the Forest Department.
- Uganda has set up a Poverty Action Fund which involves sectors competing for resources based on the extent to which their proposed initiatives have the potential to reduce poverty. The facility has created a greater need for better information.
- In Nigeria, cutting down the forest also means the eventual closure of the factory which depends on the raw material. How do national accounts take such effects into consideration? In countries where forestry is under agriculture it gets left out, but if under the environment it stand a better chance for support.
- Most forestry activities in Niger are not formal or organized. Only timber data is collected.
- What constitute forest products? Are definitions shared between foresters and statisticians? Can we standardize the definition and collection methodologies?
- The Sudanese admitted that as foresters they often work in isolation. Few members of Cabinet have forestry background. Household farm and income survey – cash crops are there but little income on forestry.
- FAO and others should put in place accounting guidelines in order to do proper calculations and presentations.
- Key for foresters to work with statistic institutes to help with databases. Training for finance people on forestry / environmental issues. International support key.
- Kenya uses Budget Outlook Papers to inform budget ceilings. Need to identify people who will champion the cause of forestry, build networks, and financially sustain these networks.
- Statistical offices and sector specific ministries should agree on methodology and definitions.
- We need to get out of our forests and encourage the finance people to come to our forests.
- IUCN supports the forum for East Africa community directors of conservation and economic planning. Inter-governmental Authority for Development met in Mombassa 3 weeks ago and raised the same issues.
- Do foresters and economic planners have the right attitude to make collaboration work? Do they have the capacity?
- Tanzania developed 11 poverty-environment indicators, using a rigorous methodology (see Box 1).

Box 1 Poverty-environment indicators for Tanzania's MKUKUTA

Wide stakeholder consultations and experience with poverty monitoring systems elsewhere resulted in proposing 11 environment indicators to measure aspects of Tanzania's MKUKUTA:

- Proportion of EIAs/SEAs which avoided or mitigated negative impacts
- Percentage of household income in rural areas derived from the sustainable processing and marketing of natural resource products
- Percentage of households able to fetch clean and safe water from a protected source in under 30 minutes (go, collect, return)
- Percentage of households with access to basic sanitation facilities
- Percentage of clean water bodies, based on the 1974 temporary water standards
- Percentage of population living in areas of high risk of environmental disaster
- Percentage of households using sources of energy, other than wood fuel, to cook
- Land area used for natural resource management that is subject to tenure security
- Number of ministries and districts establishing effective environmental units
- Mechanisms for participatory decision-making established and functioning
- Proportion of poor and vulnerable households with legally-enshrined land titles

Participants were divided into 4 groups to explore ways to improve data collection. They focused on monitoring and reporting systems; valuation, pricing and taxation; the need to link objectives, indicators and data sources; and assessment of impacts. Key points are summarized below.

Monitoring and reporting systems

Senior officials from across government, including ministers, continue to accept and make decisions based on information that they know to be outdated, inaccurate and incomplete. In the case of forestry, nearly all national inventories are obsolete, mainly because of shortages in human and financial resources. This situation negatively affects bidding processes which aim for a transparent disposal of timber, prevents a reliable assessment of ecosystem service functions, and underestimates the benefits derived from farm forestry.

Leaders must understand that regular resource assessments are a prerequisite to sustainable forest management but the need for up-to-date information is still given low priority amidst competing demands for tight forestry budgets. The same holds true for the assessment of non-wood forest products, which is all but non-existent, despite their potential to generate significant revenues to the treasury and provide a solid base for livelihood systems. Examples were given of ways to simplify and lower the cost of conducting inventories and a few countries indicated they were updating national data on planted forests.

Under the United Nations System of National Accounts, the contributions of forestry to GDP are subsumed under agriculture, effectively masking the importance of the sector to the economy. The challenge, therefore, is for foresters to find ways of integrating the appropriate data into planning efforts outside the sector and to develop systems for data collection and analysis that highlight the indirect and direct benefits of forestry. Many forestry administrations are modernizing information systems as part of capacity building but more investment is required to ensure they are

compatible with national accounting requirements and other government accountability systems.

Valuation, pricing and taxation

Foresters in sub-Saharan Africa understand household energy consumption patterns, are aware of the value of medicines derived from forests, and know the importance of non-wood forest products. Non-foresters in the group therefore found it surprising that data compiled by academia, the private sector, NGOs and international partners to better reflect the sector's contributions to the national economy were neither adequate nor available in a central system for all to access.

The importance of the environmental services that forests provide and the increasing threat of human activity on the health of ecosystems have been recognized for some time. Yet the notion of paying for ecological services has only recently emerged and the schemes which have evolved over the last decade are based on the premise that such services contribute to environmental sustainability, promote rural development, prevent loss of biodiversity and habitat, help to control desertification, and mitigate climate change. These problems are all high on the government agenda and forestry can be a significant part of the solution if more information was available on its importance to river basins, water catchments, and mountain ranges, for example.

The global trend toward payment for environmental services suggests that well designed valuation and pricing mechanisms are more critical than ever. At the micro-level, few benefit sharing mechanisms provide a fair deal to the community, the land owner, and the forest manager, especially if the land has a high value. There is also little to suggest that losses due to illegal trade in timber and non-wood forest products are sufficiently captured or calculated. At a macro-level, foresters and their colleagues in statistics and national accounting need to understand data collection and valuation methods in order to guide collective efforts and improve linkages. It is also critical for forestry services to recruit economists and to provide economists in other ministries with information to help them understand forestry.

Linking objectives, indicators and data sources

Participants concurred with the study findings which concluded that the absence of baseline data makes it next to impossible to set targets and measure progress – a problem which hinders the capacity to determine if goals are met, to identify obstacles to implementation, and to shape future forestry policies and programmes. Indicators at the household level that inform those at the national level are uncommon in the sector and foresters are often the sole suppliers of information. This situation limits the amount and type of data collected.

Capacity to monitor and evaluate national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies is weak in all governments that participated in the study, often limited to tracking implementation of projects. Where systems exist for both processes, they are often not compatible, although Tanzania and Uganda are making headway in this regard. In addition to installing a well designed system, establishing a culture within organizations to embrace monitoring and evaluation as a way of doing business remains a challenge both at sector and PRS planning levels.

The move to mainstream the environment as a cross-cutting issue in poverty reduction strategies has provided an opportunity for the sector to add a forestry dimension to

new indicators and improve data collection. There is, however, a need for institutions to take this work on board as an integral part of their mandate rather than depend solely on the interest of individuals to carry out. Other areas that require attention include standardizing definitions for consistent use across ministries and developing indicators that show the link between forestry and poverty reduction objectives.

Monitoring for impact: integrating lessons learnt

Several countries are reviewing their first generation PRSs and are changing the way they collect and analyze data as a result. In a few cases, they have developed and are using indicators to monitor performance and the impact of interventions. However, the environmental component is still weak, as are the links to Millennium Development Goals.

Factors which limit the use of data collected during monitoring to draw lessons and incorporate findings into the delivery of programmes and services include weak capacity in terms of skills and personnel, incompatible M&E systems across sectors, government inability to tap into all available information, and gaps in research. On the other hand, M&E systems to link donor assistance with government priorities are improving.

6 Forestry in poverty reduction strategies

In terms of increasing the presence and influence of forestry in poverty reduction strategies, participants shared their experiences and, in working groups, identified ways to raise the sector's profile, noting some of the institutional requirements to make this happen.

Prioritizing and developing local plans

NFP processes have considerable potential to improve the knowledge and analysis of forestry issues and to feed this information into government systems so that it is readily available for policy formulation. They are especially effective if stakeholders are able to translate NFP goals into realistic work plans and if they connect to other central planning processes (such as the PRS) which are also concerned with national economic development, the environment, customary rights, land tenure, and governance issues. However, NFP processes should not only operate at the national level but also be grounded in local realities if they are to show the contributions that forestry makes in a variety of socio-economic settings and locations. Participants agreed that more work in this area is needed and that such work provides an opportunity for foresters and non-foresters to learn together about cross-sectoral linkages.

Leadership

A successful NFP process requires leadership, innovation and sound management if the sector is ever to convince planners and economists of the importance of forestry to the country. In working groups, participants identified several factors which affect how well organizations perform: whether they have a corporate vision and strong

leaders, incentives for managers to become involved in wider planning efforts, and staff capacity at field, regional and national levels. More specifically, participants noted that most of these elements, if not all, were absent from their own NFP processes.

Characteristics of leadership: visionary, team player, innovative, good communication and lobbying skills, risk taker, sound planner and organizer, coordination skills, intelligent, knowledgeable, creative, accommodating, charismatic and influential.

Management incentives: ownership of planning processes by all parties; availability of required information; delivery of programmes and services according to the public interest; adaptive and flexible administrations.

Building skills at the field level in the following areas: integrated resource planning and management; participatory management; communications; programme and project management; team building; conflict management.

Building skills at the regional level in the following areas: in addition to those listed above, data collection; monitoring and evaluation; analysis and reporting; planning and budgeting.

Building skills at the national level in the following areas: lobbying and negotiation; networking; managing information systems; linking sectors with macro-frameworks; planning and budgeting; monitoring and evaluation; developing payment schemes for environmental services.

Communications and the media

Because the contributions of forestry to national development and poverty reduction are still not well understood, it is difficult to attract media attention. Most coverage is negative and narrow in scope. However, participants agreed that communications is critically important when trying to show how forests and trees improve livelihoods and when the sector is seeking inclusion in PRS processes. One lesson learned is the need to target different media and use different approaches, depending on the messages that need to be conveyed and the audience to be targeted. Involving the media in efforts to integrate forestry into central planning and budgeting brings issues to the attention of politicians and informs the wider public. When information is provided in a timely manner, it avoids creating misconceptions and can win support for change. Campaigns in the mass media should be tailored to meet specific needs and be used, for example, to disseminate research findings, play an advocacy role, and build networks.

A political angle

Politicians are an invaluable source of contacts and can be influential in mainstreaming forestry into national development plans and poverty reduction strategies, especially if media coverage attracts their attention and if forestry officials, by understanding the political agenda of these elected representatives, convince them of the advantages of becoming involved. However, more information is often required to show how forestry can reduce poverty in a particular constituency. Once high profile and credible politicians show an interest, they can be powerful allies in making the case to decision-makers and planners associated with PRS processes.

7 Priorities for follow-up and next steps

Prior to the workshop, participants from each country jointly prepared a short paper or power point presentation on the key constraints to strengthening the links between national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies. Drawing on the rich exchange of information and experiences over the course of the workshop, each country delegation formulated its priorities for follow-up over the next 3 to 6 months (see Appendix 7) as a basis for developing a more detailed action plan and for requesting assistance from the NFP Facility and other international partners to implement it. The following activities are those which many countries deem essential:

- **Study findings and workshop outcomes:** widely disseminating the findings of the study and outcomes of the workshop and taking them into account during national planning processes.
- **Participation:** making NFPs more participatory through appropriate coordination mechanisms and other approaches. (FAO has guidelines to help in this area.)
- **Dissemination and advocacy:** repackaging NFPs to make them pro-poor, convening stakeholder meetings, identifying focal points, updating policy analysis and using the information for advocacy purposes.
- **Data collection:** agreeing on definitions, establishing baselines, developing joint modules with statistics authorities, adding forestry questions to surveys and poverty assessments, and building capacity for the above.
- **Development of indicators:** crafting compatible and comparable indicators to measure and report on NFP and PRS impacts, outcomes, and outputs.
- **Economic assessments:** gathering data on the contributions of forestry to economic growth and poverty reduction and assessing the extent to which these contributions help to achieve the goals outlined in long-term visions and PRSs, both at a national and constituency level.
- **Training:** training on tools and approaches to mainstream forestry into economic development – how to set up a national accounting system, for example.

8 Conclusions and Recommendations

Inter-sectoral collaboration and coordination mechanisms

1. In cases where the ministry responsible for forestry is given a specific mandate to help develop policies which affect forestry but originate in other sectors, officials may still have to lobby for a place at the table. The same applies to their participation in PRS processes, including the development of indicators to assess implementation. If central agencies do not invite them to take part in discussions, it would be important for them to seek inclusion so that they can highlight the contributions of forestry to poverty reduction and, in doing so, increase political, institutional and financial support for the sector.
2. If forestry authorities better understood national development processes and how ministries interacted within them, they could map out strategic entry points to raise the presence and influence of forestry in deliberations. Identifying focal points in each central and relevant line ministry to deal with issues related to poverty reduction would significantly increase communication, as would incentives to collaborate.

3. The establishment of inter-disciplinary task teams from central agencies and line ministries to address impediments to reducing poverty would strengthen linkages to the national PRS process, especially if these working groups were represented on key PRS committees. In these fora, forestry officials need to explain in clear economic terms how sustainable forest management contributes to national and rural development. By the same token, staff working in finance and planning units should spend time in the forest to better understand the sector's importance to growth, income generation and poverty reduction.
4. A sound economic analysis of the impacts of deforestation would make a strong case for finance, planning and line ministries to call for the integrated management of natural resources. The recruitment of environmental economists in forestry departments would be instrumental in building the capacity to conduct such analysis and develop comprehensive approaches.
5. Establishing links to donor and government-donor coordination mechanisms by gaining access to working groups which address cross-cutting issues, for example, is a useful means to push the forestry agenda.
6. Because of the cross-sectoral nature of strategic environmental assessments, they can be effective tools to help forestry services to develop and analyze policies – as long as these tasks are undertaken early in the planning cycle, fully engage the finance/planning agency, and give the environment agency the power to enforce findings within the scope of forest law enforcement and governance.

Lack of data on forest resources and their range of contributions

1. Forestry services lack data to influence political decisions, including in the area of economic planning, and officials often provide estimates to finance ministries without understanding how they will be used to determine budget allocations.
2. A lack of human, financial and technical resources has reduced the scope, frequency and accuracy of national forest inventories to the point where they cannot meaningfully inform strategic and operational planning or participatory poverty assessments. Data is scattered across different ministries and reporting systems are not in a format that enables national statistics offices to use the information.
3. More research is needed to assess the value of the environmental services that forests provide in terms of water quality and quantity, soil retention and fertility, carbon storage, and conservation of biodiversity, for example.

Monitoring and evaluation systems across government

1. The absence of baseline data to set targets and measure progress limits the potential of national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies to determine if goals are met, to identify obstacles which hinder implementation, and to shape the future direction of forest policies and programmes.
2. Few indicators to track implementation and assess the effectiveness of PRSs are related to the environment and even fewer are specific to forestry – mainly because forestry officials are not widely engaged in monitoring and evaluation efforts.

3. Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely indicators (SMART) should facilitate data collection, especially if they draw on information that is already available. However, indicators often have inherent weaknesses which should be described – for example, the likelihood of their being out-of-date if they are collected infrequently – in order to warn analysts to interpret some data with caution.
4. Sources of information to track the extent to which poor people derive benefits from government policies and programmes to alleviate poverty are many: administrative data from federal ministries and local government; national surveys carried out at regular intervals; research on specific themes; and participatory poverty assessments that capture the views of poor people.

Linkages between forestry and poverty reduction

1. The contributions of forestry to poverty reduction are still not well understood, including in many forestry departments, and issues which affect the sector but originate outside it are not taken into account in national and district development plans. The challenge is to convince central agencies and relevant line ministries of the importance of forestry to economic growth, as these officials are responsible for plans, budgets and policies which influence the management of natural resources for the range of goods and services they provide.
2. When the environment is considered a cross-cutting issue in poverty reduction strategies and other development plans, the chances of including forestry as a component are better. However, stakeholders who seek to integrate the sector as part of a broader economic agenda have limited access and capacity to engage in high level decision-making processes. They also lack experience in monitoring and evaluating the implementation and impacts of policies and programmes.
3. Mainstreaming forestry into efforts to reduce poverty could increase investment in the sector, give poor people better access to forest resources and be an engine for pro-poor growth.
4. The study provided a useful overview of the context in each country in terms of the key economic and political drivers, poverty levels, governance processes, policy and planning frameworks, major initiatives, main institutions and stakeholders. However, additional information is needed to better understand policy and planning processes, the role of institutions, who should be engaged in mainstreaming efforts, and incentives required to encourage wider involvement.

International partnerships

1. International cooperation partners are moving away from project-based support to joint assistance strategies which focus on capacity building and general budget support. This shift is intended to better align aid to government priorities for development, improve harmonization within the donor community, and enhance collaboration among line ministries. However, with donors now channeling aid mainly through central budgets, the reduced amount of assistance to forestry is

2. further weakening capacity and hindering efforts to decentralize services to districts and communities. Moreover, civil society organizations are concerned that this new approach forces them rely more on government funding, a situation which they believe compromises their objectivity.
3. The support of FAO, the NFP Facility, and other cooperation partners is critical to ensure that country-led processes are in place to assess and prioritize development needs. They also play a vital role in strengthening national and local capacities to deliver an agenda that is pro-poor and fosters economic growth.
4. Participants noted that the FAO study provided governments with valuable suggestions on how to better integrate forestry into national development plans and objectives. The next challenge is for countries to secure the financial and human resources to implement these proposals, starting with the action plans they developed during the workshop.
5. Both the study and the workshop increased understanding of the urgent need to raise the presence and influence of forestry in decision-making processes across government so that the sector's contributions to economic growth and poverty reduction are recognized and appreciated.
6. Countries are motivated to continue their efforts to integrate forestry into PRSs and in other sectors. They would welcome further opportunity to share experiences in this regard, noting that lessons could be learned from ministries which are working to mainstream other cross-cutting issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS. However, they need technical assistance from FAO and others for this task, including help to develop action plans, build strategic partnerships, mobilize resources, and improve knowledge management.
7. Wide dissemination of the study's findings and conclusions would inform countries which did not participate in the initiative of the issues and proposed solutions. If they experience similar problems in strengthening the linkages between national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies, they could consider tailoring some of the proposed options to their particular circumstances.

Appendix 1 Concept note

Rationale and background

Due to their cross-sectoral and participatory nature, national forest programmes (NFPs) have considerable potential to improve knowledge and analysis of forestry-poverty linkages and to move information through government systems so that it is readily available for policy formulation and implementation. Given that macro-planners are often unaware of the extent to which forests and trees outside forests contribute to national economic development and poverty alleviation, national forest programmes can be instrumental in addressing the marginalization and under-funding of the sector by building linkages to wider national development agendas.

Jointly with the National Forest Programme Facility (the Facility), a multi-donor trust fund to enhance stakeholder participation in NFPs, FAO provides support to countries in developing and implementing NFPs that effectively address local needs and national priorities. Through capacity building and knowledge sharing, FAO and the Facility are assisting countries to integrate sustainable forest management into poverty reduction strategies and other broad processes linked to other sectors.

Between November 2005 and July 2007, FAO conducted a study in ten countries in Africa² to determine the extent to which NFPs are linked to national strategies to reduce poverty. In many countries, the study coincided with workshops that the Facility organized to increase understanding of NFPs so that preliminary outcomes could be presented for discussion and validation. A detailed report of key findings and suggested action for closer collaboration among sectors was submitted to the ministry responsible for forestry, other relevant government authorities, and non-governmental organizations, civil society and international partners that are involved in efforts to reduce poverty.

The study revealed that countries are experiencing problems in establishing closer linkages between the two processes although some are implementing innovative approaches to enhance collaboration. Without exception however, weak capacity is a serious constraint which all participating countries face, albeit to varying degrees.

Purpose of the workshop

The workshop aims to facilitate the exchange of information and experiences among countries involved in the study, identify the most urgent priorities, propose action plans tailored to each country's needs, and suggest ways in which the FAO and the Facility can support the better integration of national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies. The meeting will also serve to validate the draft synthesis report of the study's main findings and conclusions.

Expected outcomes

- increased knowledge of the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders involved in the fight against poverty
- a better understanding of ways to strengthen collaboration to reduce poverty through forestry-based interventions
- examples of best practices for broader application, as appropriate

² Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia

- a list of common issues and suggested ways to address them
- follow-up activities which could be supported through the partnership with the Facility
- validation of the findings and conclusions contained in the synthesis report

Participants

Three participants from key government ministries in each of the ten countries will be invited to attend the workshop. Representation will vary according to the structure and division of mandates within each government, drawing from the ministry responsible for forests, the ministry of agriculture, wildlife authorities, the ministry of finance, the ministry of planning and economic development, the national bureau of statistics, and authorities charged with overseeing the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of poverty reduction strategies. Key international development partners who are actively engaged in forestry and/or poverty issues will also be invited.

Methodology

Prior to the workshop, the participants from each country will jointly prepare a paper of no more than 2 pages which outlines the main issues with regard to establishing closer linkages between national forest programme processes and poverty reduction strategies. The paper should also describe approaches which strengthened collaboration, noting the factors which contributed to their success.

A trained facilitator will guide deliberations to foster a fruitful exchange of information in which key concerns are raised and opportunities to overcome them are proposed. Sessions will consist of presentations in plenary followed by discussion. Working groups will identify common problems and suggest actions which the relevant ministries/departments could take to address them, noting those which the Facility may support through partnership agreements. Simultaneous interpretation in English and French will be available in plenary and in one working group.

As host of the workshop, the Kenya Forest Service, which was launched in July 2007, will make a presentation in plenary on reforms in the sector. In addition to providing an overview of the main findings of the study on the linkages between national forest programmes and strategies to reduce poverty, a description of the Poverty-Forests Linkages Toolkit that the Program on Forests of the World Bank is testing will possibly be presented (to be confirmed).

Host: Kenya Forest Service

Venue: Safari Park Hotel, Nairobi

Duration: 2.5 days

Date: 20-22 November 2007

Appendix 2 Programme of work

Tuesday, 20 November

08:00 – 09:00	Registration of participants
09:00 – 10:00	Opening ceremony <ul style="list-style-type: none">• welcome by the Deputy PS MENR – M’Mella• remarks by the Assistant FAO Representative – Abate• keynote address on forestry reforms in Kenya – Mbugua
10:00 – 10:30	Refreshment break + group photo
10:30 – 11:00	Review of workshop objectives and expected outcomes
11:00 – 11:30	Forestry and poverty reduction: study findings – McConnell
11:30 – 12:30	Country presentations on main issues – maximum 5 minutes
12:30 – 13:30	Lunch break
13:30 – 14:00	Presentation: Forestry-Poverty Linkages Toolkit – Kazoora
14:00 – 15:30	Discussion in working groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">• establishing closer linkages with central agencies• increasing collaboration across sectors
15:30 – 16:00	Refreshment break
16:00 – 17:00	Summary of working group discussions in plenary
18:00 – 20:00	Welcoming reception

Wednesday, 21 November

08:30 – 09:00	Recapitulation of key points from day 1
09:00 – 09:30	Presentation: natural resources accounting – Barrow
09:30 – 10:00	Presentation: revised UN System of National Accounts – Chikoti
10:00 – 10:30	Plenary discussion on valuating forest products and services as well as those currently under-valued in other sectors
10:30 – 11:00	Refreshment break
11:00 – 12:30	Discussion in working groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">• calculating forestry’s full contribution to GDP: the benefits, trade-offs, and impacts across sectors
12:30 – 13:00	Summary of working group discussion in plenary
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch break
14:00 – 14:30	Presentation: poverty reduction strategies for joint action – Cheche
14:30 – 16:00	Discussion in working groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">• extent to which sectors benefit from inclusion in PRS• ways to increase presence and influence of forestry and other key sectors in central decision-making processes
16:00 – 16:30	Refreshment break
16:30 – 17:30	Summary of working group discussions in plenary

Thursday, 22 November

08:30 – 09:00	Recapitulation of key points from day 2
09:00 – 09:30	Presentation on the National Forest Programme Facility
09:30 – 10:30	Discussion in working groups <i>by country</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• priorities for follow-up• next steps, including need for support
10:30 – 11:00	Refreshment break
11:00 – 12:30	Country summaries to plenary (max 10 minutes each)
12:30 – 13:15	Wrap up and closing

Appendix 3 Discussion paper

Introduction

Given that national forest programmes (NFPs) are cross-sectoral and participatory in nature, they are ideal mechanisms for gathering and sharing information from a wide range of sources on country issues, priorities and initiatives both within and outside forestry. As such, they can be instrumental in addressing the marginalization and underfunding of the sector by building linkages to wider national agendas, including poverty reduction strategies (PRSs).

Thus far, little analysis has been done on why the forest sector is often overlooked in national strategies to reduce poverty. A recent literature review of PRSs in 16 forest-rich countries³, found reference to a NFP in only one country (Uganda) although other PRSs did mention planning in the sector. Moreover, only 5 of 17 participatory poverty assessments that were prepared to inform PRSs made reference to forest issues. While providing useful insights, such studies have not shed light on how linkages are established between processes, including in other sectors.

Based on these gaps in information, FAO conducted a study in ten countries in Africa⁴ from November 2005 to July 2007, in collaboration with the National Forest Programme Facility. This paper summarizes the factors which promote or hinder the establishment of linkages between NFPs and PRSs. More specifically, it notes that the extent to which forest issues are included in each country's PRS varies considerably, depending on the stability of government and its institutions, the political commitment to implement positive change, and the maturity of the NFP and PRS processes, for example.

The paper also identifies gaps in information on how forestry contributes to poverty reduction and suggests mechanisms to enhance cross-sector coordination and stakeholder participation in forest management. On the one hand, it recommends ways to increase the presence and influence of forestry in wider planning instruments to strengthen financial, institutional and policy support for forest-based poverty interventions. On the other, it suggests that NFPs can be made more relevant by 1) including poverty reduction as a core objective, 2) establishing relevant targets, 3) developing indicators to measure the sector's contributions in this regard, and 4) building monitoring and evaluation systems that are linked to those of the PRS.

Methodology

Prior to travelling to each country, study teams reviewed national forest programmes, poverty reduction strategies and other key documents such as policies, laws, regulations, action plans, evaluation reports, household surveys, and census information to identify the extent to which PRSs and other national development processes include forestry dimensions and are linked. They then supplemented their preliminary findings during meetings with government, the private sector, civil society organizations, and forest-dependent communities. Deliberations focused on the presence and influence of forestry in central planning processes as well as on the challenges and opportunities of establishing closer links.

³ Bird, N. and Dickenson, C. 2004. *Forestry, Bushmeat and Livelihoods: Exploring the Coverage in PRSPs*. ODI, London.

⁴ Kenya, Malawi, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, and Zambia

Where possible, time in country was scheduled to coincide with workshops that the Facility organized on national forest programmes which brought together stakeholders from across the country. The team took advantage of their presence to gather additional information pertinent to the study. These sessions also provided an opportunity to discuss and validate findings as well as consider ways to improve linkages, building on best practices and lessons learned.

Country contexts

In addition to being partners with the Facility, specific countries were invited to participate in the study because they represent a range of circumstances, as Table 1 below illustrates. For example, the percentage of people living below US\$1 per day runs from 2% in Tunisia to 75.8% in Zambia. Forest cover as a percentage of total land area varies from as little as 1% in Niger to as much as 57.1% in Zambia. Population density, as an indicator of pressure on forest resources, goes from a low of 2.5 people per square kilometre in Namibia to a high of 153.5 in Nigeria. Civil strife and the high incidence of HIV/AIDS which plague some of the countries also have a significant bearing on government priorities and budget allocations. The different stages at which countries are introducing forestry reforms make for a varied sample as well, especially since international partners are now basing their assistance on evidence of real change. Because of these wide variations, it is possible for countries not involved in the study to apply or tailor the findings to their particular situation, as appropriate.

Table 1 Population, poverty levels and forest area

<i>Country</i>	<i>Population 2004 (1 000)</i>	<i>Population 2004 (per km²)</i>	<i>% living below US\$1/day 1990- 2004</i>	<i>% living below US\$2/day 1990- 2004</i>	<i>Forest area 2005 (1 000 ha)</i>	<i>Forest area 2005 (% land)</i>
Kenya	32 447	57.0	22.8	58.3	3 522	6.2
Malawi	11 182	118.9	41.7	76.1	3 402	36.2
Namibia	2 033	2.5	34.9	55.8	7 661	9.3
Niger	12 095	9.6	60.6	85.8	1 266	1
Nigeria	139 824	153.5	70.8	92.4	11 089	12.2
Sudan	34 356	14.5	N/A	N/A	67 546	28.4
Tanzania	36 571	41.4	57.8	89.9	35 257	39.9
Tunisia	10 012	64.4	2.0	6.6	1 056	6.8
Uganda	25 920	131.5	N/A	N/A	3 627	18.4
Zambia	10 547	14.2	75.8	94.1	42 452	57.1

N/A = not available

Source: FAO State of the World's Forests 2007 and UNDP Human Development Report 2006

While the countries in the sample reflect important differences, including where forestry is placed within government hierarchies (Table 2), they also display striking similarities: heavy reliance on biomass to meet energy needs; the dominance of agriculture in all but one national economy (Nigeria); government ownership of forest resources; weak capacity for forest management at all levels; severe restrictions in public service hiring and training; fragmented governance of the sector among several ministries and departments; and the huge number of unrecorded and uncoordinated transactions in informal markets.

Table 2 Forestry's place in government hierarchies

<i>Location within Government</i>	
Kenya	Kenya Forest Service*/links to Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Malawi	Ministry of Energy and Mining
Namibia	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Niger	Min. de l'Hydraulique, de l'Environnement et de la Lutte Contre la Désertification
Nigeria	Federal Ministry of Environment
Sudan	Forests National Corporation* and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (GOSS)
Tanzania	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Tunisia	Ministère de l'Agriculture et des Ressources hydrauliques
Uganda	National Forestry Authority* and Ministry of Water and Environment
Zambia	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources

* Autonomous or semi-autonomous entities

Forestry in poverty reduction strategies

Poverty reduction strategies generally recognize that trees, woodlands and forests are essential to meeting basic needs for wood, fuel, medicine, fruits and other food. They also note, in addition to generating employment and contributing to economic growth, their importance in providing fodder for livestock, regulating climate as well as water supply, and offering other ecological services: wildlife habitat, biological diversity, soil conservation, and carbon sequestration, for example. Some strategies outline the challenges the sector faces, its potential to reduce poverty, and external factors such as land ownership, energy consumption, decentralization and urbanization which have a bearing on how forest resources are managed.

Most documents make clear the fact that livelihoods and economic growth depend on a healthy environment and the sustainable management of natural resources. Poverty reduction strategies, therefore, call for the integration of environmental concerns into development activities – an approach that provides a key entry point to influence decisions on issues affecting forestry that originate outside the sector. In fact the study found that when the environment was singled out as a priority, forestry was given greater prominence in part because of the harmful impact that unsustainable exploitation can have.

Along similar lines, PRSs pay more attention to forestry when unsustainable practices threaten the productivity of other sectors, especially agriculture, which is considered a core component of economic recovery and job creation, along with tourism, trade and industry. With specific regard to agriculture, countries expect it to be the engine for growth in the foreseeable future.

Some strategies stress the importance of private sector investment but are silent on the role business should play in development and, as importantly, on the current and potential contributions of forestry to national growth. They recognize that weak and uncoordinated management of natural resources is a major constraint which is exacerbated by population

growth, environmental degradation, and encroachment. Key objectives for forestry are halting deforestation, increasing forest cover, improving productivity and value addition, involving communities in management, strengthening enforcement, and introducing incentives for private sector participation.

In a few instances, poverty reduction strategies deal with forestry as a sub-sector of rural development and focus on improving food security through the integrated management of natural resources, combating desertification and protecting the environment. Priorities for action include establishing protected areas, rehabilitating degraded land, putting information systems in place, replanting for multiple uses and agroforestry. However, the contributions of the sector to rural economies and household incomes are not well recognized despite their significant importance.

In one case (Nigeria), reference to forestry is all but absent in the PRS although the document does note that 90% of the rural population depend on forests for livelihood and domestic energy and that poor people need to be protected against deforestation and other risks to the environment. At the other end of the spectrum, Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan specifically lists priorities for enhancing the implementation of its National Forest Plan and, after persistent lobbying, considers forestry an "urgent short-term priority" for funding. By the same token, goals related to forestry in terms of its potential to alleviate poverty are found throughout Tanzania's MKUKUTA.

As macro policy processes, poverty reduction strategies are helping to strengthen the case for forestry interventions in other sectors – agriculture, energy and water, among others. They are sharpening the focus on cross-cutting issues which affect livelihoods such as the environment, gender, and HIV/AIDS, providing entry points and incentives to increase collaboration across sectors. However, monitoring and reporting progress on strategy implementation continue to be structured and measured along sector lines.

Poverty in national forestry institutional frameworks

National forest policies and legislation provide the institutional framework for developing and implementing national forest programmes but until lately, poverty was not considered to any great extent because it was difficult to measure, its complex dimensions were not well understood, there was no agreed definition, and data was not available. However, it appears as though the more that forest policies, legislation and programmes are recent, the more likely they are to address poverty.

In some countries, national forest programmes were elaborated only after authorities commissioned several studies and analyzed significant amounts of data that shed light on the linkages between forestry and poverty reduction. Information thus obtained includes a better estimate of the number of jobs, mostly in the informal sector; the income that poor households receive from the sale of non-wood forest products and their reliance on this revenue to fill gaps from other sources such as labour and farm produce; the vast amounts of firewood and charcoal consumed each year; and the extent to which poor people rely on free forest goods for shelter, food and medicines. Using these findings has helped to raise awareness among policy-makers as well as the public of the importance of forestry to the wider economy.

In almost all countries involved in the study, forest policies and legislation include poverty reduction as an objective which is then incorporated into the national forest programmes. It is therefore not unusual for NFPs to accord priority to subsistence issues, noting that non-wood

forest products are often the only source of nutrition for rural communities when food is scarce. Most also acknowledge that forestry provides significant employment and income opportunities outside urban areas. The programmes also highlight the challenges of achieving sustainable forest management in light of population growth and poverty which give rise to illegal logging, illegal charcoal production, and encroachment for agriculture and settlement.

A few NFPs are explicit about the need to collaborate across sectors, harmonize policies and instruments, and mainstream gender and HIV/AIDS concerns. Kenya's latest draft forest policy undertakes to enhance opportunities for women and youth in forest training, education, and forest management. Some frameworks provide the basis for communities to conserve and sustainably use forest resources, including trees on farms, to support their livelihoods and achieve the government's commitment to reduce poverty. Still others call for sharing the benefits and responsibilities of forest management more equitably, reducing human conflicts over grazing rights and wildlife encroachment, and increasing private sector involvement in the development of forest industry and trade.

One country's nfo (Malawi) highlights the link between forest degradation and poverty, notes that women and children suffer the most from fuelwood shortages, and confirms a chronic imbalance in the supply and demand of forest products. Yet another (Tunisia) places people at the centre of decision-making on matters related to the natural environment where they reside. In this regard, it is the only country in the sample that established a division within the forestry directorate to focus exclusively on the socio-economic development of people living in or near forests – a concrete measure which attests to the government's commitment to improve their livelihoods and sources of income.

Nigeria's NFP considers agriculture, health, energy and rural development as key sectors but falls short of identifying ways to address cross-cutting issues such as the effect of high petroleum prices on fuelwood consumption. The document attributes the root causes of deforestation to poverty and overpopulation and its guiding principles are based on the multi-functional role of forests and on community participation in the management of resources. However, it only makes scant reference to the country's poverty reduction strategy and is silent on how forestry can contribute to the wider government agenda, including initiatives related to the Millennium Development Goals.

Coordination mechanisms

Poverty reduction strategies

Responsibility for the coordination of processes related to national poverty reduction strategies and the alignment with budget exercises varies only slightly among countries in the study sample. Tasks associated with PRS formulation, implementation and reporting are mainly housed in either the ministry of finance, economic planning and development, or in planning commissions which report to the head of state. In one case, the office of the Vice-President has the lead while, in another, a national steering committee of Parliamentary Secretaries, chaired by Cabinet, is in charge.

In some countries, however, there is no central coordinating mechanism for sectors and stakeholders to exchange information and collaborate on poverty issues. Moreover, forestry officials are often absent when policies and strategies which affect the sector are developed and implemented by other jurisdictions. National advisory groups which are established to facilitate collaboration, although multi-disciplinary, largely focus on sector specific issues. Due to limited financial support, such groups experience difficulty in meeting on a regular

basis and links with sub-national and district processes are often weak.

Overlapping and conflicting mandates also make collaboration across sectors a challenge in almost all countries. In Zambia for example, 11 government ministries and 33 pieces of legislation touch on matters pertaining to the environment. In addition, more than 30 public and private institutions are involved in natural resources management.

National forest programmes

Various mechanisms are used to bring stakeholders together to formulate NFPs and forestry reforms: dedicated units, steering committees, advisory groups, and task forces which carry out extensive consultations. When members are drawn from key ministries, the private sector and civil society at fairly senior levels, they have shown to be instrumental in integrating forestry into poverty reduction strategies. If they represent diverse interests, they widen participation in the formulation of NFPs beyond forestry circles. However, not all national approaches take into account the extent to which efforts require coordination and collaboration. The absence of a national forum to incorporate forestry into development priorities is a serious obstacle in many countries.

Moreover, frequent changes to Cabinet disrupt programmes and seriously hinder efforts to develop forestry interventions to reduce poverty. In Malawi for example, the forestry department was subject to government re-organization seven times since 1985, the most recent occurring in May 2007. In Namibia, forestry's shift to a new ministry in 2005 prevented the Directorate from enforcing parts of the legislation because some is specific to the mandate it had under its former ministry. Despite these flawed institutional arrangements, forestry officials do participate in multi-sectoral committees which bring together politicians and technical experts on a range of issues.

Where states have jurisdiction over forest management, NFP processes can serve as a template for reform at lower levels of government. The sheer size of countries such as Nigeria and Sudan, however, severely constrains participation and coordination not only in forestry but in other sectors. The Forests National Corporation in Sudan, for example, is the focal point for forestry matters. A number of councils provide support but all have responsibility for integrating and coordinating national activities related to renewable natural resources and for ensuring that state plans are consistent with federal land use policies. As each council carries out these functions, considerable confusion exists over federal-state coordination.

Improving linkages: constraints and opportunities

Lack of data on forest resources and their range of contributions

Inadequate resources, lack of equipment and low staff capacity have prevented many countries from conducting national forest inventories on a regular basis. Without up-to-date information on forest utilization and growing stock, the sustainable management of these resources becomes all but impossible. As importantly, a lack of quantitative facts makes it difficult to argue the importance of forestry to poverty alleviation and, by the same token, to influence budget allocations. Often, the figures that are available are those reported only by forestry offices and do not take into account the high number of transactions in informal markets. Moreover, forestry data is scattered across different ministries and reporting systems are not in a format that enables national statistics offices to use the information.

Under the United Nations System of National Accounts which dates back to 1993, the contributions of forestry to gross domestic product (GDP) are subsumed under agriculture, a practice that significantly underestimates the sector's importance to economic development,

including its potential to reduce poverty. However, some figures gathered using other means suggest that if the direct and indirect benefits to society of forest goods and services were calculated, they would pay for the administration and management of a country's forests.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa is working with the United Nations Statistics Division to revise the System of National Accounts. Statisticians are participating in this exercise but, for the most part, line ministries are not involved. In Malawi for example, the National Statistics Office is conducting a National Agriculture Census and Livestock which will become the most reliable source of statistics on the sector. Results are expected to bring about significant changes – quite possibly changing agriculture's contributions to GDP – yet forestry is not at the table. If forestry authorities engaged in this review, they could seek improvements to the system which would better estimate the sector's share of GDP. Working more closely with those responsible for collecting and analyzing national data would also increase the chances of capturing more pertinent data in economic and household surveys, and of setting up satellite accounts for forestry, as did tourism in many African countries.

The establishment of a national forest accounting system would provide a description of the resource base and the means to track resource flows, i.e., the total value of forests and the optimal potential of the resource. Although the benefits of mounting such a system would take up to 20 years to materialize, the precise contribution of forest products and services could be calculated, including their role in reducing poverty.

Although recent studies are helping to quantify the value of forest services and are suggesting ways to analyze their full contribution to GDP, more research is needed on the value of environmental services – water quality and supply, soil retention and fertility, carbon storage, and conservation of biodiversity, for example. More research is also needed on the cost of unsustainable forest management such as that conducted in Nigeria where deforestation and losses of non-wood forest products in the past 5 decades were estimated to be US\$ 0.8 billion per annum or 1.7% of GDP in 2003. The study advances that if the population which now depends on fuelwood for cooking was forced to switch to kerosene, the annual cost would be US\$ 4.8 to 7.3 billion. This amount, in addition to timber and non-wood forest products values forgone, is equivalent to 6-9.3% of current GDP (about US\$ 78 billion in 2005).

Monitoring and evaluation systems across government

Capacity to monitor and evaluate national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies is weak in almost all governments that participated in the study, often limited to tracking implementation of specific projects.

A sound forestry monitoring and evaluation system is one of the best means to overcome statistical deficiencies and the time has come to move beyond reports produced solely by and for foresters to those which consider the wider needs of society. A system which not only supports the accounting aspects of forestry but also fills important gaps in data to improve national sector planning will help to secure wider government buy-in, especially if it sheds light on how it helps to achieve the objectives of NFPs and Millennium Development Goals.

Where M&E frameworks exist for NFPs, they are not always consistent with those used to assess PRSs. Moreover, the absence of baseline data on which to set targets and measure progress limits their potential to examine if goals are met, identify obstacles which hinder implementation, and shape the future direction of forestry policies and programmes. A well-designed system takes into account not only the targets contained in poverty reduction

strategies but also captures relevant activities at the household level – for example, walking distances to collect fuelwood and the percentage of households involved in forest-based enterprises; that adopt irreversible coping mechanism during food shortages; and those that adopt agro-forestry technologies.

The Natural Resources Management Project which the World Bank is financing in Kenya can provide a useful model with regard to a participatory M&E approach at the local level – for example, the use of community score cards, social audits, participatory budgeting and expenditure reviews, and participatory poverty assessments.

With regard to monitoring and evaluating poverty reduction strategies, most governments developed indicators using information from national statistics offices and planning units in line ministries which, on occasion, seek input from district and local levels. One country (Tanzania) draws on 4 sources of information to track the extent to which poor people derive benefits from government policies and programmes designed to alleviate poverty: routine administrative data from federal ministries and local administrations; national surveys carried out at regular intervals; research on specific themes; and participatory poverty assessments that capture the views of poor people.

In most instances, however, few PRS indicators are related to the environment and even fewer are specific to forestry – mainly because forestry officials are not widely engaged in their development. When they miss the opportunity to take part in meetings which central agencies convene, they must wait a full cycle (often 5 years) to incorporate forestry in subsequent strategies to achieve economic growth and prosperity. The sector's absence in regional poverty profiles is another cause for concern because these profiles inform district development plans which, in turn, feed into the national agenda.

Awareness of the importance of forestry to national development and poverty reduction

Because decision makers and the general public have limited access to forestry information, they do not understand the economic, environmental, social and cultural value of forests and trees or appreciate the sector's contributions to poverty reduction. Some countries have made serious efforts to improve understanding and awareness of forestry issues by convening regular stakeholder meetings; translating research into user-friendly material; making documents available in local languages; and waging campaigns in the media to explain forest policy, legislation and regulations.

Elections offer excellent opportunities to secure the support of political candidates to address key forest issues, including governance, tenure and access rights, as part of their campaign promises. Immediately following elections is also an excellent time for forestry authorities, in collaboration with civil society, to brief members of Parliament and Cabinet Ministers to increase the visibility of forestry and identify champions who are prepared to demonstrate their commitment to the sector.

For some time, the Forests National Corporation in North Sudan has been informing the public of the multiple roles and importance of forestry, including for food security. Officials make presentations to a variety of audiences and use the media to draw attention to the negative impacts of drought, desertification, displacement, environmental degradation and unemployment. By their own assessment, these outreach activities have reinforced a positive image of foresters.

Based on the results of an awareness survey on forestry issues, Uganda developed a strategy to inform the public of the linkages with poverty reduction. Slogans such as “forests to fight poverty” on calendars, newsletters, school newspapers, and bumper stickers were all part of the effort. The NFP also effectively linked up with the publicity campaign that was mounted under the Participatory Poverty Assessment Programme.

Role of civil society

Civil society groups are ideally placed to call on authorities to explain why, in some cases, policies, legislation and guidelines on the environment and natural resources are not being fully implemented. They can be especially effective in swaying public opinion and achieving results if they use research findings to highlight the causes and impacts of deforestation, soil erosion and loss of fertility, land degradation, poaching and encroachment. If governments and international partners strengthened their support, these groups could provide a sound analysis of data collected at the grassroots to enlighten policy formulation and implementation and could be more active in promoting forestry interventions to reduce poverty.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are increasingly engaging in forestry matters, including advocacy work around the charcoal trade, small enterprise development, livelihoods and illegal activities. They are also drawing attention to the need for the greater participation of women and communities in forest management and can be instrumental in ensuring that poverty eradication and good governance remain core government objectives. In Uganda for example, various task forces highlighted the need to address the marginalization of poor people and to overcome difficulties associated with their access to forest resources and their lack of negotiating power. They also provided critical inputs into the business plan of the National Forestry Authority and relevant legislation to ensure that reforms focused on poverty issues. In another country (Tanzania), government commissioned a group of NGOs to analyze its poverty reduction strategy, assess training needs of civil society organizations, and prepare and deliver a training package to them on poverty-environment linkages.

Although the voice of civil society is weak in many countries, much potential exists for it to drive sector reforms and support sustainable forest management if given sufficient financial and human resources. Stakeholders also need a forum to exchange information and strengthen collaboration, including on ways to integrate forestry more broadly into national development policies and priorities. As well, they require assistance to harmonize their data collection and reporting systems with those of government to avoid overlap, duplication and incompatibility. NGOs would better capture the support of cooperation partners if they package their requests in terms of activities which address governance and human rights issues as well as those which are geared to establishing baseline data for future monitoring.

Partnerships with the international community

International cooperation partners are moving away from project support to joint assistance strategies which focus on capacity building and general budget support. This shift aligns aid to government priorities for development, is expected to improve harmonization within the donor community, and should enhance collaboration among line ministries. In Kenya for example, a group of 15 partners are providing technical and financial assistance to support forestry reforms and make the sector more responsive to social, economic and environmental issues. Activities over the next 5 years include:

- increasing transparency, accountability and integrity of Kenya’s forestry administration by improving the information base on forest resources and preparing plans for the development and sustainable management of both planted and indigenous forests

- providing institutional support to complete reforms and increase community and private sector involvement in the development and management of forests through a dedicated Investment Centre and transparent systems for concession allocation, asset valuation and marketing
- helping the newly established Kenya Forest Service to work with the private sector to expand forest cover, maintain the ecological services of forests, and build the country's credibility in the global carbon trading market.

When donors in Uganda directed their support away from forestry to central agencies, the government all but halted the decentralization of services to districts, making it more difficult to include forestry in district development plans and local budget allocations. In other countries, civil society expressed concern that the decrease in project support to forestry means that it now must depend on government funding for its activities – a situation which it contends compromises their objectivity.

If government and other stakeholders highlight the cross-sector nature of forestry in terms of its links to the environment and the management of other natural resources when requesting support from cooperation partners, they could increase their chances for funding. Submissions that respond to the need for urgent action in areas that correspond to donor interests would also likely be more successful – the development of indicators to assess the full contributions of forestry to poverty reduction and the collection of baseline data, including in the huge informal sector, to allow comparisons for future monitoring of progress, for example.

Conclusions

National forest programmes would be more relevant as instruments for achieving national poverty reduction goals if they are updated to: prioritize activities and areas for investment that are pro-poor; focus on poverty reduction and livelihood improvements as core objectives; promote collaboration among forestry authorities and those leading the PRS process; align forestry more closely with core government reforms; embed forestry questions in routine data collection via such means as household surveys; comprehensively address cross-sectoral policy issues; elaborate approaches to capture emerging markets for environmental services; and develop coherent monitoring and evaluation systems linked to PRS schemes.

By the same token, poverty reduction strategies would be more effective in enhancing livelihoods and in helping to attain national development goals if they acknowledge the critical contributions of forests and trees outside forests to the well-being of the target population and if they accorded higher priority to supporting the sector as an integral part of building a strong and prosperous country. Central agencies which lead PRS processes, including the development of indicators to measure progress in implementation, need to encourage the involvement of forestry officials in discussions. It is equally important for forestry officials to be more present in deliberations on poverty issues to increase political, institutional and financial support for the sector.

Generally, the study reveals that the adoption of poverty reduction as a national goal is sharpening the focus on cross-cutting issues and countries are instituting more comprehensive approaches to planning and resource allocation. Furthermore, efforts to assess and report on poverty are increasingly involving stakeholders. However participatory processes can be time consuming, in addition to costly, and some governments lack the capacity or political will to carry them out.

The analysis of findings also suggests that decision-makers will continue to underestimate the importance of forestry to social and economic development as long as the sector fails to quantify the full extent of its contributions. On the other hand, marketing forestry on the basis of its capacity to meet key objectives of other sectors could broaden understanding of the benefits and open up opportunities for collaboration.

It is also worth noting that the shift in donor funding from sector-specific projects to support of central processes is weakening forestry capacity at all levels and hindering national efforts to decentralize services to districts and communities where interventions have the greatest potential to reduce poverty.

Appendix 4 Opening remarks

Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

The Assistant FAO Representative, Workshop Organizers, Director of the Kenya Forest Service, Workshop participants, Distinguished guests, Ladies and gentlemen,

It gives me great pleasure to be with you this morning to perform the official opening of this workshop on “Improving the linkages between National Forest Programmes and Poverty Reduction Strategies in Africa.

On behalf of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the Government of Kenya, it is my pleasure to welcome all participants from Malawi, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia and Kenya who are gathered here for this important workshop. I am informed that workshop participants represent the ten countries in Africa where the study which was funded by the FAO was carried out. At this juncture, I would like to thank FAO for supporting the study and this regional workshop.

Following the election of a new government in 2003, Kenya launched a 5-year Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation. Progressing well as a country, we have achieved growth of more than 6% last year, and this is likely to increase to 10% per annum in the years to come. The Economic Recovery Strategy comes to an end this year and will be replaced by Vision 2030 which is anchored on three pillars namely economic – to achieve a sustained gross domestic product (GDP) growth of 10% over the next 25 years; social – to build a society where justice and equity prevail in a clear and secure environment; and political – to establish a people-centered, results-oriented and accountable democracy.

Ladies and gentlemen, in Kenya, our forests cover some 1.24 million hectares or roughly 1.7% of our land area. Our forests provide utility products (timber, poles, fuel wood and pulp wood); a variety of non-wood products (resin, honey, medicine); are critical for the conservation of biological diversity, water and soil; and are major habitats for wildlife. Of a population of nearly 35 million, more than 10% of Kenyan households living within a radius of five kilometres from forest reserves depend on forests.

Like many countries, Kenya developed its national forest programme in the nineties. The Kenya Forestry Master Plan (KFMP) of 1994 called for an institutional overhaul to manage forest resources more effectively and continues to be regarded as an authoritative blueprint for developing the forest sector. Issues identified in the plan are still pertinent today and are reflected in our new legislation, the Forests Act (2005) which commenced in February 2007 and our draft Forest Policy.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have come to Kenya during the peak of our forestry reform process. Earlier this year, the Government established the Kenya Forest Service to replace the Forest Department. We expect that the Kenya Forest Service will act as a vehicle to address inefficient resource utilization and the adverse effects of development on the environment through a range of partnerships arrangements. Public expectations of the new Service are very high.

Kenya has made substantial progress in implementing our medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF) but continues to experience difficulties in securing adequate financial resources from Treasury. Kenya also suffers from deficient national accounting systems in terms of capturing the full valuation of forest goods and services when calculating our GDP. Because green accounting captures more fully the importance of forestry to the economy and to poverty reduction, I call upon foresters to work more closely with the Ministry of National Planning and Development to use new accounting methodologies that measure both the qualitative and quantitative contributions of forestry to poverty reduction.

With our Vision 2030 coming to fruition shortly, we are of the view that good coordination between our national planning efforts and the forests performance is essential. We are improving our process of integrated planning at all levels. Stakeholder engagement across sectors is fundamental if we want all citizens to own the reforms set out by the Government and other partners in forestry.

Recognizing the need to integrate environmental considerations into development, the Government of Kenya formulated the “Poverty and Environment Initiative” which has acted as a key entry point for forestry to engage with finance and planning ministries to secure resources. The initiative also provides an opportunity to collaborate with line ministries responsible for policies and programmes that have poverty-environment linkages. The initiative will help us ensure adequate monitoring and evaluation systems are in place to measure impacts of our efforts, in forestry and beyond.

Historically, forestry in Kenya has been poorly represented and the image of the sector is low. We are realizing more and more that foresters must tell their story better. As a rural-based activity the scope to improve livelihoods in the poorest areas of our country remains enormous. Therefore, robust communications and better marketing of evidence to suggest the linkages must be the mainstay of the new Kenya Forest Service and our partners, and for that matter all forestry services across Africa. Members of parliament must also be informed about the sector’s contributions to national development.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am informed that the ten-country FAO study has revealed that forest resource managers will have to be more innovative and develop appropriate management strategies that will unlock the untapped livelihood opportunities in our forest estates to realize their full economic potential for the benefit of our respective citizens without compromising on the environmental values. The majority of us in the room today, representing governments across all parts of Africa, must increase the potential of the private sector to invest in business ventures and job creation by reviewing relevant legislation and strengthening institutional capacity to address issues affecting the forestry sector in the fields of environment, labour, trade, property rights and taxation.

I am further informed that the issues, challenges and opportunities discussed above are not endemic to Kenya and that the FAO study has revealed many similarities across the region. As government representatives we are here to exchange our experiences and plan for the future. The workshop aims to facilitate the exchange of information and experiences among countries involved in the study, identify the most urgent priorities, propose action plans tailored to each country’s needs, and suggest ways in which the FAO and the National Forest Programme Facility can support the better integration of national forest programmes and poverty reduction strategies.

I wish to call upon all countries represented here today to give maximum support to forestry so that one day our sector becomes a prominent feature in national planning and development. I would like to thank all those who have been active in African forestry in the past and those who have been contributing to the change processes we now all face.

With those remarks, it is now my honour and pleasure to declare this historic regional workshop on forestry and poverty alleviation officially open and to wish you fruitful deliberations.

Thank you and May God bless you.

Assistant Representative, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Honorable Secretary, Mr. Mbugua, ladies and gentlemen, good morning.

On behalf of FAO, it is my pleasure to be here with you this morning to acknowledge the importance of this workshop and of our collective efforts to seek practical and lasting solutions to poverty in Africa. FAO is grateful to the Kenya Forest Service for hosting the event and to our co-collaborator, the National Forest Programme Facility.

The study that FAO undertook between November 2005 and July 2007, of which you were all a part, has made many interesting observations. However, without wishing to pre-empt the presentation of the main findings which will be made in a short while, my view after reading the background paper for this workshop is that there are few surprises. We already know that the contributions of forestry to economic development and poverty reduction are not well recognized and are significantly under estimated. We also know that agriculture, fisheries and wildlife sectors complain of the same problem. Yet we, as decision-makers, are not doing much about it. Why is that? What is preventing us from turning this situation around?

Over the next few days, the challenge will be to tackle these and other issues head on. To do this, we need to be realistic in our search for answers yet, at the same time, we have to start thinking outside the box. I believe we have a good mix of disciplines in this room to enable us to do exactly that. In fact, the workshop is rather unique in this regard, with representation from forestry, finance, economic planning, statistics, social policy and analysis, agriculture, rural development, environment and natural resources.

Together, you can do much to improve the livelihoods and well-being of citizens in your respective countries, including through forestry-based interventions. However, forestry cannot operate in isolation any more than can agriculture, energy, wildlife, and health – for example. The links are simply too important to ignore. Like the environment, like gender and like HIV and AIDS, sustainable forest management does not fit neatly into one box – but poverty reduction strategies still mostly deal with it that way. How can we develop new approaches to make implementation truly collaborative and cross-sectoral, approaches that will also benefit other sectors which face the same problem?

The countries represented in this room are very different from each other – from forest cover to levels of poverty. You are also at various stages in terms of reforming the institutional framework under which forestry operates. Some legislation dates as far back as 1973 – more than 30 years ago – and some is as recent as 2005. These differences and others mean that solutions need to be flexible to fit a range of contexts. Having said that, however, I note that

your countries also share a number of similarities, including heavy reliance on biomass for energy in rural areas especially, government ownership of forest resources, and weak capacity for forest management at all levels.

In the coming days, you will have an opportunity to discuss these and other issues, exchange information and share experiences. As importantly, you will identify country priorities for further reducing poverty through forestry-based interventions and determine the assistance you require to make this happen. FAO, the National Forest Programme Facility, and other international partners look forward to learning the results of this workshop.

I wish you well in your deliberations over the next few days and hope that the outcomes can be used as a solid basis for future action. Thank you.

Appendix 5 Keynote address: forestry reforms in Kenya

As host of the workshop, Mr. David Mbugua, Director of Kenya Forest Service delivered the key note address on reforms in the sector. The following is a summary of his power point presentation.

Forest Policy Processes & Instruments

Forestry

- Kenya Forest Masterplan (1994)
- Forest Act (2005)
- Forest Policy (2007, ongoing)
- Environmental Policy (2007, ongoing)

Economic Development

- Economic Recovery and Wealth and Employment Creation (2003)
- Vision 2030 (2007, ongoing)

Forest Sector Institutions

- Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Kenya Forest Service (set up in February 2007 to replace the Forestry Department)
- Consists of: Board, Forest Conservation Committees, Management
- Community Forestry Associations
- Private Sector
- Civil Society

Sector Challenges / Opportunities

- KFS has an expanded mandate to oversee the management of all types of forests.
- Forests and trees are renewable resources which, if managed sustainably, can meet demand for material from wood based industries, wood fuel (80% of domestic energy), non-wood forest products, and ecological services (water, soil, biodiversity and carbon sequestration).
- Logging ban since 1999 has eroded the plantation resource but increased appreciation for farm forestry interventions.
- Poor forest resource/ecosystem valuation and mainstreaming of forestry in national accounting system, have compromised resource allocation, pricing of products and significance of forests in the economy.
- Absence of robust forest/ecosystem management plans has contributed to inadequate realization of ecosystem potential – new KFS structure caters for this.
- Forest resources in arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) contain unique ecosystems which require special support and technology transfer for their sustainable management and commercial production of wood fuel (60% of charcoal), timber and tree fodder.
- Alternative products like bamboo, non-wood forest products, commercial insects and bio-diesel have potential to transform rural and national economies.
- Industrial forest plantations under corporate management have capacity to generate substantial resources to support forest administration, extension, conservation and management.
- Forest industries are associated with obsolete technologies which impacts negatively on utilization of forest resources and prices of forest products.

- Unsustainable charcoal production in semi-arid areas – a multi-billion \$ industry is still unregulated.
- Loss of forest cover and resource degradation particularly in cultivated semi-arid lands.
- Identification and promotion of viable forest based micro-enterprises to drive conservation and management is critical in providing appropriate incentives.
- Stakeholder involvement in the past has undermined natural resource equity and resource mobilization – this is changing with FCCs and CFAs.

KFS Mandate

Through the new KFS Management Board, KFS aims “to contribute to the growth of the natural resource sector by enhancing development, conservation and management of the forest resource base in the country.” This entails ensuring an increasing supply of forest goods and services to meet the basic and industrial needs of present and future generations.

Forest Sector Reforms

- Managing Board engagements – committees, induction, inauguration, field familiarization, corporate governance
- Developing the KFS organizational structure
- Elaborating the KFS Strategic Plan (2007-2012)
- Developing / entering into a performance contract with MENR
- Formulating / securing an adequate 2007/08 budget (\$70 million per annum required, of which only 55% is funded)
- De-linking from parent ministry
- Securing approval from Treasury to retain revenue
- Gazetting subsidiary legislation – 19 rules
- Forming 8 Forest Conservancy Committees (decentralized KFS Boards)
- Reconfiguring 71 districts into 54
- Rationalizing and allocating resources to divisions within the new boundaries
- Building up and engaging with Community Forestry Associations
- Lifting the logging ban
- Administering timber sales in a transparent and competitive manner
- Instituting the Plantation Establishment for Livelihood Improvement Scheme (Shamba System re-branded)
- Collecting unpaid debts – approx Ksh 600 million
- Building-up the information base – inventory and resource assessment, plantations
- Developing strategic forest management plans (12 under development)
- Formulating an Eco-Tourism Master Plan
- Securing carbon projects
- Re-branding forestry as an attractive investment option
- Enhancing enforcement and compliance functions
- Setting-up the Forest Conservation and Management Fund
- Strengthening Kenya Forestry College
- Formulating charcoal development programme
- Instilling an enterprise-focused culture
- Getting the sawmills back in business
- Up-grading infrastructure – all aspects

- Developing Forest Department Staff Exit Strategy – counseling and retraining
- Elaborating human resource policies – operations manual, staff establishment, grading structures, career guidelines
- Undertaking senior to middle management recruitment competitively
- Developing new revenue collection systems
- Developing capacity for financial management
- Installing robust procurement arrangements
- Setting-up a system to manage assets
- Up-grading the state corporation profile
- Mainstreaming forestry in Vision 2030 / ERS / Environmental Policy
- Aligning external support from partners - \$75+ million over 5 years

Success will come in the revitalized forestry sector if KFS....

- Practices good corporate governance
- Installs an energetic management team
- Establishes the right systems
- Builds a recognized brand
- Captures the new financial opportunities
- Deepens business skills and joint ventures
- Keeps the organization lean
- Balances the books

Appendix 6 Presentations

Presentation 1: Main Findings of the Study

Rosalie McConnell, FAO Forestry Officer, Forest Policy Service

Overview

Firstly, the study recommends ways to increase the presence and influence of forestry in wider planning instruments to strengthen financial, institutional and policy support for forest-based poverty interventions. Secondly, findings suggest that NFPs can be made more relevant by

- (i) including poverty reduction as a core objective,
- (ii) establishing relevant targets,
- (iii) developing indicators to measure the sector's contributions in this regard, and
- (iv) building monitoring and evaluation systems that are linked to those of the PRS

The overview describes the extent to which forestry is included in PRSs, how poverty issues are addressed in NFPs, funding issues related to the two processes, constraints and opportunities for establishing better linkages, and main conclusions.

Purpose

- By way of background, FAO embarked on the study to
 - raise awareness of the contributions of forestry to poverty reduction
 - find out why links between NFP and PRS processes are weak
 - propose ways to strengthen collaboration
 - secure more financial and institutional support for the sector
 - reduce poverty by implementing the study's proposals for action.

Outcomes

The study looked at

- the factors that promote or hinder linkages
- best practices and lessons learned from linkages that other sectors have forged with PRSs and how they might apply to forestry
- gaps in information on the extent to which forestry contributes to economic development and poverty reduction
- areas where capacity needs strengthening
- mechanisms to enhance cross-sector coordination and stakeholder participation

Countries

- The 10 countries which participated in the study represent a range of contexts and circumstances in terms of population, poverty levels and forest area.
- For example, the percentage of people living below US\$1 per day goes from a low of 2% in Tunisia to a high of 75.8% in Zambia.
- Forest area as a percentage of total land area varies from 1% in Niger to 57.1% in Zambia.
- Population density, as an indicator of pressure on forests, goes from 2.5 people per square kilometer in Namibia to 153.5 in Nigeria.

Forestry in poverty strategies

The extent to which forestry objectives and targets are included in national strategies to reduce poverty varies considerably, depending on:

- Political context
 - stability of government and its institutions
 - political commitment to implement positive change
- Maturity of PRS processes
 - 2nd generation PRSs are more likely to highlight forestry's contributions to the economy, the problems the sector faces, its potential to alleviate poverty, and external influences on forest management
- Environmental mainstreaming
 - the more that forest authorities engage in efforts to integrate environmental concerns into poverty reduction strategies, the more attention are given to forestry priorities, objectives, targets and action plans
- Long-term horizon
 - forestry is generally seen as a long-term and high-risk investment compared to other productive sectors such as agriculture and, given that political mandates are relatively short, the sector wields little bargaining power
- Extent of collaboration across sectors
 - although PRSs state otherwise, most still deal with issues on a sector basis – an approach that makes it difficult to take into account the social, cultural, economic and environmental dimensions of forestry across the board. In other words, forestry doesn't fit neatly into one box

Poverty in national forest programmes

- Most NFPs note the need to be coherent with broader frameworks including PRS processes but don't make poverty reduction a specific goal. Generally, NFPs note the multiple roles of forests; promote participation; and show how the sector can create jobs, generate income and contribute to foreign exchange earnings.
- Reference to poverty was sometimes made in the context of:
 - Livelihoods – where forests goods and services were considered important more for subsistence than for wealth creation
 - Deforestation – where the causes of deforestation were attributed to poverty and population growth
 - Narrow sector focus – although many of the NFPs consider agriculture, energy, and rural development as key sectors, few address cross-cutting issues
 - Economic versus social needs – most NFPs have yet to deliver a strategy in which social issues are as important as productive issues or where the tradeoffs that must be made to reduce poverty are assessed

Funding issues

- Neither NFPs nor PRSs prioritize activities or estimate costs of implementation, making it difficult to develop realistic action plans and budgets.
- Thus, wide disparities can occur between allocations and disbursements so that non-PRS activities get funded at the expense of those in PRSs.
- The study could find no evidence to suggest that the forest sector benefited financially from its inclusion in PRSs (i.e. Uganda's second generation PRS listed forestry as an urgent priority for funding which has yet to materialize).

- During the annual preparation of NFP budgets, sector performance is discussed in terms of money spent rather than in terms of impacts on poverty and links to PRS budget processes or the MTEF are weak or non-existent.

Improving linkages

- NFP coordination units are better linked to central planning and budgeting processes and thus can lobby for support to NFP priorities. They also provide a forum to discuss concerns across sectors and expose more stakeholders to forest issues (Tanzania is a good example).
- Significant gaps in information to monitor both NFPs and PRS are evident in all 10 countries and indicators to measure the impact of interventions are all but absent. Using household surveys and participatory poverty assessments, for example, to collect data would help to show how forestry reduces poverty and contributes to development.
- Despite emphasis on private sector investment in both NFPs and PRS, neither adequately addresses constraints (unsupportive policies, cost of compliance, access to credit and market information). NFPs need to better engage with institutions and programmes that encourage the growth of small and medium sized enterprises – many are outside the forest sector.
- Participation of civil society in NFPs was similar to PRSs (high in Namibia, Tanzania and Uganda) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were instrumental in integrating the environment into the latter.
- When politicians and the media receive regular briefings, they are more prone to advocate the importance of forest resources to improving the livelihoods of poor people.

Making NFPs more pro-poor

- As far as NFPs are concerned, they would be more relevant as instruments for achieving national poverty reduction goals if they would:
 - prioritize activities that are pro-poor
 - include poverty reduction as a core objective
 - emphasize collaboration across sectors and with PRS authorities
 - align forestry more closely with government reform programmes
 - include forestry questions in routine data collection such as household surveys
 - develop monitoring and evaluation systems that are linked to those of the PRS

Conclusions

- As a rule, forestry authorities are not connected to national efforts to reduce poverty any more than PRS agencies are aware of the importance of forestry to achieve this goal.
- Weak capacity is one of the biggest obstacles to preventing other sectors from making decisions that negatively affect forest resources.
- Data and indicators to measure the extent to which forests help to achieve the goals of poverty reduction strategies are not available. Therefore, decision-makers continue to underestimate the forestry sector's contributions to development and chances remain slim to secure badly needed extra funding.
- Many opportunities exist for closer cooperation among sectors and some joint initiatives would not necessarily require more resources. It is more a question of learning how to work together in better and smarter ways.

- Participatory processes are resource-intensive both in terms of human and financial capacity and not all governments are committed to this approach.
- The goal to reduce poverty is sharpening the focus on cross-cutting issues but implementation of PRSs is still by sector.

Presentation 2: Forestry-Poverty Linkages Toolkit

Cornelius Kazoora, Director, Sustainable Development Centre, Uganda

Overview

The Poverty-Forestry Linkages Toolkit was designed by the World Bank Programme on Forests (PROFOR), Winrock International, the Overseas Development Institute, CIFOR and IUCN in response to the need to devise a rapid methodology to appraise forest-livelihood linkages, undertake research, use locally generated data to inform PRSs and NFPs, and help countries report on forests nationally and internationally. Uganda's experiences with testing the toolkit were presented.

Key Issues and Findings

- Unless evidence is generated on the contribution of forests to poverty eradication and development, government will not priorities them in budget allocations, more so that they are moving to general budget support.
- The toolkit was developed to facilitate inclusion of poverty-forest linkages into the PRS and similar planning strategies and programs, such as national forest programs as well as to provide a methodology to further understand the ways in which forests and forestry might contribute to poverty reduction and wealth.
- The toolkit is able to rapidly assess dependence on forests; provide a vehicle for poor people to comment upon forest laws, policies and programmes and their impacts upon local people's livelihoods; identify policy problems and opportunities; and complement quantitative data.
- A case study in Masindi Uganda led by the Sustainable Development Centre used the following tools:
 - Tool 1: Wealth Ranking
 - Tool 2: Local Landscape Situation Analysis
 - Tool 3: Timeline/Trend Analysis
 - Tool 4: Livelihood Analysis (Steps 1,2, 3 and 4)
 - Tool 5: Ranking the Importance of forest products
 - Tool 6: User Rights, Duties and Benefits
 - Tool 7: Forest Problems and Solution Matrix
 - Tool 8: Final Plenary
- The "Wealth Ranking Tool" discusses people's perception and attributes of well-being and poverty, and classifies households in relation to degrees of well-being. The strengths of the tool is that it creates good ground for interaction for use of other tools (e.g. livelihood analysis) and eliminates bias in selecting respondents. The weakness is that it requires a lot of consultation and diplomacy skills as well as an understanding of the community structure in order to plan for the use of the tool so as to get enough sample in each category.

- Using this tool, the study team found that
 - communities know very well the ranking for each household
 - few households were Average wealthy/Wealthy on the basis of all indicators
 - generally, the number of poor people is higher than that portrayed by government which uses only one indicator
 - it was more difficult to come across women headed households in the categories of Average wealthy and Wealthy
 - additional criteria generated by communities surprised the study team e.g. social behavior.

- The “User, User Rights, Duties and Benefits” Tool gathered information to help make decisions. Community members express themselves as regards use, duties they exercise over and benefits they obtain from given resources. The study team found that the categories of forests users are many; that some stakeholders assume rights to resource use which are not expressly stated in the policies or laws; users do not fully exercise their duties, including the National Forestry Authority (NFA); and stakeholders draw more benefits compared with the obligations they must assume. The strength of the tool lies in the wealth of information it provides to explain what is behind the scores e.g. NFA staff sometimes is not compromised by pit sawing. Its shortcomings entail the reluctance to state opinions publicly on performance of different organizations, confusion between rights and duties, uneasiness in airing views on rights of some users, especially timber exploiters.

- Why a re-emergence of these tools that are rooted in participatory rural appraisal that has been practiced for more than 30 years? Because they best interpret the qualitative aspects of poverty. Now developing a minimum critical mass of tool users. Making evidence overwhelming.

- The Uganda study effectively utilized the findings generated by the tool-kit to influence government discussions. The study team will produce a paper for the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) on the environment, natural resources and climate change over the next 5 years in the context of growth, employment, regional equity and private sector participation/partnerships.

- Key recommendations for forestry agencies to use the Toolkit to
 - develop formal partnerships for resource management with communities
 - conflict resolution
 - policy evaluation and formulation
 - budget negotiations
 - benchmark knowledge, attitudes and practices before implementing programmes

- The Toolkit should also be adopted by academic and training institutions for research and by NGOs for monitoring and gathering evidence for advocacy.

- More About the Toolkit: [http://www.profor.info/content/livelihood draft toolkit.html](http://www.profor.info/content/livelihood_draft_toolkit.html)

Presentation 3: Natural Resources Accounting

Edmund Barrow, Coordinator of Forest and Dryland Conservation and Social Policy, Eastern Africa Regional Office, IUCN

Overview

IUCN presented the broad concepts of natural resource accounting and its relationship to wider policy development. The presenter posed several questions to the plenary - Do environmentalists talk with economic sense or only as environmentalists? Do economic planners talk with environmental sense or only as economists? What voice do politicians talk with? Is the environment even on their agenda? Methods for calculating GDP/GNI were presented and examples given from recent cases in East Africa on measuring the contribution of the environment to poverty reduction.

Our Challenge

By not investing in sustainable environmental management, we undermine the very development, livelihood security, and improvements we so desperately seek.

- Climate change is a stark example: Sudan – worst floods in living memory affected 400,000; Uganda – heavy rains claim 300,000 victims.
- 1.5 million people affected in 18 countries, so what is the economic cost (let alone the huge social cost), and now how to cope and improve our lives?
- Economic growth does and will continue to depend on how well we manage and benefit from our environmental assets.

Some Figures

- 1997-2000: El Nino and La Nina cost Kenya approximately \$2.8 billion or more than 15% of GDP per year.
- Nakivubo Swamp, Uganda: Land reclamation reduces wastewater treatment functions of the swamp, costing \$2 million per annum.
- Tana River, Kenya: Dams alter hydrology and impact on downstream ecosystems and economies, for an estimated \$27 million.
- Natural resources degradation in Uganda is approximately 17% of gross national income (GNI) per annum, 6% of which is due to forests and 11% due to soils, at a cost of \$1.3 to \$3.8 billion.
- In Uganda, net annual income and consumption from areas around forests make up 20% of household income (75% for home use).
- In Kenya, charcoal industry worth \$0.4 billion per annum (2nd after tea), of which more than 50% comes from natural forests/woodlands.

ENR Investment

- Do environmentalists talk with economic sense or only as environmentalists?
- Do economic planners talk with environmental sense or only as economists?
- What voice do politicians talk with? Is environment even on their agenda?

Our fixation with GDP

- Most of GDP/GNI is natural resource based (agriculture, forests, tourism, water). Is GDP appropriate for environment?
 - rarely reflects environmental goods and services accurately
 - does not take into account depletion and degradation except when crop yields decline
 - tends to focus on the goods, not the bads
- Could Adjusted National Savings (ANS) better embrace real environmental issues?
- We will continue to have GDP so need to see how best the environment can fit in.

Forest Restoration in Shinyanga Tanzania: importance of trees to people

- Nearly 0.5 million hectares restored in 830 villages (2.25 million people) over 20 years – individual and community levels.
- Significant income: \$14/month from restored forests per person = supplemental and diversification (nearly \$0.5 per day from forest products alone). Approx \$1,000 + extra per annum per family (at regional level value of approximately \$275 million per annum).
- Higher than national average rural consumption of \$8.50 per month – all from environmental/forest products.
- More than 64% households significantly benefit from forest restoration – fuelwood (60%), education (fees, buildings - 35%), medicines (15%), nutrition (20%), fodder (20%) + huge reductions in effort to collect (e.g. 4 hours to 20 minutes for fuel).

What are the real contributions of the environment?

- Timber from natural resources (charcoal, fuelwood, building timber).
- Livestock sector (esp. those found in pastoralist and drier landscapes).
- Tourism, especially in Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia.
- All other natural resources goods – medicines, foods and fruits, for example.

“The reality is that we don’t know in \$ terms so we don’t invest at the national level.”

But if we don’t measure the contributions – how will we know?

- Where are indicators in PRSs to demonstrate importance of natural resources? (There is progress – more than in 1st generation PRSs),
- Who is measuring what – National Bureaus of Statistics, PRS secretariats, Finance, World Bank? What is measured and why? Are ecosystem goods and services measured? No.
- Where are real examples of ENR in national accounts and the use of that data as basis for action and budgeting?
- Is natural resource accounting happening? If so, is it part of national accounts?
- How are development and recurrent expenditures decided (and by who) to take into account the contribution of, and need to invest in environment?

PRS Indicators: Uganda

- Costs of natural resources degradation 17% Gross National Income (GNI) per annum.
- Forests provide \$360 million, of which \$112 million captured in official figures {indicator = % land under forests}.
- In 1992, distance to collect fuelwood = 0.6 km. In 2002, it is 0.73 km. Time to collect water = 30 min {Indicator = time to collect}.
- Annual direct productive value of wetlands \$300 to \$600 per household per annum.

Evolving Role of the Private Sector

- Growing corporate social responsibility and environmental social responsibility are not just public relations, but a means to improve income.
- Promoting fair and sustainable (certification – fair, organic) trade.
- How to support private sector initiatives, especially those that work with rural people.

“Reality is the private sector is investing more because it makes business sense. When will government invest more so as to make wealth creation and livelihood sense?”

The Case is Clear

- Increasing amount of facts and figures.
- Can no longer ignore (especially with climate change).
- But how to ensure responsible investment – as it is political as much as technical
- Need for accountable indicators (and means to measure) in all sectors and in PRS instruments (get beyond rhetoric of mainstreaming to accountability).

Questions: Indicators and Measures

- Are strategic environment assessments used in a practical and functional manner so that different sectors and programmes integrate environmental aspects of direct relevance?
- How are natural resources reflected in national accounting and other measures of national growth? How can this be improved?
- Does country have indicators and the means to measure them which reflect value of environment and natural resources in PRSs and MDGs? What about the next generation PRSs?
- To what extent are natural resource assets reflected in national and regional marketing and trade? How can this be improved?

Questions: Economics and Incentives

- Where is investment in the environment – catchments, water, natural resources, as wealth assets?
- What is the true economic importance of environment and natural resources to GDP and how significant are these for households and livelihoods, especially for poor people?
- What criteria should government put in place to guide future decisions on scale at which interventions will be more cost effective and environmentally sustainable?
- What incentives are needed to promote and sustain private-public partnerships for environment and natural resources management, especially marketing?

Presentation 4: Revised UN System of National Accounts in Malawi

Lizzie Chikoti, Chief of National Accounts, National Statistics Office, Malawi

Overview

Malawi's National Statistics Office has been implementing reforms to the UN System of National Accounts since 2004. Supply and Use Tables cover 350 goods and services in 110 industries, categorized by personal use and domestic / international markets. Agriculture, which includes forestry, has 10 categories. However, because of the paucity of information on forest resources, proxies are used. Data sources are many and collaboration with stakeholders along the supply-use chain is essential. At the end of the day "if you can't measure it, you can't manage it".

Introduction

National Accounts definition

- A statistical system showing status and development of the economy.
- A database for analysis of the economy.
- A summary of all economic statistics.

International guidelines

- National Accounts compilation is based on international guidelines dating from 1953, 1968 and 1993.
- System of National Accounts 1993:
 - UN, IMF, World Bank, OECD, EU
 - Comparability across countries important
 - Harmonization with Balance of Payments
 - Harmonization with ISIC Rev 3
- GDP is one of the key aggregates in National Accounts - a measure of production which refers to the flow of goods and services produced within a given period.

Three different approaches to estimating GDP

- Production approach
- Expenditure approach
- Income approach

First step in the implementation of SNA93

- Process started in 2004.
- Norwegian government provided both technical and financial assistance.
- Consultations made with data suppliers and users.
- Supply and Use Table (SUT) was adopted to compile the new NA figures:
 - shows how supply of goods and services originate from domestic industries and imports, and how those supplies are allocated between intermediate or final uses, including exports
 - supply = domestic production + imports (goods and services we can consume)
 - use = export and process and the system provides for those which cannot be consumed

SUT for Malawi

- 350 products (goods and services).
- 110 industries:
 - ISIC Rev 3 specifications
 - Size (large and small-scale)
 - Market orientation (market producers, government, Non Profit Institution Serving Households, production for own use)
 - 70 consumption categories
 - 13 asset types for capital formation
- The nature of production in Malawi dictated the need to have two major categories: production for own use and production for market

Classification of Agriculture Sector

10 Industries in the SUT framework:

- 22019 Smallholder production for own use
- 22020 Forestry and Logging for own use
- 22050 Fishing for own use
- 23010 Tobacco growing
- 23011 Tea growing
- 23012 Sugar growing
- 23015 Other Large Scale Agriculture – Commercial
- 23019 Smallholder Agriculture - Commercial
- 23020 Forestry and Logging - Commercial
- 23050 Fishing - commercial

Main data sources

- Annual Survey of Agriculture Estates
- Agriculture Crop Estimates – final round done by Ministry of Agriculture
- Livestock Census from Department of Animal Health
- Tobacco Control Commission
- Tea Association of Malawi
- Illovo Sugar Company
- Department of Fisheries
- Department of Forestry
- Business Interview Reports (Various Issues)

Incorporating results from National Agriculture and Livestock Census (NACAL)

- Malawi being an agro-based economy, agriculture sector is paramount to the development of the country.
- Results from the National Agriculture and Livestock Census (NACAL) which NSO was conducting might call for revisions to the national accounts series

Collaboration with other stakeholders

- National Accounts and Balance of Payments Committee
- Consultations at the beginning of the revision process
- Data Supplier-User workshops
- Dissemination workshops

Challenges

- Inadequate resources
- Measuring the output of agriculture, forestry and fishing is complicated because production may extend over many months or even years
- Non-compliance

Recommendations

- Need for agencies/departments to talk to each other regularly
- Information is power
- Know that **“IF YOU CAN’T MEASURE IT, YOU CAN’T MANAGE IT”**.

Presentation 5: Poverty Reduction Strategies for Joint Action in Tanzania

Blandina Cheche, Poverty and Environment Officer, Vice President's Office

Overview

Tanzania's experience in mainstreaming the environment into its second generation MKUKUTA was shared, as were the participatory process it used; the advantages of harmonization in cross-sectoral planning, budgeting and reporting; the challenges of implementation; and the need for institutional change. The presentation also noted the need to strengthen linkages between sectors within each MKUKUTA cluster, improve the prioritization process, and ensure consistency between interventions and expected outcomes.

Plan and budget harmonization history

- The Government of Tanzania implemented a number of reforms to its planning cycle (planning, M&E, reporting), including MTEF(98/99), Performance Mgt Systems and LG Restructuring (2003/4), MKUKUTA (2005/6)
- After review, it became apparent that the planning cycle contained gaps and duplications that were affecting how well public institutions plan.

NSGRP/MKUKUTA

- Successor of PRSP 2000-2003
- Formulated after national wide consultation
- Covers the period 2005 -2010
- Based on three major desired outcomes:
 - Growth and Reduction of Income Poverty
 - Improved Quality of Life and Social Wellbeing
 - Good Governance and Accountability

MKUKUTA's departure from PRS

- Priority sector approach replaced with priority outcome and results approach.
- Emphasis on inter-sectoral linkages and synergies.
- Focus on mainstreaming cross cutting issues.
- Integration of MDGs and Development Vision 2025 into cluster strategies.
- A five-year implementation period.
- More emphasis and better articulation of economic growth measures and reduction of income poverty.
- Better linkage with the budget.
- Strong external commitment.
- Communication strategy.

Achievements: participatory process

- A mechanism to work more inclusively and cooperatively.
- Increased coordination in terms of planning initiatives.
- Improved central government ownership and capacity to manage planning process.
- The manual and strategies created by public servants with CSO involvement.
- Clearer definitions of key terms provide common planning language and model.
- MKUKUTA reaffirmed as guiding framework – its strategies are now linked to institutional plans and budgets, rather than substituting for them.
- Relationship between MKUKUTA, SP and MTEF clear and hierarchically defined

Harmonization

- M&E is seen as an important management tool for tracking achievements and as a means for institutions to gather, analyze, structure, and interpret information for required performance and evaluation reports.
- Public institutions receive money approved by the Parliament annually to implement their plans.
- Institutions now report their performance to Parliament
- Since national and sector initiatives are implemented through the budget, their planning and M&E are part of MKUKUTA
- Improving institutional processes should also strengthen the planning, M&E and reporting of:
 - MKUKUTA
 - Cross cutting and sector development programmes
 - General Budget Support and Public Expenditure Review

Situation on ground

- Management information systems are still weak.
- Demand for and use of data remain low due to lack of awareness of importance.
- Surveys outcomes are infrequently reported.
- Increased focus on economic and spatial statistics needed.
- MKUKUTA Monitoring System is bureaucratic and not always effective.
- Duplication in reporting is always a reality.

Challenges

Need to strengthen:

- Links between MKUKUTA Monitoring System with ministries, agencies and local government authorities.
- Data (routine and survey).
- Efforts to make data consistent.
- Capacity to conduct monitoring and evaluation.
- Focus on managing for results.
- Funding sources of MMS so that it depends less on external support for its sustainability.

Way forward: institutional change

- Institutionalize planning, M&E and reporting to strengthen accountability and independent evaluation.
- Future actions may include developing modalities for providing performance information to the public, parliament and others; and strengthening the capacity of institutions and accountability mechanisms

Conclusion

- MKUKUTA emphasis on collaboration centers on participation of all sectors, accountability and information sharing.

“When mutual accountability is achieved then trust relation across sectors can be strengthened and governance is improved”

Issues for further action

- Strengthen linkages between sectors within each cluster to inform discussions.
- Strengthen the prioritization process
- Make interventions and expected outcomes of MKUKUTA consistent by scaling up implementation modalities, community involvement and partnerships.
- Improve information management systems and data collection, analysis and use.
- Build human resource capacity.
- Ensure financial sustainability.

Presentation 6: National Forest Programme Facility

Fred Kafeero, Facilitator, National Forest Programme Facility

Overview

The National Forest Programme Facility provides support to NFPs in developing countries. FAO is host and the Facility operates under the guidance of a donor support group and a steering committee. Through capacity building and knowledge sharing, it assists countries to integrate sustainable forest management into poverty reduction strategies and other national processes.

Catalytic support

- NFPs = dynamic processes responsive to change
- Capacity building, human and institutional
- Policy and institutional reforms
- Championing the forestry sector
- Mobilizing national and international financial resources

Provides support for

- Civil society participation in NFPs
- Formulation and implementation of policies
- Strengthening skills
- Knowledge access, use and sharing

Funding per partner country

- average US\$ 300,000 for a 3-year period

Grants to NFP stakeholders

- Workshops, fora and training
- Policy analysis and specific studies
- Information sharing

Organizational arrangement

- A donor support group of current and potential donors
- An steering committee of 3 developing countries, 2 funding partners, the World Bank, research institutions, NGOs, foundations, private sector and FAO

Information Services

- Exchange of knowledge and information
- Links to international and national knowledge sources
- Web presence www.fao.org/forestry/NFP-facility
- NFP Information Platform:
 - NFP Update www.fao.org/forestry/NFP-update
 - NFP Digest www.fao.org/forestry/NFP-digest
 - Sourcebook on Funding SFM: www.fao.org/forestry/cpf-sourcebook

How to Apply for Funds

- Draft and submit concept note
- Once concept note is accepted, create a multi-stakeholder steering committee to agree on the work plan and terms of reference; call for proposals in press, radio, networks; rank and select proposals for endorsement by the national team
- NFP Facility then issues contracts

Appendix 7 Country priorities for follow-up and next steps

Based on the study's findings and on discussions at the workshop, participants from each country identified three priorities that needed to be implemented over the next 3-6 months in order to mainstream forestry into poverty reduction strategies and national development plans. In doing so, they were mindful of the possible support that the National Forest Programme NFP Facility could provide as part of partnership agreements.

Kenya

Lessons learnt

- Need for capacity building at different levels
- Need for active participation of stakeholders
- Need for inter-sectoral facilitation and information-horizontal
- Forestry professionals should be aggressive and pro-active, i.e., come out of the forest
- Forestry needs to schedule periodic meetings with the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
- Need access and application of research results, including on science-policy interface

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Convene national stakeholder workshops to create awareness on poverty-forestry linkages	KFS (Wanyiri)	MENR, MPND, ICRAF, KNBS, MoA	June, 2008
Assess the contribution of the forestry sector to economic growth and poverty reduction, with links to vision 2030	MENR (Gichere)	KFS, MPND, ICRAF, KNBS, NEMA, MoA	March, 2008
Undertake training on tools and approaches to integrate forestry into economic development	ICRAF/IUCN	MENR, MPND, MoA, MoLS, KFS, KNBS, NEMA	March, 2008
Review the survey questionnaire for forestry contribution to GDP	KNBS	MENR, MPND, MoA, MoLS, KFS, KNBS, NEMA	March, 2008
Set up multi-stakeholder committee for coordination and review	KFS	MENR, MPND, MoA, MoLS, KFS, KNBS, NEMA	March, 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

- Finance the activities in the action plan and provide technical backstopping

Since the workshop the **Kenya Inter-Agency Task Force for Planning and Monitoring** has been established and is operational. Members are:

- Sammy Gichere-Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
- Jennifer Ngige-Kenya Forestry Service
- Sarah Muui-Ministry of Planning and National Development
- Thomas Yatich-World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)
- John Wanyiri-Kenya Forestry Service
- Paul Samoie-Kenya Bureau of Statistics
- Samuel Ihure-Kenya Forest Service

Malawi

Main issues

- Undervaluation of forestry products
- Absence of central coordinating mechanism for forestry sector and stakeholders to exchange information and collaborate on poverty issues of concern
- Lack of a system to monitor and evaluate the National Forestry Programme

Lessons learnt

- Need to foster collaboration at all levels
- Need for common understanding of definitions between statistician and foresters
- Need to have common understanding on methodology to be used
- Need to enhance capacities at all levels within the sector
- Need to recruit statisticians and economist in the forestry sector

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Organize stakeholder workshop aimed at achieving understanding on forestry valuation (agreeing on definitions and methodologies)	National Statistics Office (National Accounts Section)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key forestry stakeholders• Ministry of Finance	May 2008
Meet forestry department and key stakeholders on ways of resuscitating the National Forestry Programme forum as part of Coordinating Unit of Department of Forestry. Establish a high level committee whose main purpose is to ensure that policies and programmes to reduce poverty are consistent across sectors and are developed in a coordinated manner.	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (Principal Secretary)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Forestry• Key forestry stakeholders• Ministry of Finance	May 2008
Establish/strengthen monitoring and evaluation of National Forestry Programme	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (M&E Division)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Forestry• Key forestry stakeholders• Ministry of Finance	May 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

- Capacity building for forestry staff at all levels
- Workshop, fora and training
- Information sharing and networking

Namibia

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Create a monitoring and data collection system for forest products (develop more indicators for forestry)	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	NPCS-CBS, Civil Society, NGOs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism	August 2008
Valuation of non-timber forest products used for subsistence by a large portion of the population and accounting of PES	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	NPCS-CBS, Civil Society, NGOs Ministry of Environment and Tourism	NDP3 period
Intensify advocacy for forest protection at all levels - field, regional and national	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry	Traditional authorities, Regional Councils, NPCS, Civil Society, NGOs, Ministry of Environment & Tourism	NDP3 period

Niger

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other institutions	Target date
Workshop to inform of study findings and Nairobi conclusions	DGE : Ibro Adamou	Rural Development Strategy, Ministry of Animal Resources	Jan 2008
Support to workshops for rural development	SE/SDR: Elhadji Maman Saadou	All ministries involved in rural development	March 2008
Training for environmental accounting	DGE/EF: Ibro Adamou	National Institute of Statistics, Rural Development Strategy	April 2008
Support for data collection	DGEF/EF	National Institute of Statistics, Rural Development Strategy	May 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

- Awareness raising workshop: transportation of participants, refreshment breaks and meals
- Workshops on rural development: expert to facilitate discussions and participant support
- Environmental accounting: expert to give training and costs of workshop
- Data collection: 2 experts to help develop projects

Nigeria

Lessons Learnt

- Collaboration across sectors is very important
- National resources accounting and data collection are necessary
- Organizational requirements are crucial

Action Plan

	Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
1	Repackage the NFP document (Rebranding)			
a	Align the NFP with the new National Forest Policy	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	NPC, NBS, Agric, Finance, State Depts of Forestry, FRIN, Universities	Feb 2008
b	Prioritize NFP activities and areas of investment	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	same as above	Jan 2008
c	Refocus the NFP to make poverty reduction and livelihood improvement as core objectives	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	same as above	Jan 2008
d	Determine the contributions of forestry to GDP	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	same as above	May 2008
2	Improve collaboration among all levels of government			
a	Quarterly meetings of stakeholders to exchange info and improve understanding of the roles of forestry in national planning and poverty reduction	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	same as above	On-going
b	Develop a forestry database and computer-based assessment, monitoring and evaluation System	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of Forestry	same as above	June 2008
3	Capacity building on M & E and	FMEHUD: Mr. A. A. Afolabi, Director of	Key federal, state and local govt forest	June 2008

	Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
	sustainable forest management	Forestry	officers	
4	Mainstream forestry activities with NEEDS, MDGs, MTEF	NPC: Mr. F. Esan, Director Agric and Industry	FMEHUD, NBS, Agric, Finance, State Departments of Forestry, FRIN, Universities	June 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

There is a lack of financial resources to execute forestry programmes in Nigeria as the sector has not been given the attention it deserves in terms of budgetary allocation. Consequently, assistance from the NFP Facility is required for technical and financial support for the above programmes in order to complement the efforts of the Department of Forestry. Based on the foregoing therefore, a concept note to the NFP Facility will be developed as a follow-up.

Sudan

Main issues

- Active engagement of the national forestry institution in the development process
- Need for stronger capacity in national accounting and payment for environmental services
- South Sudan needs to carry out a forest sector review
- Critical to develop indicators for monitoring forestry's role in PRSPs

Lessons learnt

- FNC/FD must forge links to the current PRSP review process
- Develop coordinating mechanism with all stakeholders related to forestry
- Need to improve data in the north and south

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
FNC/FD prepare a paper to heighten role of forestry contributions to PRSP review process	FNC/FD/MAF	PRSP Unit, Range and Pasture, Wildlife Dept, HCNR	1 month
Conduct regional and national workshops	FNC/FD	PRSP Unit, Range and Pasture, Wildlife Dept, HCNR, NBS, National Planning	4-5 months
Compile available data	FNC/FD	Research, education, NGOs + other government institutions	?

Role of the NFP Facility

- Support national and regional workshops
- Assist with data compilation
- Help South Sudan conduct a forest sector review

Tanzania

Lessons learnt

- Collaboration is a key element to create linkages with PRSP but there are capacities gaps that need to be addressed. Opportunities exist through the NFP Facility to improve collaboration.
- The need to demonstrate the contributions of forestry to the national economy is important but poses a great challenge to forestry departments and other natural resources sectors to generate more relevant data and information.
- Existing data and information have not yet been used well to influence decision makers within the sector and beyond. Need to strengthen capacities to collect, analyze, manage and disseminate to various users for informed decision making.

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Align indicators of the National Forest and Beekeeping Programme with those of the MKUKUTA Monitoring System and ensure reporting is consistent	FBD	MPEE, VPO, IRA, Lands	April 2008
Disseminate the Annual Joint Review of the Programme (2006/07) to stakeholders and assess the extent to which interventions by different players can feed into the MKUKUTA Annual Implementation Report	FBD	NBS, VPO, MPEE, REPOA, Lands	May 2008
Initiate process to discuss report findings on the Values of Tanzania forests and find out how to use the info to ensure sustainable management of forests and linkages to broader MKUKUTA objectives and targets	FBD	UDSM, SUA, MPEE, VPO, Lands	May 2008
Identify gaps in capacity and prepare proposals to enhance skills to improve collaboration across forestry sector	FBD	UDSM, SUA, MPEE, VPO	May 2008

Tunisia

Priority areas

Strengthen the link between the NFP and PRS

- Estimate the financial value of forest goods and services and the sector's economic potential
- Conduct a census of the population which depends on forests
- Support the Forestry Directorate regarding privatization and co-management

Collaboration across sectors

- Increase participation and implement management based on an ecosystem approach
- Evaluate the cost of forest goods and services and move from 0.45% of GDP to 1.25%
- Clarify mission of basic institutions – agricultural development groups and forestry groups having common interests (GDA and GFIC) – evaluate/monitor their evolution, and strengthen the training as well as number of forest technicians (in qualitative and quantitative terms)

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other institutions	Target date
Workshop to explore establishment of a national forum	Direction Générale des Forêts (DGF): Saïd Héral	Economic Dev't, Agriculture, Ministry of the Interior and Local Development, NGOs	Dec '07 (scheduled)
Selection of target zones for interventions	Direction Générale des Forêts (DGF): Saïd Héral	Agriculture, Ministry of the Interior and Local Development	Apr 2008
Identification and definition of modalities to involve private sector	Direction Générale des Forêts (DGF): Saïd Héral	Agriculture, Ministry of the Interior and Local Development	May 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

Support from the National Forest Programme Facility could consist of studies to 1) identify and define practical modalities and tools to involve private sector in sustainable forest management; 2) analyze and increase understanding of the market chain of certain forest products; and 3) develop internal standards for non-commercial values. It could also assist to mount a pilot project for a participatory approach in resolving tenure issues on forest land.

Uganda

Main issues

- Re-instating the mechanisms that bring together various key national stakeholders (Finance, Planning, Bureau of Statistics, Ministries, Private sector, NGOs) which follows the form of a National Consultative Council
- Reviving discussions between the National Forestry Authority and Forestry Sector Service Department on operational issues and to build consensus
- Establishing a national module for collecting forestry statistics in the field
- Building and strengthening M & E capacity to monitor and evaluate NFP implementation
- Engage in the formulation of the 5-year national development plan

Lessons learnt

- Engaging others in forestry issues and being pro-active in other sector programs
- Together with UBOS, developing a module to collect forestry statistics; undertaking regular collection of forestry data at all levels
- Providing incentives (budget and non-budget) to motivate staff at all levels to collect and analyze forestry data.

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Re-instate the collaboration and coordination mechanisms	FSSD: Gershom Onyango	NFA, UFWG, UTGA, Makerere University, National Forestry Research Institute	March 2008
Engage in formulating the 5-year National Development Plan	FSSD: Silver Byarugaba	NFA, UFWG, UTGA, District Forestry Service	April 2008
Set-up permanent	G. Onyango	NFA	Feb 2008

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
coordination mechanism between NFA and FSSD	D. Akankwasa	UFWG	
Build and strengthen M & E capacity to monitor and evaluate NFP implementation	FSSD UFWG	Universities, UBOS, private sector, districts	March 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

- Provide information on key international and regional strategic issues
- Support the collaboration mechanisms of the Uganda Forestry Sector Coordination Committee through funding an annual national consultative conference
- Assist in designing a module for the collection of forestry data to fit in national statistics

Zambia

Main issues

- Restructuring the forestry institutional framework to make it in line with the National Forestry Policy 1998 and the Act of 1999
- Strengthening forestry's involvement in the Natural Resource Consultative Forum, as well as provincial and district development coordinating committees
- Consolidating the indicators for forestry in the Fifth National Development Plan
- Building capacity for monitoring and evaluation

Lessons Learnt

- Establishing mechanisms which are mandated to collaborate across sectors and providing them with adequate resources can enhance collaborating, as would creating bottom-up multi-sector teams for development planning and data collection.
- Improving linkages and harmonizing data collection between the forest sector and central statistics office will raise awareness of its contributions to national development.
- Having regular fora at national/decentralized levels and sharing information on poverty reduction, as measured by indicators, would promote greater collaboration and increase the chances for successful outcomes.

Action Plan

Proposed action	Lead agency	Other agencies	Target date
Consolidate the forestry indicators in the FNDP	MFNP	CSO	May 2008
Build capacity for monitoring and evaluation	MFNP and Forestry Dept	CSO, AGRIC, ENERGY, ECZ	1 st Phase May 2008
Promote dialogue among planning, statistics, forestry and other stakeholders	Forestry Department	MFNP, CSO and the NFP Facility	March 2008

Role of the NFP Facility

The NFP Facility can assist with funding the dialogue among planners, statisticians and other stakeholders, especially during annual reviews. It can also strengthen capacity of the Forest Department at district and provincial levels, in data collection and monitoring.

Appendix 8 List of participants

Kenya

Mr. David K. Mbugua
Director of Forests
Kenya Forest Service
Tel: +254 20 3764753
Fax: +254 20 3764249
Email: kfs@wananchi.com

Ms. Sarah Muui
Principal Economist,
Rural Planning Directorate
Ministry of Planning and National Development
Tel: +254 20 341242
Mobile: + 254 722 494755
Email: nmuui@yahoo.com

Mr. Paul Samoei
Poverty Analysis Research Unit
Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
Mobile: +254 722 658897
Email: psomoei@cbs.go.ke

Mr. Samuel Gichere
Chief Economist
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
Tel: +254 20 2730808
Mobile: +254 722 880913
Email: gichere@mazingiraasili.go.ke

Ms. Jennifer W. Ngige
Acting Deputy Director, Forest Extension and Partnership
Kenya Forest Service
Mobile: +254 722 331690
Email: ngigejw@yahoo.com

Mr. Anthony Maina
Chairman, Forest Reform Secretariat
Kenya Forest Service
Mobile: +254 722 806127
Email: mainaam2000@yahoo.com

Mr. Samuel Ihure
Head of Marketing
Kenya Forest Service
Mobile: +254 722 756039
Email: sgihure@.forestry.go.ke

Malawi

Mr. Robert Msuku
Economist
Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
Tel: +265 1788888
Fax: +265 1788247
Mobile: +265 9344880
Email: rmsuku@gmail.com

Mrs. Lizzie Chikoti
Chief, National Accounts
National Statistics Office
Tel: +265-1-756279
Fax: +265-1-758515
Mobile 265-8-869081
Email: lizchikoti@yahoo.co.uk or ichikoti@nso-lilongwe.gov.mw

Namibia

Mr. Joseph Hailwa
Director, Directorate of Forestry
Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Forestry
Tel: +264612087663
Email: hailwaj@mawrd.gov.na

Ms. Annely Shishome
Chief Forester
North West Region
P/ Bag 5558, Oshakati, Namibia
Tel: + 26465230295
Email: shishome@iway.na

Beaven Walubita
Economist
Poverty Reduction and Human Resources
National Planning Commission
Email: bwalubita@npc.gov.na

Niger

Monsieur Ibro Adamou
Chef de Division des Forêts Naturelles et Gestion des Terroirs
Direction Générale de l'Environnement et des Eaux et Forêts
Ministère de L'Hydraulique, de l'Environnement et de la Lutte Contre la Désertification
Tel : (227)20733329/96965910
Email: ibroadamou@yahoo.fr

Niger cont.ed

Monsieur Elhadji Maman Saïdou
Secrétariat Exécutif de la Stratégie de Développement Rural
Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Lutte Contre la Désertification
Tel : (227)20203187/96561301/93928165
Email: mamansaad@yahoo.fr

Monsieur ILLO Aboukassoum
Directeur Adjoint de la Production Animale et de la Promotion des Filières
Ministère des Ressources Animales
Tel : (227)96467605
Email: illoabouk@yahoo.fr

Nigeria

Mr. Thomas Folorunso Fameso
Chief Forest Officer, Forest Management
Forestry Department
Federal Ministry of Environment
Tel: +2348055142456
Email: folufameso@yahoo.com

Mr. Innocent Edewede Azeke
State Director of Wildlife Management,
Forest Management Department
Ministry of Environment
Palm House, Sapele Road, Benin City, Nigeria
Tel: +2348033536168
Email: innoeazeke@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Folorunso Esan
Federal Director Industrial and Agricultural sector, National Planning Commission
Abuja, Nigeria
Tel: +2348037002621
Email: funsoesan@yahoo.co.uk

North Sudan

Mr. Abdulhamied Adam Hamid
Deputy General Manager
Forests National Corporation
Tel: +24918391299182/183471575
Email: abdulhamied@hotmail.com

Mr. Hussein Mustafa Mohamed
Chief, Department of Range and Pasture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forests
Tel: +2490122150092
Email: pastoralism2005@yahoo.com

North Sudan cont.ed

Mr. Hassan Gaffer Abdelrahman
Poverty Alleviation Strategy Unit
Ministry of Finance
Mobile: (249)0122340292
Email: assegbal@gmail.com

South Sudan

Mr. Jaden Tongan Emilio
Undersecretary for Forestry
Government of south Sudan
Tel. +256477103357
Email: jtemil@yahoo.com

Tanzania

Mr. Juma Mgoo
Coordinator, Management of National Resource Programme
Forestry and Beekeeping Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
Tel. +255784483599
Email: jsmgoo@mnrt.google.2

Ms. Blandina Cheche
Poverty and Environment Officer
Vice President's Office
Email: ndina40@yahoo.com

Mr. Fanual Shechambo
Associate Director and Coordinator Social Policy and Analysis
Institute for Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam
Tel: +255-754-851507/ 748-851507
Email: fshechambo@ira.udsm.ac.tz
shechambo@yahoo.com

Tunisia

Monsieur Ahmed Ridha FEKIH SALEM
Directeur général de la Direction générale des forêts
Ministère de l'Agriculture et des Ressources hydrauliques
Tel. (00216)71848892/97425067
Email: bo.dgf@iresa.agrinet.tn

Monsieur Slaheddine TOUATI
Commissariat régional au développement agricole d'El KEF
Tel (00216)78224717 /98543860
Email: crda.kef@iresa.agrinet.tn

Uganda

Mr. Gershom Onyango
Assistant Commissioner, Forestry Support Services
Ministry of Water and Environment
Email: ggonyango@yahoo.co.uk

Zambia

Mr. Bwalya Chendauka
Principal Extension Officer
Easter Province
Tel+260-6-221778
Fax +260-6-222001
Email: bchandauka@yahoo.co.uk

Mr. Shadreck Sichone
Principal Planning Officer
Ministry of Finance and National Planning
Tel: +260-6-250886
Mobile: 0966624629
Email: sichonenalumande@yahoo.co.uk

Sustainable Development Centre

Mr. Cornelius Kazooru
Consultant
Uganda
Tel: +256-772-926253
Email: sdcc@infocom.co.ug

World Agro-forestry Centre

Mr. Thomas Yatich
Research Analyst, Environmental Policy and Research
Global Environmental Policy Project
Tel: +254-20-7224195
Fax: +254-20-7224001
Email: T.Yatich@cgiar.org

Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Habtemariam Kassa
Scientist (Ethiopia)
Eastern and Southern Africa
Email: h.kassa@cgiar.org

The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

Edmund Barrow
Coordinator, Forest & Dryland Conservation and Social Policy
Eastern Africa Regional Office
Email: Edmund.Barrow@iucn.org

FAO

Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Forestry Officer
Forest Policy Service
FAO Rome
Tel: +39 0657053081
Fax: +39 0657055514
Email: Rosalie.McConnell@fao.org

National Forest Programme Facility

Mr. Fred Kafeero
Executive Director
Environmental Alert
Tel: +256 415110547
Fax: +256 41510547
Email: fkafeero@envalert.org

Mr. Michael Chihambakwe
National Forest Programme Facilitator
Southern Africa
Tel: +27 12 354 8529
Fax: +27 12 354 8531
Email: Michael.Chihambakwe@fao.org

Facilitators

Mr. Wouter Hijweege
Wageningen International
Wageningen University & Research Centre
Tel: + 31 317 495 304
Fax: + 31 317 495 395
Email: wouter_hijweege@wur.nl

Ms. Isilda Nhantumbo
Independent Consultant
Tel: +254 736 286798
Email: isynhantumbo@yahoo.com.br

Workshop Secretariat

John M. Wanyiri

Secretariat

Mobile: +254 722 273577

Email: wanyirimj@yahoo.com

Mr. Scott Geller

Secretariat

Mobile: +254 720 320220

Email: scott-geller@ltsi.co.uk

Eunice Maina

Secretariat

Mobile: +254 722 674501

Email: mnwamuyu@yahoo.com