

**Proceedings of  
Midterm Review Response Workshop**

**Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
February 7-9, 2005**

**PFMU  
February 2005  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Table of contents	2
Introduction	3
Workshop Objectives	3
Discussions on Different Components of the PFMP	4
Session I: Opening of Workshop and Introduction of Participants	4
Session II: Midterm Review Results on Participatory Forest Management Systems	4
Session III: Midterm Review Results on Diversified Livelihoods	10
Session IV: Midterm Review Results on Capacity of Partner Organizations	19
Session V: Midterm Review Results on Policy, Networking and Dissemination	22
Session VI: Workshop Closing	26
Annex	
Annex A: List of Participants	27

## **1. Introduction**

The Participatory Forest Management Programme (PFMP), a joint programme of FARM Africa and SOS Sahel is being implemented in Ethiopia (Chilimo, Bonga, and Borana forests) and Tanzania (Nou forest). This program has the aim of “developing and institutionalizing innovations in policy and practice in participatory sustainable forest management in East Africa” and provides coping strategies and diversified livelihoods to families living in and around the forest areas. The PFMP has shown tangible progress during the past two years and has passed the difficult process of building trust among local partners.

The PFMP, which is funded by the European Union, DFID, Comic Relief and DSW, has reached the midway of its four-year contract. As this is a critical point in time for the programme, an internal midterm review (MTR) was carried out by international consultants. The review assessed the progresses that have been made in the different components of the programme, pinpoint areas of concern and suggests ideas or ways of tackling some of the gaps to successfully finalize and handover the programme within the next two remaining years. Thus, following the review, an MTR response workshop was held from Feb 7-9, 2005 at the Ras Amba hotel, Addis Ababa.

## **2. Workshop Objectives**

The MTR response workshop was organized to:

1. Discuss the major concerns of the MTR
2. Review and initiate ideas for sustainable handing over of projects during the remaining two years of the programme; and
3. Identify areas of concerns not covered by the MTR.

### **3. Discussions on Different Components of the PFMP**

#### **Session I: Opening of Workshop and Introduction of Participants**

Ms. Sally Crafter, country director of FARM Africa, welcomed the participants and stated that this is a critical point to review the work done, to learn from our mistakes and decide on how and at what pace we want to proceed. She asked all participants to actively take part in the discussions to make this workshop a good starting point for the following two years. Emphasising the importance and value of learning from mistakes, SC made the following point;

**“If you have never made a mistake, you have never made anything!”**

Ato Zelalem Temesgen, programme manager of the PFMU, also stressed on the need to critically review the strategy of the programme as this is a good time to make changes and/or adjustments as deemed necessary. He stated that the sustainability of the programme after it is handed over is the major point of discussion.

This was followed by introduction of participants from the four project sites, PFMU, FARM Africa and SOS Sahel.

#### **Session II: Midterm Review Results on Participatory Forest Management Systems**

**Mr. Ben Irwin, Technical Manager, PFMU**

The section on the Participatory Forest Management Systems from the MTR was presented. In each section of the review, the aim and approach of the topic, the progress and breakthroughs it has attained, its sufficiency, appropriateness and sustainability, and suggestions for future directions and actions were clearly put.

The problems that were faced by other countries while implementing PFM were stated in this section and were discussed among the participants to see whether similar issues have arisen in the programme. The four major points highlighted by the reviewers were:

1. FUG overprotection of resources;
2. Elite resource capture (development resources and or the actual forest resources);
3. The government being reluctant to handover productive forests or sanction commercial use; and
4. Inability to maintain the quality of the process beyond the pilot phase.

*The reflections from each project team on the issues raised were as follows:*

**Nou:** Elite resource capture needs to be assessed closely for a better understanding of the situation. The Nou forest is a State owned forest and is operating in partnership, complete handover is not done so far and thus government reluctance is not seen in the sense mentioned on the MTR. Considering quality, there are village level community groups but lower groups are not seen yet and there is no formal link between the groups, therefore this must be one area to look into for maintaining quality.

**Borana:** user groups do tend to overprotect. The elite problem is also seen because the interest of vulnerable people is not always addressed and more powerful groups might grab opportunities.

**Chilimo:** Elite's problem is not seen as such however, the plantations that are ready for harvest are found only in some of the FUG's forest area hence all will not be able to get the benefit at the same time. The government reluctance is not a problem currently (overcome), we have reached an understanding with the government and hence most situations are supportive. The woreda people are involved in the process with the aim to ensure maintaining of quality after handing over however, it needs further work.

*Following this section, suggestions made on issues that the PFMP should examine in future were stated and discussed both on plenary as well as in groups. The points given by the reviewers for further analysis were:*

- The net benefit of engaging in PFM for FUG members;
- Institutional development and governance including gender dimensions;
- Links between forest dependence and environmental degradation
- Forestry cooperatives - pros and cons
- Impact of PFM on livelihood strategies of different households
- Maintaining quality of the process - investigation, negotiation, and implementation

*The reflections of the teams on the above mentioned issues were as follows:*

**Bonga:** When saying net-benefit, we shouldn't only consider the economic benefit the community gets out of the PFM programme. There are other benefits including social and institutional that need to be considered; for example, some have found recognition as social equals (Manja) after being involved in PFM process. Rather than equal benefit it seems more appropriate to discuss the issue of equity.

**Borana:** the process has taken a justifiable time to start the programme especially in building trust. What is the justifiable amount of time to work on such a programme? So far it has been a learning stage, for the remaining period we need to organize the experiences and test it for efficiency and replication. The project principle was not economical it was to get the best forest management without denying benefits.

**Chilimo:** The net benefit obtained is hard to calculate against time as it incorporates complex gains such as improved environment, empowered people etc. More information could have been obtained by the reviewers from the community members had they had enough time. However, it is a good issue to pay attention to and it may guide us in the future.

The reviewers have presented an M.Sc thesis which states the wrong assumption on poor groups as destroyers of forests while in reality it is the rich who are the larger-scale user. This is a good history, but is not seen anymore since the forest is being conserved by the different FUGs.

Following the plenary discussion, the participants were divided into four groups to discuss and present on issues found to be essential. The presentation of each group is summarized below:

Group work questions;

1. Which themes, from those suggested on the MTR as well as other additional ones, should be focused upon in PY 3 and 4 and what are the suggested actions?
2. Which strategies (directions) should be followed in PY 3 & 4?

<b>Group</b>	<b>Theme/Strategy</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>Strategies</b>	
	Use PFM for livelihood strategy	- Look into PFM contribution for livelihood - Focus more on forest based livelihood
	Review PFM process in relation to time and quality - Is the time taken too long or enough? - Cost-benefit ratio for community - Feeling of the community on the process	Review socio-economic data collection tools and finalize up to 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter
	Review institutional aspects - Why do we need coops? Legality issue, credit access, bank account? - GO capacity to form coops from past experience	- Review the legality of user groups as an association - Lobby for legality of FUG
	PFM guidelines (FUG and WAJIB)	Harmonize the two guidelines
	PFM supportive policy - Tanzania has a good policy, an act - Oromia has supportive proclamation - Southern region has federal policy that needs further work	- Focus on attaining supportive policy at the Southern region. Particularly in the thematic areas like Policy, institution and PFM guideline
<b>II</b>	<b>Theme</b>	
	- Cost benefit of engaging on PFM particularly for poor HH in a degraded forest areas	- Clear understanding of the benefits so far accrued from PFM interventions - Seek different options for maximizing benefits
	- Traditional institution vs. equity	An in depth study of the two themes need

	- decision making - material incentives to participation	to be commissioned
	Government reluctance to handover valuable forest assets	Lobby and advocate
	Change in livelihood strategy vs. choice	Implications of forest management plans and CDF need to be studied in depth
	<b>Strategies</b>	
	Development of a PFM guideline to ensure and maintain the quality	- Consult each project and distill their practical experiences - Disseminate the experiences
	Planning for sustainable utilization overlooked and protective approach much emphasized	- Re-visit previous plans and consider sustainable utilization for new ones
	Donor time vs. actual time required to produce a quality product	Engage donors to appreciate reality and to make money worthwhile
	Unified RFPA's vs. different FUG utilization plans (conflict and equity)	Management plans need to address different productive potentials and ways of distributing benefit
	Cooperatives	- De-stigmatizing the stigma - Create good governance - Implement clearly
	Working in partnership with GO	- Capacity building - Engage region, zone, and woreda staffs and DAs (Bonga an ideal example) - Strong advocacy and lobbying - Organize exchange visit/ field visits - Prepare publications/ design thematic and technical papers
<b>III</b>	<b>Theme</b>	
	Forest resource use: - Over protection/ sustainable harvesting - Government/community - forest use/ benefits	understanding/ using policies - training/ events
	Government roles - structure (changes too often)	lobby, flexibility to cope with changes
	- Elite resource (development process) capture - understanding community dynamics	- create good governance equal information flows - involve existing community groups (youth, women etc.)

	Community roles / institutions	Revisit/follow up: - Forest cooperative/ business orientation - Gaps between coop bureau / NR bureau
	Government reluctance to handover valuable forest assets (Site specific)	Find out NTFP potentials for forest livelihoods
	Livelihood impact	monitor livelihoods
	Maintaining quality - sustainability	GO involvement, GO plans for PFM
	<b>Strategies</b>	
	PFMP as a learning org.	An element of this could be of documenting on mistakes committed on the processes and periodical critical reviews
	Reflection meetings	Move monthly reflection meetings from mere discussion on progress to critical review process
	Use of PFM with minimum resources	In depth look into tools and identify the critical ones
	PFM - GOV led	Insure that the Gov takes the lead at all levels
<b>IV</b>	<b>Theme</b>	
	Maintaining the quality process	Focus on bringing impact on the community - sustainability and work on replicability by: - Regular reflections - Policy lobbying - Regional/national PFM: Produce manual
	Institutional development and governance including gender dimensions	- explore possibilities with critical attention of enabling PFM /coops, FUG, others/ - navigate policy and directive that have provisions - work to ensure sub-group/category level decision making
	<b>Strategies</b>	
	Establishment of strong FUGs	
	Advocacy for GO on PFM	
	Inter project/ and staff experience sharing	

## **Session III: Midterm Review Results on Diversified Livelihoods**

**Mr. Zelalem Temesgen, Programme Manager, PFMU**

This section was summarized and presented to the participants in order to capture the key livelihood issues that need critical review. The main points that were put forward for the plenary discussion were:

### **Major concerns raised by reviewers:**

- Should we do trials or replicate successful programme to increase income?
- What is the purpose of the livelihoods component - in relation to the program purpose?
- The issue of subsidy - true input costs. E.g. bringing technology from different area and charging only for the technology and not the transport cost?
- Should the risk be analyzed and borne by the communities or should we minimize the risks for them?
- The issue of marginalized groups e.g. in Tanzania the poor can not benefit out of some technologies because of cost
- Who is the poor? Should we focus only on the poor?
- Different responses as to what the purpose of livelihood is; for e.g., in Borana for poverty alleviation in others to reduce dependency on NR etc.
- Linking the groups to rural banks for sustainability - is this livelihood part of the PFM?
- Will the livelihood interventions be sustainable after the end of the program?

### **Suggestions for future directions by reviewers:**

- Livelihood strategies should be run as Business enterprises - cost sharing - e.g. providing training on subsidised way
- How does the Ethiopian PFM context differ from others? Does it not work without the livelihood component? What is it meant to express?
- Understand how forest revenue be used to promote equitable livelihoods, incorporate livelihood development into forest management plan
- Recognize PFM as an empowering tool

- Try to understand forestry's contribution to livelihoods and the links between forest dependency, food security and environment
- Review gender dimensions - what are the conditions in each project?
- Assess possibilities and the need for Rural Banks to provide grant to FUGs in the form of a CDF
- Document pitfalls and strengths of farmer experimentation, forest based enterprise development and credit and savings groups, e.g. credit payment in Chilimo is 100%. How was it achieved?

*Based on the above points, discussions were held among the participants:*

**Borana:** The project is not providing alternative livelihoods, it is diversifying their livelihood. When considering target groups, addressing only the poor and more marginalized ones might force the others to prefer to be poor, to join the poor group in order to get resources. What is in the projects is farmer – led, the question is who owns the ideas and the processes, in which the project plays a big role.

CDF can be initiated from the community themselves. We should not ask the government to set aside the money but create linkage with financial institutions for support. Ours is a grant but micro finances are business based and hence sustainable.

Creating an enabling environment is what the project should do. Otherwise, it will marginalize some people. Using the forest values as income generating means is one way but other resources outside of the forest should also be considered. If for example, productivity is increased by using various technological innovations, livelihood will be improved and we will develop a sustainable system. Therefore, livelihood interventions are necessary.

**Nou:** if the project focuses on the poor, we can reduce pressure on the forest as well as change/improve livelihood and hence we need to work towards that. In Tanzania, since Nou forest is a catchments forest, the government has to compensate and we need to lobby for that. There is a revolving fund but it is not clear whether the government can replicate this.

Livelihood is essential for a successful PFM and the CDF should be used to promote such activities as butterfly projects which otherwise are costly. CDF should not be part of the package of PFM but part of the planning stage for each particular project.

**Bonga:** bringing alternatives or diversifying livelihood does not completely take-off the community from the forest but result in sustainability. When we come to subsidy, we should know where our boundary is so as to step down before going too far and create dependency.

Sustainable management for e.g. credit programmes are available and these can be replicated by government. When we see extension programmes, one of the dimensions is access to input which most wouldn't have had otherwise. For example, improved potatoes were never heard of by the community, but now they are selling the seeds. Community development fund is essential and can also be replicated by the government since they have a rural finance system being organized. But we need to qualify and prioritize.

Diversified livelihood is essential to convince the community to get off the NR. PFM goes beyond forest management they go to household management which should be appreciated. Equity should be considered carefully for the government to carryout this programme successfully. Probably it is better to organize discussion with government officials to know what they can provide.

When looking at the gender issues, it used to be addressed at the last stage. Now, we have some activities at FUG levels such as women saving and credit projects. We have now agreed to include the component at the beginning of the programmes. There are some cases where the women have started to know their rights and demand for it.

**Chilimo:** The expenditure on livelihood is less than 6% of the total budget and this can be afforded by the government. Therefore, lobbying is important. The members are investing their time and labor as protectors of the forest. The government on the other hand is reducing its cost; therefore, the advantages of livelihood outweigh the disadvantages. Probably the success would not have been so well if livelihood was not carried out.

Natural resources bureau gets far less budget than other bureaus so lobbying is definitely essential. Once the initial fund is established it will be a revolving fund and hence not too much for the government to handle.

When seeing the gender dimension, livelihood activities are mostly run by women but not fully. In addition, women groups are given trainings on management and utilization. On the other hand FUG meetings are mainly attended by the males. Membership is equal for both but when it comes to forest guarding the males seem to be active. In the cooperatives because there is membership fee, only one household member tends to be a coop member, and usually the males are the ones who become members. Incomes are usually handled by the male still showing their domination in the household.

Following the plenary discussion, the participants again split into groups to work on a few selected issues that require more discussions:

1. Focus areas of intervention on income from forest based livelihoods, and how?
2. Policy of subsidies - how to minimize subsidy?
3. How to refocus on building skills?
4. When and how to use and replicate CDF?

## **Group I**

### **Refocusing livelihood interventions on forest based incomes**

#### **Focus on the following Natural based livelihood interventions**

1. Butterfly farming
2. Eco- tourism (nature clubs have started using the Chilimo forest, thus the activity may start by asking for service charges whenever possible. If FUGs agree, the CDF can be used to start such activities.)
3. NTFPs - spices, cardamom, mushroom, beekeeping, ginger, medicinal plants, coffee, gums etc.
4. Agro-forestry
5. Forest products marketing
6. Channelling/linking forest revenue (plantation sales) to other livelihood options
7. Local adaptation of wild species (this will bring the species such as different spices to the backyard and hence decreasing pressure on the forest)
8. Value adding to forest products: e.g. bamboo, lumber

All the above activities need to be identified by FUGs during the planning process from livelihood discussions based around what incomes and valuable products can be sustainably harvested from the forest.

#### **When and how to use and replicate CDF**

1. Its use need to be identified by the management plan
2. Link forest revenue to build CDF
3. Link FUGs with other institutions who provide services
4. Build communities planning skills for developing proposals and soliciting funds
5. Create a mechanism by which forest revenue can be equitably distributed between members and also user groups

***The program should work to bring common understanding of integration of forest based livelihoods into PFM***

## **Group II**

### **Policy on subsidy - how to minimize subsidy?**

- On experiment/action research/ verification of trials of technology
  - o Can partially be subsidised (local inputs to be covered by community)
- For successful technology
  - o Full cost of technology with support from relevant GO (in some cases not including transport costs from research stations outside the zone). Plus linking with source/market, encourage informal technology development and dissemination
- Subsidy should only be used when the whole community is using it. If an individual is benefiting, e.g. pedal pump then it should be a credit that has to be paid back.

### **When and how to use and replicate CDF?**

**When:** CDF or livelihood intervention should be introduced after PFM planning process so as to incorporate it into the PFM plan

**How:**

- CDF can be used as a start up capital (revolving fund)
- Encourage saving and credit by cooperatives (association in Tanzania)
- Linking FUGs with Financial rural institutions

**Replicability:** Based on documentation and information of success and/or failure..

### **Group III**

#### **How to refocus on building skills?**

- PTD - approach or process
- Working with groups than individuals because wider group coverage will be achieved for almost the same expense
- Need market / business skills (not just production skills – as now)
- CDF should not be part of PFM package but used for skill development (financial management)
- Skills (50% importance).
- Technology (50% importance)
- Focus on farm and on forest should be balanced
- Who seeks technology: the community has to be the one seeking the technology
- No reality without risk – community need to learn to manage risk
- What skills exist / what skills are needed ?, the role of the project should be only facilitation

#### **When and how to use and replicate CDF**

- need to form policy/strategy for CDF use
- Capital Grant/ input to coops
- use as revolving fund
- use for purchase technology (credit)
- must be community managed
- used for scaling up technologies

***CDF should be used / invested in forest and should target the poor***

***CDF should be used as a tool to develop skills in finance/ revenue management***

**Looking at the current livelihood activities of the 4 projects – Are we trying to promote too many different activities? Do we have the skills and capacity? Are the activities related to the forest? Would it be better to concentrate on few activities and do them really well?**

<b>Chilimo</b>	<b>Borana</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Poultry</li> <li>2. Tree seed</li> <li><b>3. Bee- keeping</b></li> <li>4. Vegetable promotion</li> <li>5. Small scale/ traditional irrigation enhancement</li> <li>6. Forage promotion</li> <li>7. Pedal pump introduction</li> <li>8. SWC activities (gabion introduction)</li> <li>9. Seed money (open fund) for different activities identified by FUG members (e.g. sheep rearing, sheep fattening, grain marketing etc.)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Beekeeping</b></li> <li>2. Grain banking</li> <li>3. Goat fattening</li> <li>4. Credit and saving</li> <li>5. Agriculture (improved maize var., manure)</li> <li>6. Dry-land - water harvesting</li> <li>7. Horticulture - fruit trees, vegetables?</li> <li>8. Multipurpose trees - Neem</li> </ol>

<b>Bonga</b>	<b>Nou</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agriculture (new crop varieties - potato, farmer trials)</li> <li><b>2. Beekeeping</b></li> <li><b>3. Agro-forestry - on farm demo</b></li> <li><b>4. Forest seedlings - community nursery</b></li> <li>5. Poultry - improved breed</li> <li>6. Sheep rearing and fattening / credit and saving</li> <li><b>7. Cultivation of forest spices</b></li> <li><b>8. Forest coffee production</b></li> <li>9. Irrigation pumps</li> <li>10. Fruit tree (seedlings)</li> <li>11. Vegetable production</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On-farm researches - Improving seed varieties (maize, wheat and beans)</li> <li><b>2. Beekeeping</b></li> <li>3. Dairy goats - improving local breeds</li> </ol>

Only the ones in bold are forest based of those currently being preformed by the respective projects. Therefore, more attention should be paid on how to make the livelihood activities

forest-based. However, this doesn't mean that we should abandon already started non-forestry livelihood activities.

Bonga seems to have more forest based activities than the rest which could be due to the high potential of the forest but more focused assessment should be done to see the reason and ways to do the same in the remaining projects. In addition, we should carefully select the livelihood activities as some of them might have an adverse effect on the forest. Mainly, the selection of technologies should be based on their economic and institutional sustainability. On the other hand, feasibility assessment should be carried out for the proposals that are prepared for livelihood interventions by the FUGs. Equally important is development of a strategy for CDF and how it links to forest based livelihoods for the remaining years.

## **Session IV: Midterm Review Results on Capacity of Partner Organizations**

**Mr. Ben Irwin, Technical Manager, PFMU**

### **Government Capacity**

It was stated that the aim of this component of the PFM is to build the capacity of government staff and rural communities to manage natural resources in a sustainable and equitable way. Here it is aimed to involve government staffs in all the processes of the PFM and create close relationship with the new forest managers. In PY 4, the government staffs are envisaged to be the sole implementers of the programme.

Even though the reviewers didn't have enough time to assess the exact impact of this component, the generally observed breakthroughs were the acceptance of the government staff of the failure of state control forest management and inappropriateness of the old extension approach. In addition, the staffs seem to have confidence in the skill and knowledge of PFM.

Areas of concerns identified for capacity of government partners are:

- Gap between the projects and the government i.e. chronic lack of resources at woreda level.
- E.g. Local governments do not and will not have the capital budget resources to grant CDF to FUGs, so the current approach is not replicable.
- A thorough study into the financial implication recommended including a review of the WAJIB approach.
  - Institutional norms/ weakness of government agencies in relation to PFM
- Are there NGO institutional norms that are important to be transferred to government teams?
- Can PFM be part of the job description of government employees / foresters?

The reviewers suggested that even though task transfer and attitudinal change has been successfully carried out by the PFMP, capacity building on an analysis of the peculiar institutional needs, constraints and weaknesses of the local governments are essential in order to ensure the expansion of the PFM approach.

*Plenary discussions followed on this issue and the major points raised were:*

- We need to know the minimum budget for PFM; we should refine to do it with minimum cost and thus develop a strategy for this
- We should focus on DAs rather than the woreda staff and equip them technically because they are much closer to the community
- We should lobby to include PFM in the job descriptions of government staffs
- We should work to include PFM in the training curriculum of farmers, DA and other agricultural professionals.
- Cost recovery assessment should be examined- e.g. using the WAJIB to pay tax for the forest use
- Government need to start giving technical support as of PY 4 but the handing over process should start now. SOS Sahel had this experience in other projects – it was stated that it took a year to hand over project activities.

### **Community Capacity**

The aim of this component is to form successful FUGs and cooperatives. Thus far the reviewers have recognized that the FUGs are formed and working successfully.

However, the top-down system of the government makes it hard for the community to access any fund or service they desire and hence creates some sort of dependence on the PFMP teams by FUGs. Thus, it is still a challenge to make the community confident and be able to control their destiny. But still, the empowerment of the community through the participatory approach of the programme should not be undermined.

In addition the reviewers have suggested that cooperatives should be looked into because in some instances they don't seem to be the best alternatives. Equity issues and impact of the community training strategy should be assessed to know which ones are the most valuable. The probability of the government replicating this is very unlikely and thus alternatives should be looked into.

Suggestions presented by reviewers include:

- enable community to generate their own revenue rather than depending on CDF;
- Manual should state which training activities are essential and which unjustified.

*Main points raised on the plenary discussion that followed were:*

- Cooperatives get monitoring from cooperative offices unlike FUGs, in addition, FUGs can't get service such as supervision, audition etc, can not sue or be sued or challenge the government. Cooperatives get a lot of services and should not be completely ignored. We should also not forget the government capacity to replicate PFM with cooperatives as a community institution.
- Training won't be an out of budget program for government because they are already there to train the farmers especially in the farmers' schools now at *woreda* level.
- Cooperatives are not for opening bank accounts. They are needed for credit and saving i.e. business orientation. In the case of Chilimo, all are not encouraged to become cooperatives depending on the revenue they have and whether they can pay the share capital. However, if they assist in forest protection, they get some support, e.g. getting wood for house construction.
- Like the livelihood component ideas are confused. The idea of cooperatives was incorporated to make the group a legal entity. If the group is to takeover the forest then they have to be legal and thus the initial idea was not business.
- Equity issue comes up when cooperatives sell plantation and the FUG will be marginalized and probably not get the revenue of the plantation; e.g. in Chilimo, all FUG members are not cooperative members and this brings disparity between FUG members.
- Cooperatives fail because of various reasons - embezzlement, lack of monitoring etc. Now cooperatives are required to be economically viable and most FUGs can't afford that, so can we recommend cooperatives as part of PFM to the government? Or should we lobby for the recognition of FUGs as legal entities?
- Tanzania has an enabling working environment for FUGs, village groups can be empowered and open bank accounts with no problem.
- Need to explore the different ways that can be used to legitimize FUGs; This should be the other key area for policy lobbying

## **Session V: Midterm Review Results on Policy, Networking and Dissemination**

**Ms. Arsema Andargatchew, Communication and Information Officer, PFMU**

The aim of this component was presented to be "to catalyze the adoption of PFM within forest policy and practice by influencing national forestry development through feeding the results of its work into national and regional forestry debates." The approaches and the progresses thus far were:

- Project publications produced in various media and disseminated  
Proceedings and findings of various programmes and field reports have been prepared and distributed.
- Dissemination and promotion of lessons learned and best practice  
Setting up of a PFMU in Addis Ababa, preparation of a newsletter and creation of a website have been successfully carried out
- Policy makers study and forestry project partners forum set up  
This is something that needs to be looked into and initiated during the remaining time of the programme
- Development of Ethiopian and Tanzanian forest policy  
PFMU working on influencing policy through the Ethiopian Foresters Association, Oromia showing good progress in recognition of PFM, but less activity in the SNNPR

### **Suggestions from Reviewers:**

- From consultancy reports to knowledge based on rigorous review and debate of field experiences not based on activity level progress reporting as currently done.
- Production of one manual of best (and worst) practice
- Case studies are a good idea as long as they are rigorous and honest – consider the impact of the work and test assumptions, also document the process from the GO and household perspective – at present dominated by projects narratives
- Success stories should be strictly limited to PR material for fund raising and not be confused with case studies

- GO staff should be encouraged to produce reports – to contribute to the debate and to build their documentation skills

*Major points from plenary discussion were:*

- Having Radio programmes were part of the initial programme, is it possible to consider this and other such as formation of an international forum, e-mail group etc. can this be realized?
- Policy is a major area that needs focus.
- Communication discipline is also important. We need to develop communication between projects, countries etc.
- We should have discussions and visits between projects. Good to organize the biannual exchange meetings as per the plan.
- Present documentations are too general and don't show the process especially for government.
- For some having internet may not necessarily mean they can use it and thus training might be needed
- Web site can be made more user friendly to assist projects get important information
- Staffs should be given the technical support to write documents.

*Following the discussion a group work was done for session III and IV based on the following questions: Recommend programme focus areas for:*

1. Government capacity
  - a. Finance/cost of implementing PFM; institutional issues
  - b. Trainings: need, priorities and cost
  - c. Work on the existing training curriculum's
2. Community capacity
  - a. Cooperatives: What are we promoting/ what do we need to do?
  - b. Training: needs and priorities; cost
3. Networking and Information
  - a. Policy, lobby - on the thematic areas; PFM, Community institution and PFM guideline
  - b. More effective documents/ publications

## **Group I**

### **Government capacity**

#### **Finance:**

- fund raising skills - in the case of Tanzania
- reducing logistic by concentrating on Development Agents (DAs)

Condition: No new implications than the existing government policy (e.g. per diem)

#### **Institution:**

- The project to be facilitator through joint planning at district level
- staff turnover - to concentrate at DA level and have proper documentation
- reflection on PFM process

#### **Training/ skills needed**

- Participatory planning skills
  - o PRA tools
  - o PFRA
  - o Communication
  - o Gender and conflict management
- recording and documentation
- Institution management
- Business management

NB. this is unavoidable, the government should include in its training programme

## **Group II**

### **Community Capacity**

Major areas of Training needs

#### *Technical issues*

- participatory skills
- Forest management skills
- Forest resource utilization (revenue generation)

#### *Financial and Institutional management issues*

- Record keeping
- Auditing (activity and financial)
- Minutes and Reporting

#### *Empowerment*

- Good governance
- Equity
- Rights and responsibilities
- Experience sharing (establish FUGs forum)

#### **Strategy**

- Critical assessment of training needs in relation to government capacity to deliver
- Training should be provided locally in the community with minimum cost
- Have / include PFM training into farmers training curriculum
- Work towards including PFM in DA training curriculum

#### **Cooperatives**

- Special and immediate study of viability of coops as important and replicable institutions?
- Collective engagement of all - stakeholders to lobby and advocate for an appropriate and viable community institution.

### **Group III**

#### **Networking and Information**

##### **Policy and lobby**

- Critical review of policy and involvement of local staffs
- Decentralization as a strategy
- Develop a clear strategy for policy lobbying
- Positively approach policy debates
- Use informal network/ influential people (including local people)
- Carry out visits
- Do formal discussions (regional/ zone/ and district)
- Carry out community level discussions
- Embrace others working in this area such as GTZ
- Involve communities in policy making processes
- Contact with legal groups for opportunities in regards to legalizing FUGs
- Cooperatives vs. association need to be agreed upon among staffs before lobbying begins

##### **Documentation/ Publication**

- Try something different - creative, innovative etc. such as foresters fair
- Involvement of all projects for contribution
- Include policy briefs
- Produce manual/ handbook, using process/ experience papers
- Include case studies
- On time production of quarterly newsletter

What do People want to read in the newsletter? (This was posed to the participants and the replies were as follows)

Target should be both internal and external and should include:

- page of links/ contacts of other actors;
- external feedback such as MTR;
- make it exciting, interesting, include good pictures;
- capture lessons learnt and innovations;
- Show major issues of PFM;
- Other projects niche.

*This brought the discussion on the MTR to an end. The participants identified issues that were not addressed by the MTR but also essential to look into as follows:*

- How should we proceed?
- Consider the viability aspect - how can we address viability and sustainability?
- Are we overstretching ourselves?
- Livelihood are identified by communities – how to select among them
- Too much work, less time to think - refocus
- Do we have the right skills and professionals to do all these?
- Have to select what we can do within the remaining time.

Participants have finally agreed to further discuss issues raised at project level and critically review in relation to the project realities at the ground. Furthermore, it was emphasised that the programme should focus on being a learning organisation.

## **Session VI: Workshop Closing**

**Mr. Feyera Abdi, Country Director, SOS Sahel International (UK)**

Mr. Feyera hoped that the reflections have helped each participant to see what has been done thus far and what needs to be changed or improved. He further stated that this is probably a partnership first in its kind and what the programme leaves behind matters most. The review, in his opinion, was made at the right time to assess the need for corrective measures and thus projects have to be realistic in choosing what is doable within the remaining years. Feyera stressed on the opportunity this workshop has created on building good team spirit and closed the workshop by saying that he expects the projects to take the outcomes of the discussions from the workshop seriously and implement them accordingly.

## Annex

### List of Participants

<b>No.</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
1.	Alfei Daniel	FARM-Africa	Nou JFM Project, Tanzania
2.	Arsema Andargatchew	SOS Sahel	PFMU, Addis Ababa
3.	Ben Irwin	SOS Sahel	PFMU, Addis Ababa
4.	Cassian Sianga	FARM-Africa	Nou JFM Project, Tanzania
5.	Efrem Lemu	FARM-Africa	Chilimo PFM Project
6.	Feyera Abdi	SOS Sahel	Addis Ababa
7.	Luwiza W/Gebriel	FARM-Africa	Bonga PFM Project
8.	Masota Abel	FARM-Africa	Nou JFM Project, Tanzania
9.	Mesfin Tekle	Gov. BoA - FARM-Africa	Bonga PFM Project
10.	Muktar Abdula	SOS Sahel	Addis Ababa
11.	Olani Edessa	FARM-Africa	Chilimo PFM Project
12.	Olika Belachew	FARM-Africa	Chilimo PFM Project
13.	Sally Crafter	FARM-Africa	Addis Ababa
14.	Semalign Belay	SOS Sahel	Borana PFM Project
15.	Solomon Hailu	FARM-Africa	Bonga PFM Project
16.	Wubishet Adugna	FARM-Africa	Bonga PFM Project
17.	Zelalem Temesgen	FARM-Africa	PFMU, Addis Ababa
18.	Ziyenu Lemma	FARM-Africa	Bonga PFM Project