

# **Evaluation of the work of the Forest Governance Learning Group 2009-13**

**Peter Branney**

**January 2014**



**CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Methodology for the Evaluation	2
1.2 Information and Data Sources for the Evaluation	2
1.3 The Conceptual Framework for FGLG	3
<b>2 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL APPROACH OF FGLG</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Global Trends in Forest Governance	5
2.2 The FGLG Model and its Rationale	6
2.2.1 Evaluation of the Underlying Theory of Change	6
2.2.2 Evaluation of the FGLG log-frame	9
<b>3 EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF FGLG</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1 Overall Project Performance	10
3.2 Quality of Planning and Reporting	19
3.3 Documentation and Other Outputs	21
3.4 Cross-country Learning and Experience Sharing	22
3.5 Gender and Generation Issues	23
3.6 Assessment of Assumptions and Risks	23
3.7 Funding and Accounting Arrangements	27
3.8 Performance of Main International Project Partners	27
3.8.1 IIED	27
3.8.2 RECOFTC	28
3.8.3 EC	28
3.9 Performance Against Key Evaluation Criteria	29
<b>4 EVALUATION OF THE IMPACTS OF FGLG</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 FGLG Impacts (on forest governance outcomes)	31
4.2 International Level Outcome Impacts	35
4.3 FGLG Impacts (on people and forests)	36
4.4 Sustainability	36
<b>5 LESSONS LEARNT</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1 Overall Effectiveness	38
5.2 FGLG Teams	38
5.3 FGLG Approach	38
5.4 FGLG in an International Context	39
5.5 Methodologies and Innovation	40
5.6 Constraints of the FGLG Approach	40
5.7 Project Design and Management	41
<b>6 RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>42</b>
6.1 Consolidate and Disseminate Lessons from the Learning Group Approach	42
6.2 Analyse the Effectiveness of Different Tactics	42
6.3 Enhance IT Usage	42
6.4 Assess Country-wise Forest Governance Status	43
6.5 Invest in Impact Studies	43
6.6 Establish a Central Archive/Repository of FGLG Material	43
6.7 Enhance the Role of IIED (International Project Facilitator)	43
6.8 Improve the Level of Donor (EC) Engagement	44
6.9 Improve Linkages with other Projects (including EC Projects and Others)	44

6.10	Involve Existing FGLG Teams in New Project Development	44
	<b>ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE</b>	<b>45</b>
	<b>ANNEX 2 – COUNTRY REPORTS (3 COUNTRIES VISITED)</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>ANNEX 3 – PERSONS MET (OR INVOLVED IN EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS)</b>	<b>62</b>
	<b>ANNEX 4 – A FRAMEWORK FOR FOREST GOVERNANCE</b>	<b>64</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABIODES	Association for Biodiversity and Sustainable Development (Mozambique)
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CF	Community Forest
DFID	Department for International Development (UK Government)
EC	European Commission
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (of the United Nations)
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Agreement
FES	Foundation for Ecological Security
FGLG	Forest Governance Learning Group
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement and Governance through Trade
FORMIN	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Finnish)
FRA	Forest Rights Act
GFP	Growing Forest Partnerships
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LTSI	Land and Timber Services International
LUPA	Association for Community Development (Mozambique)
MICOA	Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (Mozambique)
MINAG	Ministry of Agriculture
NAPCC	National Action Plan on Climate Change
NESDA	Network for Environment and Sustainable Development (Cameroon)
RCDC	Regional Centre for Development Cooperation
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Centre
REDD	Reducing Emissions through Deforestation and Degradation
SAPCC	State Action Plan on Climate Change
TFD	The Forest Dialogue
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreement
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1 - Project Narrative Terminology	3
Table 2 - Critical factors for FGLG effectiveness	8
Table 3 – Performance against log-frame outputs and output indicators	10
Table 4 - Evaluation by Output (summary)	18
Table 5 – Types and assessment of Project outputs (deliverables)	21
Table 6 - Assessment and evaluation of log-frame risks and assumptions	24
Table 7 - Impact against outcome indicators from both Project phases 2004-13	32
Table 8 - Significant outcomes of FGLG countries	34

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This evaluation study was undertaken with considerable support and logistical assistance from the Forest Team of the Natural Resources Group at IIED. Special thanks for all the assistance and advice go to James Mayers, Duncan Macqueen, Elaine Morrison and Leianne Rolington. The evaluation process itself involved communicating with a large number of individuals who had been directly involved with FGLG or who were external experts in their fields relating to forest governance. The many people who gave up time to meet or talk with me are listed in Annex 3. My apologies if I have inadvertently missed anyone out. Thanks to all those people – I hope I have been able to capture your diverse views and suggestions in a balanced way in this report. Finally, I'm grateful to David Sanmiguel of the Forestry Sector Unit C.2 – FLEGT and REDD+ at the Office for Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) – EuropeAid in Brussels for coordinating a presentation on this evaluation on January 30<sup>th</sup> 2014 and for those who attended (also listed in Annex 3).

Peter Branney, Edinburgh, 2014  
peterbranney@msn.com

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Introduction

The Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) is an informal alliance of in-country teams and international partners, currently active in seven African and three Asian countries<sup>1</sup> with additional more recent actions in China. It is facilitated globally by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) based in UK, with some additional regional facilitation support (for 2 countries in Asia) from the Regional Community Forestry Training Centre (RECOFTC) in Thailand. The FGLG initiative broadly aims to support country level teams to influence aspects of forest governance in their respective countries by using a range of approaches and methodologies and move towards 'good forest governance' that will enhance the contribution of the forest sector to eradicating poverty, enhancing human rights, improving livelihoods and increasing natural resource sustainability.

The initiative began in 2003, and secured EC funding in 2005. A second phase of the FGLG initiative – the '*Social Justice in Forestry*' Project - started in 2009 and finished at the end of 2013. This second phase has been funded by the EC, under contract number EuropeAid/ENV/2008/151966/TPS, with some additional support from DFID. Total funding over the period 2005-2013 has been approximately € 5 million (€ 2.5 million during the second phase from 2009-13).

This report gives the findings of an independent evaluation of the work of the initiative from 2009-13 with some additional assessment of its overall impact since 2005. The main tasks of the evaluation were:

- i. To assess the approach of the FGLG initiative
- ii. To assess the performance of the FGLG initiative
- iii. To assess the impacts of the FGLG initiative (project outcomes and wider impacts)
- iv. To draw out lessons from the experiences of the FGLG initiative
- v. To make recommendations based on the evaluation

### Evaluation of the Approach

The evaluation found that the FGLG initiative's focus on forest governance is in line with current global thinking and intervention logic on forests that concludes that governance issues are fundamental to forest conservation, sustainable forest management and alleviating poverty amongst forest dependent people. In fact the Project itself and its national and international partners have contributed to bringing forest governance issues to the forefront of the international discourse on forests over the past decade to the point where forest governance is now recognised as being critical to achieving social justice in forests. The Project therefore works in a domain that can contribute to achieving important global impacts.

The underlying theory of change that defines the Project's approach is as follows: Teams or groups of individuals from both civil society and government are established in each participating country. These individuals have specific capacities, experiences, knowledge and networks relevant to the forest governance issues of the country. They are supported by the Project to build their capacities to utilise a range of different methods (sometimes called tactics) to influence forest governance in the country. It is expected that this will lead to positive shifts in policies, laws, rights, regulatory frameworks, institutional arrangements, citizen participation etc. that will have direct benefits for forest dependent people i.e. those who are invariably marginalised and without a direct voice in the forest governance discourse.

The most important lesson from this evaluation is that the FGLG approach is valid and meets a particular need in terms of its influence on forest governance. The approach is characterised by being innovative, informal, individual and influential. Experience has shown it to be effective in

---

<sup>1</sup> Ghana, Cameroon, Malawi, Tanzania, South Africa, Mozambique, Uganda, India, Indonesia & Vietnam.



influencing forest governance and contributing towards social justice. Because of their track record, FGLG members in most participating countries are increasingly being recognised as appropriate participants in a variety of forest governance processes. The approach, emphasising as it does the informal and individual elements of governance can complement other more formal governance processes (including REDD+ and VPAs) that tend to be more structured and controlled and are often adequately funded from elsewhere. Since changes in forest governance rarely take place solely as a result of planned and structured processes, individuals and their actions can be influential when provided with sufficient support for targeted action. The Project has built the confidence and capacity of key individuals enabling them to engage more effectively in both formal and informal processes in forest governance and sector reform at a national level and has enabled collaborative action and mutual support amongst individual actors from different institutions. For a relatively small outlay of about € 25,000 per year it has proven possible for the FGLG in-country teams to draw in expertise from different sectors into the national forest governance discourse and provide key individuals with an informal setting for mutual support and collaborative action capitalising on their own personal networks and institutional bases. The flexibility and autonomy of the FGLG teams in deciding how to use their resources to the greatest effect is a major strength of the approach.

Gaps in the approach include a need to support greater awareness and voice of forest dependent people to be able to better articulate their demands for better governance (some countries have done this through downward linkages with field-based projects). Another important factor for improving the sustainability of the approach is to invest more in institutionalising the body of practice represented by FGLG teams to ensure that this does not dissipate at the end of the Project.

A critical issue for the Project is the rather unclear targeting of country-level actions due to a lack of systematic assessment of forest governance at the start of the initiative to identify key weaknesses and opportunities. This issue is also reflected in the Project log-frame which is insufficiently specific at the country level e.g. country level indicators are lacking. By tackling these weaker areas of the Project approach it would be possible to contribute to identifying and achieving clearer impacts – especially at outcome level i.e. changes in forest governance. A number of critical factors contributing to FGLG effectiveness are identified.

### **Evaluation of Project Performance**

Analysis of log-frame outputs and output indicators shows that 3 out of 4 Project outputs have largely been delivered, whilst 1 output has been partly delivered. However, this largely positive evaluation of the achievement of Project deliverables has to be moderated by taking into account the relatively weak log-frame indicators that are used and the difficulty of objectively verifying them. Measurable country level outputs and related indicators are not defined, therefore performance can only be assessed against the rather broad global indicators (specific objective indicators) and output indicators neither of which give a good picture of the country level achievements (which in some cases are significant).

Particularly strong performance against output indicators includes better policies and procedures favouring local forest control; enhanced multi-stakeholder engagement in forest legality and other decision-making processes; all aspects of engagement with national REDD + processes and the use of various media aimed at influencing debates and governance for social justice. FGLG has performed less well against indicators for actions aimed at bringing greater areas of forest under sustainable management controlled by community institutions; initiatives for putting forest information into the public domain and establishing greater synergy between adaptation and mitigation forestry. The weaker performance in these areas is largely a result of lack of specific engagement by country FGLG teams in these areas rather than their actions proving to be ineffective. Under output 4 the Project's actions have contributed to raising the profile and concept of social justice in forestry globally within international networks and learning processes. The recent establishment of the China-Africa learning platform on forest governance (also under output 4) has been an important milestone for the Project although

coming as it did at the final phase it has not yet been possible to fully develop this initiative. However its establishment represents a solid foundation which could be built on in future given appropriate support.

### **Evaluation of Impacts**

FGLG has made a moderate contribution to changes in aspects of forest governance over the period 2005-13 that has varied considerably from country to country both in terms of the level of change and the areas of governance affected. Considering the complexity of the issues concerned and the extremely broad scope of forest governance this is a significant achievement for a small Project. However, despite the Project's positive performance against output indicators, Project supported actions have not been sufficient to achieve the intended level of governance improvement at overall outcome level (measured against the specific objective indicators). At country level, some highlighted governance impacts include:

- In **India** the Project has contributed to the formulation and subsequent rules and guidelines for the Forest Rights Act (2008) – especially the promotion of community forest rights. This has established the legal rights for forest dependent and tribal people to utilise local forest resources and will increasingly have an important impact on social justice. Earlier FGLG India was able to influence the National Planning Commission to recognise the importance of NTFPs for national planning and development thus releasing more funds to support this.
- In **Indonesia** the Project has strengthened the country's REDD+ process and programme by linking the national programme to sub-national (actual implementation level) and by increasing transparency, stakeholder participation in the REDD+ process. As a result, REDD+ is now much more likely to be implemented in a way that contributes to social justice and local needs especially as a result of the existence of an active network of FGLG 'alumni'.
- In **Malawi** the Project has provided evidence to influence discussions on policies and government actions in connection with the charcoal trade. This has led to an understanding of the legitimacy of the charcoal trade and its importance for local communities. Once put into action in the form of supportive programmes and regulations this will enable local people to establish charcoal enterprises from sustainably managed forests for the first time thus contributing to their livelihoods. FGLG has also contributed to ensuring that the REDD+ process is more transparent and accountable to civil society.
- In **Mozambique** the Project raised civil society and media awareness on the illegal timber trade that was leading to over-exploitation of forests and has led to action by government to combat corruption and engage in discussions with Chinese logging companies and timber traders for the first time. This has also had impacts for the local people who depend on these forest resources
- In **South Africa** the Project has initiated a shift on the government's approach to working with outside stakeholders by organising and supporting small forest growers to lobby for a more favourable institutional and regulatory environment that will stimulate small-scale forest enterprises. This has been strengthened by the possibility of a government-sponsored enterprise support programme.

At international level there has been a strong level of co-operation between FGLG and a range of international processes and initiatives in the forest sector including REDD+, FLEG-T, VPA, The Forests Dialogue, Growing Forests Partnerships, Forest Connect, African Model Forests Network and PROFOR. This level of cross-learning, collaboration and communication has increased the profile of FGLG, has facilitated shared learning between different processes and has enabled a series of co-funded events, studies, reports, trainings, workshops and actions to take place within the participating countries that would otherwise have not happened had FGLG been working in isolation. Whilst FGLG has clearly benefited from this high level of

collaborative working, it is less clear what actual impacts FGLG has been able to have on these processes, many of which are better funded and more extensive than FGLG.

There has been insufficient time for the impacts of the recently initiated China-Africa forest governance learning platform to be demonstrated – although this remains a valid area for engagement that is very relevant to the participating countries (in Africa). There are now a number of initiatives involving international organisations or donors (EU, IUCN, WWF etc.) for linking Africa with China. Careful consideration is needed to ensure that the China-Africa forest governance learning platform with the support of IIED fills an appropriate niche in this increasingly crowded field (the social justice in forestry angle provides the most potential for this).

Concerning Project sustainability, the evaluation concludes that most of the country teams established under FGLG would persist in one form or another after the end of the Project and in a way that would allow the FGLG approach to continue to operate. Often this is likely to be in a rather more informal and unstructured way than at present, but the social capital accumulated by the teams is a significant contributing factor for this.

### **Lessons and Recommendations**

Lessons identified by the evaluation include:

- That the FGLG approach is valid and can be effective in influencing forest governance, especially by engaging with and complementing other on-going and more formal processes such as VPA processes or REDD +.
- For a relatively small outlay of about € 25,000 per year in a country it is possible to draw in forest governance expertise from different sectors into the national forest governance discourse and provide key individuals with an informal setting for mutual support and collaborative action capitalising on their own personal networks and institutional bases.
- That a particular strength of the FGLG approach is its somewhat informal and more individually-oriented approach to forest governance reform.
- A number of critical factors contribute to the effectiveness of FGLG teams, including careful development of autonomy, quality of members, role of members (government and civil society) and Project hosting arrangements.
- Constraints to the FGLG approach include: insufficient time commitments of FGLG members; funding limitations; lack of country-level targeting and unclear incentives for FGLG members to participate.

It would be useful to develop a follow-up project amongst existing, and potentially with new, FGLG partners. There has now been sufficient experience to demonstrate that the approach can have positive impact on forest governance and consequently on social justice. The FGLG approach supports and is complementary to other approaches and processes that aim to enhance social justice in forests and can contribute to enhancing their effectiveness in a relatively cost-effective way. Ultimately a multi-pronged strategy is required for creating sector reform and this includes the FGLG approach.

The evaluation concludes with a number of recommendations for the future including:

- i. Consolidate lessons from the learning group approach
- ii. Analyse the effectiveness of different tactics
- iii. Enhance IT usage
- iv. Assess country-wise forest governance status
- v. Invest in impact studies
- vi. Establish a central archive/repository of FGLG material
- vii. Enhance the role of IIED (international project facilitator)
- viii. Improve the level of donor (EC) engagement
- ix. Improve linkages with other projects (including EC projects and others)
- x. Involve existing FGLG teams in new project development

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) is an informal alliance of in-country teams and international partners, currently active in seven African and three Asian countries<sup>2</sup> with additional more recent actions in China. It is facilitated globally by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) based in UK and with some additional regional facilitation support (for 2 countries in Asia) from the Regional Community Forestry Training Centre (RECOFTC) in Thailand. The Project aims to support country level teams to influence various aspects of forest governance in their respective countries by using a range of approaches and methodologies. The purpose of this is to move towards ‘good forest governance’ that will enhance the contribution of the forest sector in these 10 countries to eradicating poverty, enhancing human rights, improving livelihoods and increasing natural resource sustainability.

After a short inception phase starting in 2003 the FGLG was supported from 2005-09 by the EC and the Dutch and British governments. Subsequently it has been supported under a further phase of EC funding under Contract Number EuropeAid/ENV/2008/151966/TPS with some support from DFID. This EC funding originates from the Thematic Programme for Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources, including Energy which forms part of the EU’s response to help countries tackle the increasing environmental challenges and contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal on environment. This second phase of the Project started in 2009 and will be completed at the end of 2013. Total funding over the period 2005-2013 has been approximately € 5 million (€ 2.5 million during the second phase from 2009-13).

The current phase of support from the EC is formally entitled ‘Social Justice in Forestry’. Although this name is rarely used in documents and reports, the concept of social justice in forestry i.e. the need to remove inequity in the sector has remained as the fundamental driving force to the FGLG approach. The terms ‘Forest Governance Learning Group’ or ‘the Project’ are better understood in the participating countries and these are generally used when referring to this project and in this evaluation report.

In 2009 the FGLG was evaluated by an independent consultant who outlined the results that initiative had achieved over the four year period 2005-09. This further independent evaluation of the FGLG initiative was conducted during September and October 2013 i.e. towards the end of the present phase. The evaluation’s scope is to assess FGLG’s overall impact over the current phase i.e. from 2009-2013 and also to give a longer term view of the impact that each country team has achieved over the last nine years.

While the aims, objectives and approach of the second phase differed from the first phase, forest governance issues remain central to the Project although there have been some shifts in emphasis between different governance themes both at country level and also at international level. Within FGLG participating countries the approach has also shifted from the development of practical tools for the use of country teams and capacity development of country team members during the first phase to the development of strategies with specific aims e.g. to improve the legality of forest products or to ensure that initiatives in the forest sector that aim to combat climate change can also contribute to improving forest governance, during the current phase.

The objective of this independent evaluation is to assess the performance, achievements and impacts in relation to the overall goal, specific objective, outputs and activities of the Project. The evaluation includes an assessment of Project design for addressing its stated goal, purpose and outputs; the Project’s performance, achievements and impacts; Project implementation, management and administration; lessons learned and recommendations for the future.

Annex 1 gives detailed terms of reference for this evaluation and includes five main tasks which can be summarised as:

- i. To assess the approach of the FGLG initiative

---

<sup>2</sup> Ghana, Cameroon, Malawi, Tanzania, South Africa, Mozambique, Uganda, India, Indonesia & Vietnam.

- ii. To assess the performance of the FGLG initiative
- iii. To assess the impacts of the FGLG initiative (project outcomes and wider impacts)
- iv. To draw out lessons from the experiences of the FGLG initiative
- v. To make recommendations based on the evaluation

This evaluation report is structured around these 5 tasks which are covered in chapters 2-6.

### **1.1 Methodology for the Evaluation**

The FGLG initiative is geographically wide-ranging and diverse in its country-wise approaches and achievements. This makes evaluation particularly complex - especially as the limited time frame did not permit visits to all participating countries. A number of evaluation methodologies were used including:

- i. Selection of a sample of 3 of the 10 participating countries<sup>3</sup> for actual country visits (in consultation with IIED)
- ii. Meetings and discussions with key individuals during country visits including FGLG team members and others
- iii. Short workshops with FGLG teams and other key individuals involved in forest governance (in the 3 countries visited only)
- iv. A field visit - only 1 (in Mozambique) was possible during the short country visit
- v. Comprehensive desk review of reports, documents and other materials (including websites and videos) including those prepared by IIED, FGLG teams and partners (e.g. RECOFTC)
- vi. Phone discussions (based around an open questionnaire) with FGLG members from countries not actually visited
- vii. Email communication and phone discussions with key individuals concerned with forest governance globally
- viii. Meetings and phone calls with IIED staff
- ix. Self-evaluations completed in a prepared format by all country teams

The 3 countries visited during the evaluation (Cameroon, Mozambique and India) provided ample opportunity for in-depth discussions on the work of FGLG with country team members, other forest sector stakeholders and (to a more limited extent) with local community representatives. Consequently a more thorough understanding and evaluation of the Project was possible for those countries (3 short country reports are Annexed). Whilst comments and evaluation assessments have been made for these 3 countries it was not the intention to rank or compare the performance of all 10 countries because of the very different level of understanding that was possible between those countries visited and those that were not. This report therefore represents an evaluation of the whole FGLG initiative although examples and lessons are drawn from specific countries. Country specific outcomes have been included in summary form in chapter 4.

Before finalising the report, a presentation of the main findings was given at the EuropeAid Office for Development and Cooperation, Forestry Sector in Brussels on 30th January 2014.

### **1.2 Information and Data Sources for the Evaluation**

FGLG does not aim to deliver direct and measurable impacts for target communities (unlike field-based projects). As a result, its information and reporting systems focus more in actions and outcomes rather than impacts and Project reports contain adequate information on the actions implemented by country teams. At global and regional levels activity-based information is available from IIED and RECOFTC. The impacts on forest governance of these actions under the four Project outputs are documented in Project reports - mainly in narrative rather than quantified form. The FGLG initiative as a whole is characterised by a general absence of country-specific baseline indicators and forest governance monitoring indicators making it difficult to systematically and objectively assess outcomes and impacts. This is partly because it aims to influence forest governance and governance processes rather than delivering results at grass roots level.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cameroon, Mozambique and India

The lack of clearly well-defined outcomes and outcome indicators for each country could have been addressed by carrying out more systematic governance assessment using an available methodology<sup>4</sup>. This would have involved a simple consultative process to identify several key forest governance indicators for each participating country (possibly 4 or 5 per country). These indicators would relate to priority areas of governance for the country and would be quantifiable and easily measurable. This country-wise analysis would have then provided a more comprehensive reference system for analysing the initial governance status, the weaker governance areas that FGLG could tackle and would have also provided a systematic means for monitoring forest governance shifts. Assessment of forest governance at country level needs to be regularly updated to ensure that planned actions remain valid and to monitor both positive and negative shifts. At global level (for the 10 participating countries) this would not be possible (hence the narrative and essentially non-quantitative outcome indicators in the Project log-frame). Consequently evaluation of the outcomes and impacts of the FGLG initiative is based largely on a range of views and perspectives rather than on quantitative information.

There is also a lack of clarity in the terminology used in Project documentation and reports. This has created confusion in Project reporting between ‘outcomes’ i.e. what the FGLG Project aims to achieve in terms of changes in forest governance, and ‘impacts’ i.e. what effects these changes in forest governance have had on the target groups of people and on forests. There is also frequent confusion in annual country reports between actions carried out under FGLG and the outputs or ‘results’ of these. Chapters 3 & 4 of this report try to clarify this somewhat confusing situation by separating the assessment of actions and results (in Chapter 3) from assessment of outcomes i.e. impacts on forest governance, and impacts on people and forests (in Chapter 4). Table 1 is also included to clarify this terminology.

Table 1 - Project Narrative Terminology

<b>Log-frame Level</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
Activities/Actions to needed to achieve the <b>expected results</b>	What the Project has actually done or contributed to e.g. workshops, trainings, studies, media productions; reports; policy briefs; data analysis, media engagement, attendance at national and international events etc.
Outputs (deliverables at the Project’s <b>expected results</b> level)	The results of these actions i.e. greater public or media awareness on critical governance issues; greater levels of participation in governance processes; enhanced capacities and understanding; better coordination between government and civil society; political commitment etc.
Outcomes (achievement of the Project’s <b>specific objective</b> )	The changes that have actually taken place in terms of policies and processes in forest governance e.g. greater levels of community rights; reduced corruption; greater targeting of poor and marginalised groups in policies and legislation; institutional reforms; greater transparency and accountability; more effective delivery of programmes etc.
Impacts (at the level of the <b>overall objective</b> )	What the effects of these outcomes have been on the target people (usually poor forest dependent people) and/or on the forests themselves.

*Note: Terms on bold denote those used in the log-frame (EC terminology)*

### 1.3 The Conceptual Framework for FGLG

The FGLG initiative is based around a conceptual framework otherwise called the theory of change that has underpinned the Project design and its log-frame, the implementation approach and the make-up and functioning of the country FGLG teams in both phases of the Project since 2003. This framework can be briefly summarised as:

Teams or groups constituted of individuals from both civil society and government are established in each participating country. These individuals have specific capacities, experiences, knowledge and networks relevant to the forest governance issues of the country (but not necessarily working in the forest sector). They are supported by the Project to build their capacities to utilise a range of different

<sup>4</sup> For example: PROFOR/FAO (2011) Framework for Assessing and Monitoring Forest Governance

methods (sometimes called tactics) to influence forest governance in the country. It is expected that this will lead to positive shifts in policies, laws, rights, regulatory frameworks, institutional arrangements, citizen participation etc. that will have direct benefits for forest dependent people i.e. those who are invariably marginalised and without a direct voice in the forest governance discourse. The validity and effectiveness of this conceptual framework based on implementation experiences of FGLG over 2 phases is discussed in Chapter 2.

## 2 EVALUATION OF THE OVERALL APPROACH OF FGLG

### 2.1 Global Trends in Forest Governance

*Reflect on the context of forest governance action and discourse in the countries involved in the FGLG initiative since 2003 and assess the general premise, political timeliness and appropriateness of the approach.*

The concept of improved forest governance and the critical need for sector reforms to enhance forest sector contributions to national and international development goals receives much greater prominence nowadays than was the case in 2003 when the Project began. This greater recognition of the importance of forest governance (especially at national level) as a contributing factor to social justice has been in part a result of the operation and actions of FGLG teams in the participating countries. Thus, since 2003, the forest governance discourse and actions aimed at tackling key governance issues have increased in importance in all 10 participating countries and is expected to continue into the future. Reasons for this include:

- Participating countries have large remaining forest areas and their forest sectors are major contributors to national economic development (often with potential to contribute more e.g. with greater investment)
- Participating countries have large numbers of people who depend, at least partially, on forests for their livelihoods<sup>5</sup>. Although this number will decline gradually as a result of economic development this is a slow process. For the foreseeable future large numbers of poor and marginalised people living in forests or at the forest fringes will continue to have little or no voice in the way the forests on which they depend are governed. Forests are important resources for sustaining and enhancing people's livelihoods, lifting them out of poverty and acting as safety nets in times of crisis. Therefore enhancing forest governance will contribute to social justice and reducing poverty and inequity
- The link between forests and global climate change has increasingly been highlighted over the past decade. Forests are now widely recognised for their potential to mitigate climate change (acting as carbon sinks) and conversely by contributing to enhanced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions when they are degraded or lost. Forests are themselves vulnerable to the effects of climate change. They can also act as locally important means for enhancing the resilience of rural people to climate change by providing physical barriers that control soil erosion, flooding etc., by protecting water catchments and water sources and by controlling micro-climates. In addition, they can produce a diverse range of products to sustain, enhance and diversify local people's livelihoods and thus reduce their vulnerability to climate change and extreme climate events.
- Forests in the participating countries remain critical and vulnerable hotspots of biodiversity that have global as well as national significance.

In all 10 participating countries there have been important changes in forest governance over the past decade. These vary from country to country. Amongst the most important are: increasing forest areas coming under decentralised management in the form of participatory forestry models conferring greater rights to forest people; development of systems for ensuring the legality of traded forest products such as the FLEG-T/VPA process for countries exporting timber to the EC and elsewhere; increasing commercial importance of international timber export and trade from African and Asian countries for the newly emerged super-economies of China and India; increasing political willingness to discuss and engage on issues of corruption in the forest sector; increasing attention given to biomass energy; development of national programmes and plans for reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from deforestation and degradation (REDD) and the associated links to international carbon markets and emissions trading and, in some countries such as Uganda, Ghana, South Africa, institutional reforms of national forestry agencies. Improved forest governance is an essential component and driving force for all these changes. Therefore FGLG works within and contributes to a dynamic governance

---

<sup>5</sup> Globally about 1.6 billion people are at least partially dependent on forests and about 60 million of these are wholly dependent. UNEP (2009) Vital forests



framework in a sector with important implications for poverty, climate change, economic development and human rights.

The increasing contributions of major bilateral and multi-lateral donors in some of these critical governance-related fields over the past 10 years creates new opportunities and openings for productive collaboration that can achieve shifts in forest governance. Similarly, the increasing levels of private investment in the forestry sector in many of the participating countries whilst having some potentially negative implications for forest governance also creates a major opportunity for moving towards better governance that can have impacts for poor people and forests.

The FGLG focus on forest governance is in line with current global thinking and intervention logic on forests that concludes that sector governance issues are fundamental to forest conservation, sustainable forest management and alleviating poverty amongst forest dependent people. Indeed, the Project itself and its national and international partners have contributed to bringing forest governance issues to the forefront of the international discourse on forests over the past decade to the point where forest governance is now recognised as being critical to achieving social justice in forests. The Project is therefore working in a valid domain and sub-sector and one that can contribute to achieving important global impacts. In fact, many individuals involved in FGLG country teams have gone on to contribute to international forest governance initiatives and processes. Their hands-on experiences of the tangled realities of national-level governance reform processes have been a particularly useful adjunct to the more theoretical and academic perspectives that otherwise tend to prevail.

FGLG is particularly focused on creating the space and political will for the necessary governance changes to take place through a process of influencing and changing attitudes amongst key stakeholders including governments, politicians, the media and civil society. At country level, FGLG has been flexible enough to capitalise on and take the advantage of new opportunities brought about by some of these global influences. This is well demonstrated by FGLG's ability to engage with and add value to REDD processes in many participating countries (especially over the past 5 years). India provides a specific country-level example the ability of FGLG to engage with the development and enactment of new forest legislation i.e. the Forest Rights Act. FGLG is well positioned to contribute to forest governance outcomes even with its relatively limited resources through collaboration and partnership action.

## **2.2 The FGLG Model and its Rationale**

*Assess the approach and design of the initiative, its theory of change and log-frame.*

### **2.2.1 Evaluation of the Underlying Theory of Change**

The underlying theory of change for FGLG described in section 1.3 was discussed widely during the evaluation with FGLG teams and with external global forest governance 'experts'. Changes in forest governance rarely take place solely as a result of planned and structured processes. Invariably, individual actions, influences and networks are also important contributing factors for enhancing forest governance and sometimes are significant driving forces for change. Several global governance experts pointed out that in their experience individuals and their networks can make a real difference to governance and reform processes. The FGLG approach recognises this by providing support and capacity development for these less formal processes. FGLG has built the confidence and capacity of key individuals enabling them to engage more effectively in both formal and informal processes in forest governance and reform at a national level, and importantly, has enabled collaborative action and mutual support amongst individual actors from different institutions. It has also promoted the concept of 'safe space' where different stakeholders and individuals can come together to discuss and learn away from the formal working environment of their respective institutional bases and away from the more confrontational processes of activism and lobbying that tend to lead to entrenched positions and unwillingness to compromise.

The FGLG approach, emphasising its support for informal and individual elements of forest governance processes, was considered to be innovative and largely untested when it was developed in 2003. Since then, FGLG teams have been increasingly valued through their demonstrated actions and effects as effective and important actors in national forest governance and sector reform processes. FGLG has thus been able to complement the more formal processes that are already underway in different countries such as REDD or VPAs which tend to be more pre-defined and controlled (and are

often already funded from elsewhere). FGLG adds value and brings in additional expertise and influence to these processes. The flexibility of FGLG means that the country teams and concerned individuals can themselves develop and respond quickly to new opportunities and governance entry points as they occur. There are many examples where planned actions (at the start of the Project) have been overtaken by events and new opportunities and under these circumstances the country level actions of the FGLG teams have proved to be dynamic, opportunistic and under some circumstances catalytic.

However, the underlying theory of change does have some gaps. A missing element is the voice and influence of forest dependent people themselves on governance processes as an expression of their demand for better governance and social justice (often based on better awareness of laws and rights). Enhancing their voice can stimulate and provoke action by government and civil society on forest governance. FGLG teams do not claim to have a mandate to represent marginalised people but they do provide a channel for forest dependent people's voices to reach decision-makers in a transparent and non-confrontational way. Some FGLG teams e.g. India and Vietnam also support actions to create and enhance local awareness and 'voice' although with limited resources available in the Project the extent of such support is limited. In these situations collaboration with other field-based projects has been an effective way of raising awareness and voice.

FGLG team members are selected and operate in their capacity as individuals. Whilst investing and supporting their capacity development can make them more effective in influencing governance processes it is unclear what will happen to this body of practice as individuals move away and into other roles. Similarly, the same individuals are inevitably in high demand within their own countries and thus tend to have insufficient time to engage with the critical governance processes that FGLG aims to affect because of this.

Different studies have been carried out through FGLG in participating countries to generate evidence to initiate action and raise awareness on specific governance issues. In a number of cases these have been very effective in providing empirical data and stimulating wider interest and action in tackling particular problems such as studies on charcoal production in Malawi and illegal logging in Tanzania. However fewer studies have been carried out and thus less evidence is available, to show the impacts of the governance changes that have taken place. For example in Cameroon the increasing compliance of concession managers in the larger commercial logging concessions under the FLEG-T process appears to have been complemented by an increase in the number of potentially more damaging and less-regulated 'small licences' although there is limited evidence documenting this. In Mozambique the changed regulations requiring preparation of management plans prior to issuing 'simple licences' has been effective in reducing the number of these annual licences issued (reported to be only 20% of the level of previous years) but the effects of this on levels of illegal harvesting or local employment are unknown. In Malawi it is not clear how the shifts in perception regarding the 'legality' of charcoal production have affected those communities that are involved in charcoal production and whether this has actually had positive livelihoods impacts.

Shifts in forest governance may be reflected in changes to forest policies, laws and regulations although frequently, existing or new policies, laws etc. are not implemented or transformed into effective action on the ground or at the least there may be a significant time lag before practice responds. Concerned implementing agencies (in most cases government forestry agencies) are often slow and unresponsive to shifts in governance and individual attitudes are often contradictory to good governance. This is the prevailing situation in a number of participating countries i.e. it is the non-implementation of current laws and policies that is the main issue rather than their existence.

More attention needs to be given to understanding and analysing individuals, institutions and institutional structures to shed light on this frequent mismatch between policy and practice. Some FGLG countries such as India, Indonesia and Vietnam have adapted their country plans and focus to enable them to operate at both central level and implementation level (state or provincial) so that implementation issues can be addressed directly at least in some pilot sites. Again with limited Project resources this would not have been possible without collaboration with other field-based projects. Very few Project actions appear to be directed at institutional reforms even though these are often

critical to establishing more responsive and accountable delivery mechanisms and institutional reforms as a factor in forest governance is not well covered in the Project log-frame.

The table below describes some of the key factors that contribute to FGLG effectiveness based on the experiences of the 10 countries. It also summarises the inherent constraints.

Table 2 - Critical factors for FGLG effectiveness

<b>Critical Factors for FGLG Effectiveness</b>	<b>Associated Constraints</b>
Involvement of both government and civil society in FGLG (as individuals rather than as representatives of their organisations)	If FGLG is too closely associated with specific civil society organisations (or individuals) this may lead to conflicts over membership and difference of approach
Careful identification of influential individuals (not necessarily in the forest sector) with strong track records and good networks in both government and amongst civil society (also internationally)	Influential individuals may have limited time for FGLG engagement and are frequently in high demand from other projects and programmes. Where they are already actively involved in forest governance issues the added value of FGLG is sometimes unclear. Building capacity and supporting individuals is unsustainable (since they will move on into other roles) unless the body of practice becomes institutionalised or permanently captured in some way. This issue has been partially addressed by the FGLG alumni structure developed in Indonesia.
Focus on a limited number of 'themes' identified as being those where governance actions can be successful	Difficult to achieve balance between being responsive (to new opportunities) and keeping focused on critical issues. Focus is anyway difficult to achieve in the absence of a structured country-level forest governance assessment framework (this should be a prerequisite)
Flexibility and autonomy to respond to new opportunities as they arise	Plans tend to be ambitious as additional opportunities arise and other commitments continue
Both central level and sub-national level actions are needed to address implementation issues and these complement each other.	It is often unclear (due to lack of analysis) what the cause of implementation failures are even where policies/laws are sound. Invariably these are due to institutional deficiencies that require institutional reforms. Institutional reforms are complex, time consuming and often unpopular amongst governments. Funds will be a constraining factor for working at sub-national level – collaboration and institutional partnerships are required
Strong coordination to ensure good internal communications amongst FGLG teams and between FGLG teams and other actors on forest governance	Shifting membership and hosting/convenor-ship of FGLG can significantly reduce the effectiveness of the approach e.g. in Mozambique, and weakens communication and outside recognition of FGLG as a significant player in forest governance
Investment in evidence based studies is an effective starting point for governance actions e.g. charcoal in Malawi, illegal logging and trade in Tanzania. Subsequent investment in impact studies (of governance changes) can validate governance shifts or help to identify further shortcomings.	Funds will be a constraining factor – collaboration and institutional partnerships can be effective.
Complementary action on raising 'voice' of forest communities is needed to better inform governance reform processes, drive political change and increase legitimacy. This implies the need for strong downward linkages with field-based initiatives (projects)	Funds will be a constraining factor – collaboration and institutional partnerships can be effective. Both central-level engagement and bottom-up voice and awareness are needed for effective change.

Being part of an international or regional initiative such as FGLG with links to IIED/RECOFTC and other international institutions brings credibility and the potential for expert support.	International institutions need to avoid micro-managing country level processes as this reduces national ownership and engagement.
---	--

Experience has shown that the FGLG approach can contribute to improving forest governance. By supporting individuals, coherent teams and mostly informal actions it can complement other more formal governance processes and add value to these. In several countries the FGLG team is increasingly being recognised by government as an important player in the forest governance discourse and as a result the FGLG teams and individual members are being requested to contribute to governance processes in a diverse range of ways including in some cases to international governance processes.

### 2.2.2 Evaluation of the FGLG log-frame

The FGLG log-frame has been used as the basis for the evaluation of achievements (in Chapter 3) and impacts (in Chapter 4). Note the absence of clearly defined and quantifiable (measurable) indicators at both the specific objective (outcome) level and overall objective (goal) level in the log-frame. The log-frame also includes assumptions (last column). These are discussed further in section 3.6.

The Project log-frame is an adequate tool and for capturing the Project's rationale and focus at the global level (all 10 countries combined). It has a coherent internal logic where the outputs contribute to the governance outcomes although all aspects of governance are not necessarily covered. However, with a global log-frame covering 10 countries, individual log-frame elements will invariably tend to be fairly generic rather than specific (as the governance situation varies considerably from country to country). Associated with this is the absence of a clear framework for assessing forest governance at country level by identifying priorities, weaknesses and measurable outcome indicators. In practice, for each participating the country actions in annual plans have been fitted into this generic global log-frame (under each of the 4 outputs – expected results) but without any further development of country-specific results indicators. As described in section 1.2 this is partly a result of an absence of a clear early assessment of the governance situation (or baseline) for each country. Outcomes are described in country level Project reports but again in a largely non-quantitative way.

Annual narrative reports submitted by IIED to the EC have attempted to overcome this lack of quantifiable indicators by reporting the number of countries contributing to each indicator (reflecting the global indicators the Project log-frame). The result of this is that Project activities and results are quite clearly described in reports but outcomes (i.e. what changes in forest governance have actually taken place) for each country are not well monitored or measured.

The Project log-frame lists a number of indicators at the Project overall objective level (goal level). These include:

- FAO state of forests reports
- Transparency international assessments
- Reports on MDGs
- National data on forest sector output
- Reports on FLEG-T and REDD (UNFCCC)

There are no reports showing baselines and subsequent changes based on these sources of information. Thus the overall contribution of FGLG to the overall objective is almost impossible to assess.

### 3 EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF FGLG

#### 3.1 Overall Project Performance

Table 3 analyses outputs and performance against output indicators for each country (and also for international partners for output 4). The brief summaries and assessment scores are based on country reports, self-assessments, discussions and interviews for the current project period (2009-13). Note that this evaluation is based on a fairly strict assessment of performance against the indicators identified in the log-frame. This means that not all Project activities will necessarily be reflected here.

Contributions to international forest governance processes are all captured under output 4 since all other output indicators specify numbers of countries (of the 10 participating) rather than trans-national and international networks and processes.

Score	Assessment
1	Indicator completely met
2	Indicator largely met
3	Indicator partly met
4	Indicator met to a limited extent only
5	Indicator not met
X	Unable to be determined

Table 3 – Performance against log-frame outputs and output indicators

Output	Output 1: Forest rights and small forest enterprise. Policy reforms, investment decisions and institutional arrangements in favour of secure forest rights and small forest enterprise				
Indicator	<i>1.1 Policies and institutional arrangements altered in favour of local forest control, and attributed at least in part to actions by FGLG teams, in at least 5 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>1.2 Laws and regulations modified to enable community forest control and enterprise, following support from FGLG teams, in at least 4 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>1.3 Information flows, accountability tools and guidance - and the preparedness to use and integrate them – improved in institutions with stewardship roles for forest resources, in at least 6 countries by 4th year of initiative</i>	<i>1.4 Small forest enterprise associations' capability to engage with policy that controls the business environment improved, in at least 4 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>1.5 Forest area under sustainable forest management controlled by local community institutions increased, and attributed at least in part to actions by FGLG teams, in at least 4 countries by end of initiative</i>
<b>Cameroon GREG-Forêts contribution to:</b>	Revision of manual on community forests	Challenging the requirements for CFs to carry out EIAs (but no change yet)	Recognition of GREG-Forêts as hub for forest governance		
<b>Ghana FGLG contribution to:</b>	Integrating national forest forum initiative and			Engagement of Kumasi Wood Cluster and other	

	bringing in community perspectives			associations in policy forums	
<b>India FGLG contribution to:</b>	Revitalisation of JFM (nationally) and reduced control of State Forest Dept. in JFM committees (state-wise)	Guidelines and amended rules on FRA (2012) Post-claim strategy for registered communities under FRA (for enhancing livelihoods)	Enhanced Ministry of Tribal Affairs monitoring system for FRA implementation. Capacity building for state administrations and communities on FRA (various states)		Registered community forests under FRA in Odisha, Jharkand and Chhattisgarh
<b>Indonesia FGLG contribution to:</b>	Greater awareness and capacity on forest governance issues amongst government and civil society FGLG 'alumni'. Greater recognition of CFM tenure rights	Improved local government regulation of sandalwood (East Nusa Tenggara Province) giving greater local benefits from harvesting trees from farm land	Better information sharing and dissemination for the forest sector more widely (specifically on clarifying deforestation baselines)		
<b>Malawi FGLG contribution to:</b>	Forestry sector incorporation in national Growth and Development Strategy	Analysis of governance and benefit sharing arrangements for Mpira Dam catchment based on CF norms		Capacity building for cooperatives working in Viphya plantations Sourced funds for studies on trees on farms enterprises	Expansion of clan-based management system from Ncheu to Shire catchment
<b>Mozambique FGLG contribution to:</b>	Greater awareness of the 20% of tax from forest concessions that is earmarked for local community development and greater public awareness of community delimitations	Changed legislation on simple licence duration and associated requirement for management planning	Improvement of EIA reports		
<b>South Africa FGLG contribution to:</b>	Industry policy to raise emphasis on forest sector.	Review of land reform and land rights and policies. Improvements in the afforestation licencing process (more licenses issued)	Development of sustainable forest management system for small forest enterprises Code of practice (draft) for timber growers	Greater awareness and support for small forest enterprises leading to leverage of financial support from government for community forests. Investment into bankable community forestry	Financial support for additional community forestry projects and for costs of EIAs (resulting in more projects)

				projects. Greater capacity and organisation of representative organisations for SMFEs (South African Timber Association)	
<b>Tanzania FGLG contribution to:</b>			Forest governance hearing to improve accountability and transparency of forestry agencies		
<b>Uganda FGLG contribution to:</b>	Awareness of the role of Parliament in natural resource management (including forests) through a policy brief Greater media interest and awareness in forest governance including continued resistance to forest reserve alienation	Draft forestry regulations. Continued pursuit of court cases	In the absence of capability within Govt. institutions continued engagement of civil society on policy formulation (via FGLG)		
<b>Vietnam FGLG contribution to:</b>	Greater awareness of forest governance concepts nationally e.g. through training and university courses Development of CF policy (will conclude 2013)	Awareness on need for a legal framework for CF	Development and use of accountability tools to enhance relations between farmers and govt. officials		Awareness and capacity building for communities on forest laws and rights and increased number of CFs
<b>Overall rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Output</b>	<b>Output 2:</b> Legitimate forest products. Strategies to improve legality of forest products, institutionalise citizen engagement and contribute to broader forest governance improvement			
<b>Indicator</b>	<i>2.1 Multi-stakeholder engagement in forest legality development and other decision-making processes in the forest sector enhanced, in at least 5 countries by 3rd year of initiative</i>	<i>2.2 Contributions made to VPA processes in fostering citizen engagement, integrating local rights and pursuing credible and effective standards of domestic and export-import legality - in Cameroon, Ghana and Indonesia</i>	<i>2.3 Civil society's ability to use legal tools for better decision making in the forest sector improved (e.g. scrutiny of investment contracts, and improving substantive and procedural rights), in at least 5</i>	<i>2.4 Number and effectiveness of initiatives putting information on forest resources, their ownership and use in the public domain increased, in at least 8 countries by end of initiative</i>

		<i>(and potentially others in Vietnam and Tanzania) by 3rd year of initiative</i>	<i>countries by end of initiative</i>	
<b>Cameroon GREG-Forêts contribution to:</b>	Establishment and functioning of Ministry of Forests anti-corruption unit Greater awareness and analysis on legality/legitimacy issues Greater political awareness on illegal logging	Effective community level participation and transparency in VPA process		Organisation of I-learn events on specific forest governance themes to which public and media are invited
<b>Ghana FGLG contribution to:</b>	Convening the reference group of key players in the sector and acting as a link between government and civil society	Study on VPA transparency Greater contribution from civil society in VPA (including the Legality Assurance System) Greater awareness on implications of 'salvage permits'. Detailed research revealing lost revenue from failure to review stumpage fees. VPA process able to accommodate CF and small forest enterprise		
<b>India FGLG contribution to:</b>		Studies leading to greater awareness on the better utilisation of plantation forest resources	Increased number of claims under FRA by communities (esp. Odisha)	Greater transparency of information and discussion on FRA implementation
<b>Indonesia FGLG contribution to:</b>			Teak farmers become eligible for capital support through bank loans (under national reforestation fund)	Improved transparency in reporting on forest statistics on deforestation at international forums by Govt. agencies
<b>Malawi FGLG contribution to:</b>	Revival of the National Forestry Governance forum	Assessment of transparency for Viphya plantations. Design of new model for VPA to involve smallholders		
<b>Mozambique FGLG contribution to:</b>	Sustaining civil society engagement in forest sector governance through the 'Forestry Dialogue for Civil Society' Media attention on corruption in the forestry sector		Contributed to changing regulations for 'simple licences' requiring management plans to be prepared before licences are issued	



<b>South Africa FGLG contribution to:</b>	National certification process for small timber growers			
<b>Tanzania FGLG contribution to:</b>	Better relations and trust between government and civil society organisations through Tanzania Forest Working Group Cross-border memorandum of understanding (follow up to illegal timber trade studies)			Greater media and public awareness on cross-border timber trade issues and illegal logging
<b>Uganda FGLG contribution to:</b>	Awareness on illegal logging leading to harvesting ban and reviews of regulations for concessions e.g. ‘Trouble in the forest’ has been highly influential		Civil society advocacy surrounding the degazettement of Mabira Forest Reserve resulting in periodic rejection of proposals and cases reaching court	Public dialogue and national symposium on forest governance.
<b>Vietnam FGLG contribution to:</b>		Definition of timber legality (in VPA process) Better understanding of legality and chain of custody for smallholder timber		
<b>Overall rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Output</b>	<b>Output 3:</b> Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry. Initiatives to combat climate change through action in the forest sector contribute to pro-poor forest governance and sustainability				
<b>Indicator</b>	<i>3.1 Both REDD and adaptation forestry strategies – and the equity and sustainability balances they will require – considered and negotiated amongst civil society, private sector and government agencies, in at least 3 countries by 3rd year of initiative</i>	<i>3.2 REDD strategies focused on areas where local property rights and institutional capability can be effectively combined with good forestry practice with manageable risks and transaction costs, in at least 3 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>3.3 Contributions made to the development of new institutional capacity for managing REDD and adaptation forestry, in at least 3 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>3.4 Stakeholder decision-making in biofuel development strategies strengthened to incorporate better secured rights, legality development and climate mitigation forestry, in at least 4 countries by end of initiative</i>	<i>3.5 Increased collaboration for synergy between adaptation and mitigation forestry, and for improved resilience of farm-forest production systems, in at least 4 countries by 3rd year of initiative</i>
<b>Cameroon GREG-Forêts contribution to:</b>	Inclusion of CF in REDD RPP Incorporation of landscape				

	approach into REDD RPP				
<b>Ghana FGLG contribution to:</b>	REDD + strategy development				
<b>India FGLG contribution to:</b>	Greater uniformity in JFM sharing arrangements under REDD+	Improved community perspectives in National REDD + consultation	Community guide to REDD		Enhanced awareness of the potential of farm forestry plantations
<b>Indonesia FGLG contribution to:</b>	Task force on REDD and ensuring greater transparency and participation in REDD strategy preparation. Technical aspects of REDD RPP – including assessment of drivers and regulations (under REDD)	Improved gender and community governance perspective in REDD RPP (strategy)	Greater awareness of the importance of institutional aspects for REDD implementation (incorporated into the REDD strategy)		
<b>Malawi FGLG contribution to:</b>	Development of national REDD + strategy with greater NGO participation National consultation process on REDD	National consultation meeting on REDD. Process for developing MRVs (part of REDD RPP)	Establishment of a multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms for REDD and incorporation into USAID support for REDD+. Establishment of REDD coordination secretariat.	Greater awareness of the issues relating to charcoal production and of means of addressing these Development of a national renewable energy strategy Cross border study on charcoal (with Mozambique and Tanzania)	Preparation of a briefing that highlights link between REDD+ and adaptation needs.
<b>Mozambique FGLG contribution to:</b>	Participation (as a civil society member) in the national REDD technical working group and better incorporation of gender aspects	Contribution to development of the new decree for approval of pilots and studies under REDD		Study and report on charcoal production and good practice manual on charcoal Cross border study on charcoal (with Tanzania and Malawi)	REDD+ report produced linking mitigation and adaptation
<b>South Africa FGLG contribution to:</b>	National climate strategy discussions (giving greater emphasis on pro-poor aspects)				
<b>Tanzania FGLG contribution to:</b>	Improved civil society and media understanding of REDD.	REDD piloting across different projects. Improved civil society		Cross border study on charcoal (with Mozambique and Malawi)	

		engagement in REDD Task Force			
<b>Uganda FGLG contribution to:</b>	Preparation of REDD RPP	Climate change policy working papers and incorporation of recommendations into the implementation strategy for CC	Capacity building on REDD for district government staff Country civil society participants' preparedness and involvement for COP 18		
<b>Vietnam FGLG contribution to:</b>	Consultations and briefing papers on social safeguards for REDD+	Incorporation of SMEs into REDD+ process	Community level capacity and awareness on REDD.		
<b>Overall rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>Output</b>	<b>Output 4:</b> Trans-national learning and preparedness. Understanding improved in international networks and processes about effective action for improved social justice in forestry				
<b>Indicator</b>	<i>4.1 Four international learning events held, country exchanges conducted, and online forums, social networks, policy portals and wiki-technology developed amongst FGLG country teams and wider trans-national network, by end of initiative</i>	<i>4.2 Learning platform developed between Chinese policy researchers and opinion formers and their counterparts in at least 3 African FGLG teams and the India FGLG team to focus on issues of forestry investment and trade, by 4th year of initiative</i>	<i>4.3 Policy tools, analysis results, news and advocacy materials produced online and in hard copy aimed at influencing debates and policy developments in favour of social justice in forestry, by end of initiative</i>	<i>4.4 Findings on social justice in forestry installed in international initiatives and organisations, by end of initiative</i>	
<b>Cameroon GREG-Forêts contribution to:</b>		Awareness of the need to engage with Chinese private sector companies where this had governance implications	Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.) I-learn events on thematic topics		
<b>Ghana FGLG contribution to:</b>		Awareness of the need to engage with Chinese private sector companies where this had governance implications	Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)		
<b>India FGLG contribution to:</b>	Regional collaboration on REDD+ and CF (RECOFTC coordinated)		Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	FGLG India contributions to international common property conference in Vietnam.	
<b>Indonesia FGLG contribution to:</b>	Regional collaboration on REDD+ and CF (RECOFTC coordinated)		Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)		
<b>Malawi FGLG</b>			Various (media, policy briefs,		

<b>contribution to:</b>			videos etc.)	
<b>Mozambique FGLG contribution to:</b>		Initiation of dialogue between Govt. and Chinese logging companies (workshop held)	Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	
<b>South Africa FGLG contribution to:</b>	Processes for SADC FLEG-T drafting		Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	
<b>Tanzania FGLG contribution to:</b>		Awareness of the need to engage with Chinese private sector companies where this had governance implications	Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	
<b>Uganda FGLG contribution to:</b>			Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	
<b>Vietnam FGLG contribution to:</b>	FAO/PROFOR guidelines on forest governance assessment and monitoring (internationally) Regional collaboration on REDD+ and CF (RECOFTC coordinated)		Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.)	Contributions of Vietnam FGLG team to a range of regional and international workshops and conferences
<b>International (i.e. including IIED/RECOFTC) contribution to:</b>	International learning events (4) in China (2013); Vietnam (2012); Mozambique (2011) and Indonesia (2009). Regional REDD based events (facilitated by RECOFTC) Position paper on REDD + governance and community forestry (RECOFTC) based on a Regional learning event	China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform formal establishment in year 5. Study reports produced by Chinese and African teams. Enhanced media awareness (in China) on implications of Chinese private investment for forest governance in African countries	Various (media, policy briefs, videos etc.) 'Stories of change' series (with RECOFTC) Collaboration with 'The Forests Dialogue' on guide for 'Investment in locally controlled forestry'	Justice in the forests video series (coordinated by IIED) Contribution to FAO 'Voluntary guidelines on the responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of National Food security' based on FGLG experiences. FAO guide to improving governance of forest tenure published. Participation of FGLG members and partners at COP and side events enabling discussion on critical aspects e.g. rights, benefit sharing, private sector engagement etc. REDD and forest in climate resilience links made in Doha and Durban. IIED/RECOFTC and FGLG country teams engagement in FLEGT

				processes (drawing on FGLG experiences) Formal links between IIED/RECOFTC and FGLG teams and GFP, ILCF, Forest Connect and TFD on social-justice related issues and approaches.
<b>Overall rating</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Table 4 - Evaluation by Output (summary)

	<b>Overall score</b>
<b>Output 1:</b> Forest rights and small forest enterprise. Policy reforms, investment decisions and institutional arrangements in favour of secure forest rights and small forest enterprise	2
<b>Output 2:</b> Legitimate forest products. Strategies to improve legality of forest products, institutionalise citizen engagement and contribute to broader forest governance improvement	3
<b>Output 3:</b> Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry. Initiatives to combat climate change through action in the forest sector contribute to pro-poor forest governance and sustainability	2
<b>Output 4:</b> Trans-national learning and preparedness. Understanding improved in international networks and processes about effective action for improved social justice in forestry	2

Scores for each indicator reflect a value judgement based on a fairly strict interpretation of where an 'FGLG contribution' can be clearly identified. This is based on Project reports, self-assessments, interviews and other sources. If there is no clear evidence of an FGLG contribution the cell has been left blank. The overall scores for each output are calculated as the mean of all the indicators. This assumes that all output indicators have equal weighting (which is not necessarily the case) and is thus a rather crude means for evaluating performance at output level.

Analysis of log-frame outputs and output indicators shows that the 4 outputs have all been largely or partially delivered by the Project. However, this largely positive evaluation of the achievement of Project deliverables has to be moderated by taking into account the relatively weak and non-objectively viable log-frame indicators that are used. Note that a number of Project-attributable achievements are not captured by the indicators from the log-frame. In particular, measurable country level outputs and related indicators are not defined, therefore performance can only be assessed against the rather broad global indicators which do not give a good picture of the country level achievements which in some cases are significant.

Particularly strong performance against the output indicators include policies and procedures favouring local forest control (1.1); multi-stakeholder engagement in forest legality and other decision-making processes (2.1); all aspects of engagement with national REDD + processes (3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) and the use of various media aimed at influencing debates and governance for social justice (4.3). FGLG has performed less well against indicators for actions aimed at bringing greater areas of forest under sustainable management controlled by community institutions (1.5); initiatives for putting forest information into the public domain (2.4) and establishing synergy between adaptation and mitigation forestry (3.5). The weak performance in these areas is largely a result of lack of specific engagement by country FGLG teams in these areas rather than a result of actions proving to be ineffective. Country teams have tended to identify areas for intervention based on their own knowledge and interest with the result that other areas may have been given less attention. For example actions in the broad area of climate change have focused in almost all countries within REDD+ processes and there appears to have been very little engagement in climate change adaptation strategies, the national level processes and policies for this and specifically in the forest sector contributions to this (in terms of bringing more synergy between adaptation and mitigation).

For output 4 which reflects the Projects contributions on social justice to international networks and learning processes there has been significant activity in terms of learning events, learning platform (China-Africa) production of tools and other materials. The result of this has been effective engagement with a varied range of international partners and initiatives. The extent to which the findings on social justice and forestry have actually been installed amongst these partners and initiatives as a result is less clear.

More effective actions could have been identified through better preliminary analysis of the existing governance situation in the country followed by agreement amongst teams on strategies, targeting actions and identifying specific tactics and for addressing particular weaknesses. In general this does not seem to have taken place. It would have been expected that IIED and RECOFTC could have provided more initial support to teams to carry out this assessment and to develop country plans reflecting the achievement of clearly identified outputs as a result. In practice, FGLG teams have been opportunistic – seeking to engage in opportunities as they arose and without clearly considered governance outcomes in mind. Moreover, in a few situations annual plans contain actions that appear to have only tenuous links with the Project outputs and would not contribute significantly to governance outcomes at all. Considering the limited resources from the Project, better targeting would have been a means to improve effectiveness of actions either by utilising funds for actions that do not benefit from other projects or programmes – or conversely by adding Project resources to existing processes with the aim of making them more effective.

In terms of overall performance, Project supported actions, whilst significant, have not been adequate to achieve the intended scale of governance outcomes although the direction of change is mostly positive. Self-assessments by country teams broadly confirm this. Although most teams have also mentioned that they could have achieved more with more financial resources it appears that securing the commitment of sufficient time by FGLG team members (especially those who are most active, most knowledgeable and most influential) was also a major dilemma. In addition, FGLG has made good use of opportunities for collaboration and joint action with other projects or organisations that has enabled it to contribute more to governance outcomes.

### **3.2 Quality of Planning and Reporting**

Annual work plans have been prepared and submitted regularly to IIED by each country FGLG team in formats developed by IIED. In most cases these plans were also presented and discussed during the

international learning events attended by two participants from each country. All teams reported that there was a good level of dialogue and feedback on their draft plans between their country team and IIED both during the international learning events (when teams also had an opportunity to interrogate, comment and peer review on each other's plans) or subsequently through email or country visits by IIED staff. Annual plans describe activities that will be undertaken under each of the 4 Project outputs (in most cases). Biannual progress reports were subsequently prepared and submitted to IIED by country teams outlining progress against the planned activities and have been summarised into Annual Reports. Despite this well-structured planning and reporting process, the quality of plans and reports varies considerable from country to country although there has evidently been an attempt to improve and systematise the quality and format of plans and annual reports during the course of the Project.

FGLG teams have been flexible and responsive enough to respond to new opportunities to engage with forest governance as they occur. Unsurprisingly, since these actions are unplanned and mostly unpredictable they do not appear in annual plans although they are subsequently included in annual reports. The body of annual plans and biannual reports produced by the 10 countries provides the best overview of Project progress and achievements that is available (almost all are available online via the IIED FGLG website). They have been used by IIED for compiling the Interim Narrative Reports submitted to the EC. These formal narrative reports have been supplemented by progress reports from the international learning events prepared by IIED<sup>6</sup>. These progress reports have been made available on-line and provide a highly comprehensive and more readable overview of key Project achievements, challenges and lessons and include country summaries. Since the body of Project reports coming from the 10 countries is large, this synthesis and overview is particularly important for creating wider awareness and understanding of the FGLG initiative.

Whilst the overall quality of reports on FGLG is high some shortcomings include:

- Limited amount of analysis or explanation (especially at country level) of performance. In some cases planned actions have been dropped from subsequent reports without explanation whilst there is some de-linking of reported actions from the plans submitted earlier (again with limited explanation). Later country reports tend to be better in quality.
- Limited quantification of actions reported e.g. numbers of people involved in events or areas of forest affected etc.
- Lack of clarity on which of the reported actions have had significant FGLG inputs and which are separately initiated or supported. Whilst it is useful to report on all governance related actions to get a full picture of the forest governance situation in the country, the overall impression created is that FGLG reports include some activities that are not necessarily initiated by the Project or benefiting from Project support. Perhaps it would have been useful to categorise actions and impacts in terms of whether FGLG involvement was absent/minimal/significant etc.
- The learning event reports, whilst very useful for creating a wider awareness of FGLG progress are hybrids between Project planning/reporting documents (of interest to a more limited readership) and analysis of actual experiences and lessons on tackling critical governance issues. This is unfortunate because it reduces their value as a reflection on the body of practice that is represented by the experienced group of individuals making up the FGLG teams in all 10 countries.

The development of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform has also been documented in a series of 3 important reports<sup>7</sup> that provide a strong analytical basis for further actions in this particular sphere of forest governance.

---

<sup>6</sup> Forest governance change and climate change (2009) [from Indonesia learning event]; Just forest governance – for REDD, for sanity (2011) [from Mozambique learning event]; Social justice in forestry (2013) [from China learning event];

<sup>7</sup> (i) China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform, Report on Inception Event (2013); (ii) China-Africa links that impact governance of forests and livelihoods: review of evidence and perception on the China side of

### 3.3 Documentation and Other Outputs

The Project has an impressive and wide ranging portfolio of documents and other materials of many different types. These have been produced by IIED, RECOFTC or by country FGLG teams (often in collaboration with various country partners). Full lists of these materials produced from 2009-13 are included in the annual learning event reports produced by IIED and a large number of materials are available via the IIED FGLG website or the RECOFTC website. Table 5 summarises and quantifies these by type although it does not include the most recent figures for 2013 since final reports have not yet been received from most participating countries.

*Table 5 – Types and assessment of Project outputs (deliverables)*

<b>Types</b>	<b>Approx. No.</b>	<b>Purpose and assessment</b>
International workshop and workshop reports (learning events etc.)	5	Available on IIED website. 1 produced by RECOFTC. These provide a clear and comprehensive overview of Project actions and achievements for a wider international readership.
National or sub-national workshops	50+	Workshops are a common tactic. In most cases there have been associated written outputs
Media (press and web articles)	100 +	Reflect a wide media interest in forest governance and the ability of FGLG country teams to utilise the media for highlighting particular issues or achievements.
Films video clips	15 +	Includes 6 produced by IIED reflecting forest governance challenges and achievements in FGLG countries plus several produced with RECOFTC support for Asian countries. In addition several FGLG country teams have produced and used films in the media such as TV (e.g. Tanzania, Ghana, Uganda, Mozambique)
Reports and documents	60 +	Produced mainly by country-based FGLG teams often with the intention of providing evidence to contribute to action on a particular governance issue. In many cases these have reflected collaboration with other projects or country partners.
Others	50 +	Including field guidelines, policy briefs, posters, leaflets, presentations, blogs – produced by country FGLG teams and also by IIED and RECOFTC often for a specific purpose and/or targeted at a specific audience. A few are available in languages other than English. Also includes joint guides e.g. 'Improving governance of forest tenure' (jointly between IIED and FAO) and project proposals that have been submitted (and have been successful) for establishing related projects e.g. Growing Forest Partnerships and Forest & Farm Facility.

The quantity and quality of documents and other written and published outputs of FGLG reflect the importance that these are considered to have for influencing forest governance at both the country and international level by providing information and critical analysis. The same materials have also contributed to raising the national and international profile of FGLG and developed a wider awareness of Project actions. Many documents are already available on-line (although not all) but a single repository of all FGLG documents and other outputs is still lacking. Both IIED and RECOFTC websites provide access to many of the most important documents but some are still only available in their countries of origin and not yet on-line.

Perhaps surprisingly, there has been very little analysis done of the effectiveness of the various types of documentation and other media that have been used as tactics for supporting forest governance engagement by FGLG. Regardless of the quality of materials produced they tend to add to the huge quantities of electronic and written materials that are produced by all programmes and projects. Many of the intended readers or viewers will have insufficient time or interest to utilise them properly. The first phase of the Project saw the introduction of some tactics that were complemented with capacity

---

the relationship (2013); (iii) China-Africa links that impact governance of forests and livelihoods: review of evidence and perception on the Africa side of the relationship (2013)



development for FGLG members. However this current phase has seen fewer examples of innovation or introduction of new ideas beyond these – possibly because the earlier innovations have proved to be effective. There is a strong dependency on workshops as a Project tactic although the value of participation as opposed to the written outputs is questionable (as workshop reports are rarely read by non-participants). There are some exceptions to this e.g. the media attention around some of the reports e.g. on illegal logging in Mozambique or Tanzania or charcoal production in Malawi (rather than the studies and reports themselves) has led to better awareness of the issues and calls for action (although limited action). Cameron FGLG has utilised an I-learn technique (from international learning events) for quick and highly focused events targeting particular themes. In general media engagement of different kinds has proved to be useful for getting awareness and action- particularly from political actors.

### 3.4 Cross-country Learning and Experience Sharing

Cross country learning and sharing comprises an important ingredient for FGLG and has contributed to the international profile and effectiveness of country teams. Various different types of action have been supported to achieve this including:

- International FGLG learning events attended by participants from all 10 countries plus IIED/RECOFTC staff and other invited participants. 4 such events have been held during the period 2009-13
- Regional events facilitated by RECOFTC to which Asian FGLG teams have been invited. These include a Regional event on REDD+ and community forestry
- ‘Bilateral’ events and cross-country visits where members from one country FGLG team have visited another team – either for the purpose of discussing and addressing cross-border issues, or for sharing on specific topics e.g. Indian FGLG team members visited Vietnam to provide their experiences on community forestry; Mozambique and Malawi teams visited each other to share experience of assessing charcoal use and trade and Tanzanian and Mozambique team members visited each other to investigate cross-border trade
- The launch of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform bringing together FGLG representatives with Chinese representatives (Government and media) to plan and discuss for this initiative
- 3<sup>rd</sup> party events to which FGLG country team members or IIED/RECOFTC staff have been invited to attend. These have provided some formal opportunities to present some of the achievements of the Project and an informal means for widening networks on forest governance and promoting awareness of FGLG.
- Informal and occasional communication and sharing (usually on-line) between FGLG members from different countries. There have been some notable developments stemming from such communication – such as the Malawi team being emboldened to tackle forest concession issues after being inspired by the work of the Uganda team on these issues. However this type of networking has not developed very widely and there has not been a concerted attempt to coordinate or facilitate this e.g. through social media

These events have been important for building the capacity of FGLG team members from the 10 participating countries (and China) for sharing experiences and for the coordinating and facilitating role of IIED and RECOFTC. Participants at international learning events invariably gave very positive feedback on their participation in these and on the organisation and facilitation of these events by IIED. Participation at these events has clearly contributed to capacity development of participants as they have learnt new tactics and have felt empowered by hearing from colleagues. It is less clear whether these events have contributed significantly towards country level governance outcomes.

From each country team usually 2 participants attended these events. Although efforts were made to select different participants for different events, there still remain many FGLG country team members who were not able to attend any international learning event. Frequently those attending were those who were already most active in their respective country teams (such as the country convenors – who were required, whenever possible, to attend given their roles within country teams and as the main points of contact with IIED). Arguably these individuals are those for whom capacity development

was least needed (although this capacity development was not the sole purpose of these events) as they already have considerable experience and additional opportunities for international networking outside of FGLG. An important consideration for these international learning events is their cost, since participants have come from at least 11 countries involving considerable travel and organisation time. More cost effective options such as use of IT or regional/thematic events covering fewer countries offer an alternative to the current model of international learning events.

Several members of FGLG country teams pointed out that whilst there was a good level of sharing and interaction during the annual events this was not sustained or followed up subsequently – either by IIED or as a result of individual participants’ actions. The reports from these events indicate a good analysis of the FGLG approach and experiences and on forest governance themes during the workshops – but comparing this with subsequent plans and actions it is not clear that this more structured analysis has actually resulted in more targeted actions, improved tactics or more effective achievements of outcomes by the participating countries.

Bilateral events and cross-country visits were mostly self-initiated by country teams and were also very positively viewed by participants. In this case governance outcomes have been easier to determine since the focus of such visits was usually more specific e.g. to investigate cross-border issues or to share experiences and contribute to capacity development on a specific topic.

### **3.5 Gender and Generation Issues**

There is only limited evidence of specific targeting to address gender and generation issues and very little reference to these in plans, reports of Project achievements or during conversations with FGLG team members. The focus is more generally on ‘community’, ‘forest dependent’ or ‘poor or disadvantaged’ people. On the whole the Project appears to be rather ‘gender neutral’ rather than gender targeted. This could reflect the interests and constitution of FGLG teams – although in most countries FGLG teams have a good gender balance. Opportunities for a more direct focus on gender and generational issues are limited by the mode of operation of the FGLG teams except in countries where there is a significant field-based presence contributing to grass-roots implementation as well as the work at national level to bring such issues from the field to the national discourse (such as India and Vietnam).

A full analysis of gender coverage in the Project reports and various media has not been conducted as part of this evaluation (due to time factors). A general overview indicates that gender has not formed a particularly strong element for FGLG country teams’ actions. An area that could have been strengthened (as a starting point for FGLG action on gender) could have been to carry out a better analysis of gender roles within the forest sector (especially in the concerned institutions). This would have contributed to country level gender sensitive forest governance indicators that could then be used to track progress.

### **3.6 Assessment of Assumptions and Risks**

The Project log-frame contains a number of assumptions at the levels of overall objective, specific objective and for each output. Table 6 indicates whether each assumption has impacted on the Project and whether it has been mitigated through Project actions or by other means.

There has been only limited consideration of country-specific risks in the Project or sufficient in-depth analysis to assess them. There are inherent risks in making shifts in forest governance and some of these have been demonstrated in participating countries. For example the FLEG-T VPA processes whilst addressing some of the legality issues relating to timber trade and export coming from larger concessions have also led to an increase in less controllable logging in ‘small titles’ in Cameroon for feeding local markets (although this is still anecdotal). In other situations (e.g. Mozambique) a reduction in such small-scale concession logging may also have implications for local people who depend on these for employment and may have livelihoods consequences.

Table 6 - Assessment and evaluation of log-frame risks and assumptions

	<b>Intervention Logic</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Evaluation assessment of assumptions/risks</b>
<b>Overall objective</b>	Socially just and sustainable management of forests in developing countries	Political interest, space and practical opportunity are sufficiently developed and maintained at local, national and international level.	<p>This is valid and critical assumption (although it should probably appear at specific objective level because it is within the influence of the Project). Creating political space implies political actions – not normally considered as Project roles.</p> <p>There is an underlying missing assumption that changes or impacts at the outcome level will necessarily result in positive impacts on livelihoods and forests. In practice this is not necessarily always the case. Unintended negative impacts may also be possible (risk) and other outcomes may be neutral in their effects on people’s livelihoods. These can only be mitigated by careful impact monitoring and with sufficient flexibility to alter planned approaches as a result.</p>
<b>Specific objective</b>	Improved forest governance in 10 countries in Africa and Asia – securing local rights, developing forest product legitimacy and combatting climate change	Sufficient momentum and buy-in from key individuals and institutions can be generated to maintain useful networks and implement well-targeted improvements.	This is a valid and critical assumption. Mitigation by the Project is to identify and work with key individuals and networks.
		High level political will exists or can be created through targeted interaction and generating momentum in key processes to tackle persistent and emerging problems of social injustice and unsustainable management in forests.	This is valid and critical assumption Mitigating this risk is specifically a justification for the FGLG approach.
		Entry points can be found across different institutions and areas of legislation to foster cooperation and simplification of policy and management frameworks	Rather weak assumption. Entry points are not hard to find – but identifying and targeting appropriate actions (tactics) at them may be an issue.
		International processes allow for sufficient articulation of local and national realities to make a difference	This remains a valid assumption. The associated risk is that there is a gap between theory and practice in some international processes – the Project mitigates this by injecting local and national realities into otherwise generic processes (e.g. REDD)
Expected results	<b>Output 1:</b> Forest rights and small forest enterprise. Policy reforms, investment decisions and institutional arrangements in favour of secure forest rights and small forest enterprise	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Sufficient and appropriate policy and institutional reform opportunities can be created and seized to make a difference</li> <li>ii. Legal and regulatory development processes can be given sufficient momentum and transparency, and resulting modifications can be sufficiently implemented</li> </ol>	<p>The first two assumptions are valid – but the major associated risk is that insufficient efforts cannot be directed by FGLG teams to mitigate them. In practice time and inputs by FGLG teams members have proved to be limiting factors for the Project – not creation of opportunities.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> assumption appears very country-specific (South Africa?) and may not be very relevant elsewhere.</p> <p>The 4<sup>th</sup> assumption is mitigated by the activities and analysis of FGLG –</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Small forest enterprise associations are sufficiently secure to engage with policy and willing to try out new working procedures</li> <li>iv. Breakthroughs in the realisation of local rights are feasible in some circumstances, and the sustainability of local management actions can be credibly judged</li> </ul>	<p>to identify circumstances where local rights opportunities can be influenced.</p>
	<p><b>Output 2:</b> Legitimate forest products. Strategies to improve legality of forest products, institutionalise citizen engagement and contribute to broader forest governance improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Transparency, accountability and effectiveness of decision-making likely to be improved through multi-stakeholder involvement</li> <li>ii. VPA processes are not ends in themselves, but offer credible and clear chances of steps being taken to better forest governance</li> <li>iii. The political climate provides the necessary freedom and space for civil society groups to identify, sharpen and use these tools</li> <li>iv. Improved information in the public domain is a significant catalyst for action to improve forest governance and management</li> </ul>	<p>The first 2 assumptions here are validated by Project experiences and approaches. However there is a risk with the first assumption because multi-stakeholder processes are notoriously difficult to manage at national level and do not necessarily ensure good decision-making or cost effectiveness.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> assumption leads to a risk that cannot necessarily be mitigated by the Project. An example of this may be Mozambique. FGLG cannot change to political climate and better forest governance may be very slow to materialise.</p> <p>The 4<sup>th</sup> assumption cannot be validated as the Project has taken very little action to test this.</p>
	<p><b>Output 3:</b> Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry. Initiatives to combat climate change through action in the forest sector contribute to pro-poor forest governance and sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Sufficient national and international attention is given, or can be generated, to REDD and adaptation forestry in countries involved in this action</li> <li>ii. REDD debates can incorporate consideration of good forestry, local need and practical institutional feasibility – to balance efficiency and equity (not solely focused on maximum emissions reduction)</li> <li>iii. Key national institutions are willing and able to develop new capacity for shaping and managing REDD and adaptation forestry</li> <li>iv. Sufficient motivation in public and civil society agencies to engage with biofuel development planning</li> <li>v. Links between adaptation and mitigation are credible, and practical policy targets for improving resilience can be found</li> </ul>	<p>The ‘adaptation’ element in the first assumption is a significant risk. Decoupling of REDD and climate change adaptation persists through different international processes, support mechanisms and at country level responsible agencies.</p> <p>Assumptions 2 and 3 are valid and have been the focus of FGLG engagement in national REDD processes (and their potential for influencing forest governance).</p> <p>The 4<sup>th</sup> assumption is vague and unlikely to pose a risk. Perhaps a better assumption is that there is sufficient understanding (evidence) available to be able to effectively engage in biofuel development planning.</p> <p>The 5<sup>th</sup> assumption is similar to the first and may already have been addressed in countries where national adaptation plans are already in place. Policies for improving resilience will emerge from these plans although due to limited engagement of the Project in this area it is not really tested or reported.</p>

	<p><b>Output 4:</b> Trans-national learning and preparedness. Understanding improved in international networks and processes about effective action for improved social justice in forestry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Demand for, and effectiveness of, learning events and exchanges continues to build, and online work is well-focused not diversionary</li> <li>ii. Diverse and potentially divergent opinion formers in China, India and Africa recognise the utility of a learning platform, and give it sufficient energy to make it work</li> <li>iii. Sufficient profile and interest can be generated for these products, such that they are taken up and used</li> <li>iv. FGLG can be sufficiently well informed, networked and agile to get the right messages to the right initiatives at the right time</li> </ul>	<p>The first assumption is untested – the project has had limited engagement in online work.</p> <p>The second assumption cannot be mitigated yet – the formal launch of the China Africa forest governance learning platform was early in 2013 and subsequent actions and responses are not yet clear.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> assumptions are valid, have been tested and the Project approach has demonstrated that the risks of these have been mitigated.</p>
--	---	---	---

### **3.7 Funding and Accounting Arrangements**

The Project has operated according to EC procurement procedures with contracts being signed between IIED and the national and international partners involved in Project implementation. These are documented in Project narrative reports to the EC. The 10 participating countries receive roughly equal grants regardless of their size or the scope of their activity programme. Advance funds have been transferred from IIED to the country host organisations based on these contracts and on the agreed annual work-plans with additional funds being paid after receipt of financial reports. Financial reports for IIED have been prepared on a 6-monthly basis by participating countries to account for Project expenditure. The system has worked well with no fund flow problems reported from participating countries. Considering the number of separate grants involved to different organisations across 10 countries this represents a high standard of financial management and disbursement procedures that was commented on favourably by the country teams.

IIED has utilised standard audit procedures for evidence based verification of a sample of the vouchers raised by the country teams. In addition it has prepared annual audit reports for the project for submission to the EC. At the time of this evaluation an EC audit of this project is being conducted (results are not yet known).

Progress with Project expenditure has been more or less as planned. Although the latest figures (late 2013) appear to show about 70% disbursement at this stage it is likely that remaining undisbursed funds will be fully accounted for once all expenditure vouchers have been lodged from all country FGLG teams and when Project accounts are closed. Levels of expenditure on the establishment of the Africa-China forest governance learning platform appear to be lowest (about 20%) – possibly because this initiative was late to start. However, this represents a small item out of the overall budget. Since Project expenditure has been smooth and closely in line with the planned budget and there has been no requirement to move funds between budget heads.

### **3.8 Performance of Main International Project Partners**

#### **3.8.1 IIED**

IIED initially developed the concept of the FGLG and was responsible for developing this into a successful project proposal for EC support. During the implementation of the Project IIED plays a dual role. Firstly, as Project manager it is accountable to the EC for all aspects of Project administration including financial management, planning, reporting, documentation and quality assurance for Project delivery. In addition, IIED also has a role as provider of facilitation, capacity development and intellectual services to the Project and to FGLG teams as well as a source for dissemination of Project experiences through publications and other means. As Project administrator of this complex and wide-ranging initiative IIED has proved to be competent and effective and all country teams reported favourably on IIED's performance. The main difference between planned and actually implemented actions has been in the development of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform, the start of which was delayed to year 3 and which was thus only formally launched in the final year of the Project.

IIED has provided a competent and balanced level of support to FGLG teams by providing high quality technical backstopping and capacity development support including commenting on reports, plans and documents and facilitation during international learning events as well as country visits by individual IIED staff. The quality and value of intellectual inputs and level of engagement by key individuals from IIED was mentioned by most country teams in their self-assessments. At the same time IIED has maintained a low profile in the 10 participating countries. This has been important for the sensitivity of governance issues that cannot be seen to be 'pushed' from outside without undermining the ownership of national governance processes as well as the capacity and profile of the FGLG teams (although several teams mentioned that they would have liked to have had more inputs from IIED). This low country profile by IIED has been less evident in the development of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform although there has not yet been sufficient opportunity to see how this develops further. There is a view that this should anyway be based on a trilateral structure with institutions and individuals representing Africa, China and the West as all 3 have significant experience to share. IIED staff brought to the Project their wide-ranging global knowledge of forest governance for the benefit of FGLG teams and team members. In addition IIED has been an

effective and vocal advocate for good forest governance in a range of international forums including meetings, journals and websites. This has contributed to raising the international profile of FGLG and IIED's involvement in it – in contrast to the low profile adopted in the participating countries.

The level of support required by country FGLG teams has apparently been quite variable. Evidence for this comes from the performance of the teams themselves (although there are many other factors that affect this) as well as the plans, reports and other documents produced by them. These vary enormously in quality – particularly in their ability to better articulate what it is that the participating country teams aim to achieve (as opposed to what they plan to do). Additional support/quality assurance support from IIED may have been a good means for strengthening the analysis and reporting by some of the weaker teams.

### **3.8.2 RECOFTC**

The role of RECOFTC in FGLG has been as a regional partner for IIED providing technical support and backstopping for the three participating Asian countries. In practice RECOFTC has mostly focused on country support for Vietnam and Indonesia with only limited engagement with India. In addition, RECOFTC has been able to bring its own additional resources for facilitation and networking throughout the region and has provided support in three core thematic areas where it has practical expertise namely: participatory forest management; capacity development (training) and documentation.

RECOFTC has a strong regional presence with good networks in all Asian countries. It has thus contributed to strengthening the Project approach and actions, particularly in Vietnam and Indonesia. The link between RECOFTC and the country teams has been reinforced in Vietnam where the RECOFTC country office is also the host organisation for FGLG. Whilst this arrangement has some obvious advantages in terms of collaboration and potential for additional funding, it does contradict the lessons from elsewhere that governance processes need to be nationally rather than internationally driven<sup>8</sup>. RECOFTC has been active in involving FGLG teams and members from all three Asian countries in regional events and has extensively promoted FGLG through documents and its website.

Despite the relatively limited area of engagement by RECOFTC (only in Asia) it has performed its role well (as reflected in the country self-assessments from Indonesia and Vietnam). It has also added international credibility to the Project through its strong Regional presence and networks (including valuable linkages with other RECOFTC projects) and has enabled IIED to concentrate more support in participating countries in Africa.

### **3.8.3 EC**

Although this report did not aim to cover an assessment of the performance of the EC in relation to the Project, a few important issues have become apparent during this evaluation.

As donors the EC are to be commended for being bold enough to fund what was an innovative and relatively untested concept at the start and for continuing to support the Project through two phases. This willingness to take risks on a new approach has now been vindicated by the success of the Project in achieving its outputs and by the subsequent wider recognition of the importance of engaging in forest governance as an essential ingredient for ensuring social justice in forestry.

However, the Project was criticised from a number of sources consulted during the evaluation including by external 'experts' and also by representatives of the EC for its apparent lack of clarity in outputs and outcomes. Annex 3 lists the persons consulted. Analysis of the log-frame in section 2.2.2 tends to reinforce this criticism. Issues with the quality of reporting and understanding of the Project can be traced back to the Project narrative and weak structure of the log-frame (especially to the indicators). This reflects the difficulty of creating an effective and useable log-frame for a multi-country project that does not at the same time become too unwieldy. However, since the log-frame

---

<sup>8</sup> Although there are specific reasons for this – concerning the country convenor who was subsequently employed by RECOFTC. It was agreed that he should continue in this capacity with RECOFTC affiliation because of his strong track record and networks

forms an important part of the Project document it is felt that improvements to the log-frame would have resulted in a clearer framework for the Project from the start.

In the three countries visited the level of engagement of EC delegations with the Project appeared to be minimal. It appears that this is a widespread issue across all participating countries. To an extent this is understandable since country EC delegations have no direct responsibility for the Project. EC representatives were invited to all international learning events but in most cases were unable to attend.

This lack of contact has limited the opportunity for the EC to learn from the Project (at first hand) and gain ideas that may have wider relevance for other EC-supported projects. It has also limited the contact and engagement of FGLG teams with other EC-supported projects which may have provided an opportunity for strengthening the evidence base of the governance initiatives being supported by FGLG and for providing an opportunity to engage with critical implementation aspects through field-based projects and linked studies.

In four FGLG countries<sup>9</sup> there is on-going support from the EC (and others) for FLEG-T that has led to the development of VPAs between these four countries and the EC. FGLG was not exclusively designed to support FLEG-T and in fact some country teams have become significantly engaged in the VPA process in Ghana and Cameroon, much less in Vietnam and not to any significant extent in Indonesia. Representatives from FGLG have attended yearly EC FLEGT projects meetings in Brussels.

### 3.9 Performance Against Key Evaluation Criteria

*Explore the initiative's relevance, specificity, efficiency, effectiveness, creativity, innovation, flexibility, sustainability and institutional relationships.*

Based on the analysis in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 the key evaluation criteria for the whole FGLG initiative have been assessed. Additional criteria beyond those normally included in EC project evaluations have been added to reflect the ToR for this evaluation including flexibility, creativity/innovation and coherence<sup>10</sup>. A similar assessment has been done for the 3 countries visited (Annex 2) but no attempt has been made to do this for the other non-visited countries because it is felt that this would be inaccurate given the lesser level of engagement and understanding of these countries during the course of the evaluation.

*Scoring: 1 = high; 2 = moderate; 3 = low; 4 = none; X = unable to assess*

Criteria	Evaluation	Score
Relevance	The Project globally is tackling relevant and significant issues with implications for social justice, environmental sustainability and economic development. If anything, this relevance has increased over the Project period because of increasing emphasis on forest and climate change and the understanding that governance is the key to tackling many forest sector issues.	1
Effectiveness	Whilst the FGLG approach underpinning the Project is valid and potentially effective, several factors that would have improved effectiveness of the approach have not been incorporated in all participating countries. These include better and more targeted country level planning based on country governance assessment; combining central level engagement with additional engagement at implementation level and greater levels of collaboration with other (separately funded field-based projects). The China-Africa forest governance learning platform under 4.2 has eventually been launched – although this has been towards the end of the Project and as a result has not had sufficient opportunity to become effective as a governance methodology. The Project has been effective – but overall, less than expected.	2

<sup>9</sup> Ghana, Cameroon, Vietnam, Indonesia

<sup>10</sup> Standard 5 EC evaluation criteria include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. EC (2004) Project Cycle Management Guidelines



Efficiency	Operation and coordination of country teams (no salaried staff) and the largely informal working arrangements have enabled FGLG to demonstrate good performance against the log-frame despite the relatively small country budgets. Efficiency has been enhanced by collaborative action with other projects and organisations. The achievement of some significant results and outcomes at country level despite limited budgets has demonstrated moderately good efficiency.	1
Sustainability	About 50% of interviewees from country teams considered that FGLG teams would continue after the end of this Project phase. The likelihood of alternative funding support is high where the Project has developed strong institutional linkages and has had a good profile. Some level of funding is a critical factor for sustainability although several teams mentioned that they would be able to operate at a much lower level of funding that they had received through the Project.	2
Impact (including outcomes on forest governance institutions and processes)	Impacts on forest governance and the issues relating to assessment of these are analysed in Chapter 4. Furthermore there have been few attempts made to monitor governance impacts against known baselines using indicators. Overall impact has varied from country to country – at a global level it has been moderate and whilst there clearly have been some impacts in some countries (in some cases these may have been quite significant) overall impact of the Project on country level forest governance and international processes has been less than planned.	2
Impacts (on forests and people)	Direct impacts on people and forests were not anticipated for FGLG. Where there have been some significant governance shifts e.g. in India – there are likely to be substantial positive impacts although again these have not been tracked by the Project (and there are risks of unanticipated negative impacts)	X
Creativity/innovation	During the first phase of the Project (2005-09) a number of new approaches (tactics) were developed that have continued into the second phase. Confidence of teams and individuals has enhanced their willingness to use new or innovative tactics – some of which are potentially risky to the concerned individuals. However, fewer new or innovative actions were identified during the second phase and opportunities to use creative tactics e.g. social media or greater levels of political engagement have not been taken up as planned. The effectiveness of some of the tactics used e.g. policy briefs, study reports etc. has not yet been fully analysed although this type of self-analysis would have been a useful outcome of the Project.	3
Flexibility	Country FGLG teams have proved to be responsive to current and changing circumstances and willing and able to engage in new opportunities as they arise in all countries.	2
Coherence (institutional relationships)	In all FGLG teams there has been a tendency for strong links to develop via the ‘host’ organisation for the Project in the country. This has often proved productive in terms of leveraging additional resources for collaborative action and for more joined-up action. In many cases FGLG has developed strong relations with government on particular issues e.g. on VPAs in Ghana; anti-corruption in Cameroon; FRA in India and small holder forestry in South Africa. During the evaluation ‘lost’ opportunities were also identified e.g. to engage with DFID programme in Mozambique on land reform and adaptation strategies in India.	2

According to the usual criteria for evaluating project performance, performance of the FGLG initiative can be categorised as moderate-high. Its particular strengths include the relevance of the concept and the efficiency of implementation of the Project. The approach has proved to be moderately effective and it is anticipated that sustainability will also be moderate (taking this to mean sustainability of the approaches introduced and of the implementing structures in participating countries).

## 4 EVALUATION OF THE IMPACTS OF FGLG

Evaluation of impacts of FGLG is considered in two parts:

- Impacts on forest governance (direct Project impacts at outcome or specific objective level)
- Impacts on livelihoods and forests (indirect Project impact at purpose or overall objective level)

This section of the report aims to evaluate the impacts of FGLG over the past decade i.e. resulting from both phases of the Project from 2005-13.

### 4.1 FGLG Impacts (on forest governance outcomes)

The Project log-frame for the current phase includes four indicators of the specific objective (outcome). These are not objectively verifiable nor are they comprehensive enough to give a full picture of FGLG impacts on forest governance. Of the four indicators, one is international and cannot be used as part of an assessment of country-level forest governance impacts.

Compared with this, there were eight impact indicators at outcome level for the Project's first phase (it is unclear why there are fewer outcome indicators for the second phase given that the specific objective remained more or less the same). For the purposes of this evaluation the two sets of indicators have been combined (Table 7). Whilst this is a pragmatic solution to evaluation Project impacts at outcome level it is still somewhat unsatisfactory because of the lack of quantification and because indicators do not fully cover the full scope of forest governance or the Project's actions.

IIED was one of the early leaders in the development of the concept of forest governance indicators<sup>11</sup> and there are now several available systems for defining and assessing forest governance which could have been used to identify, select and quantify indicators for each participating country and for the Project as whole. A recent system developed by the World Bank<sup>12</sup> has been included in Annex 4 as an example of a framework for assessing forest governance impact.

Evaluation of the governance impacts of FGLG is beset by a number of problems:

- i. There has been no comprehensive analysis of forest governance (including identification of succinct and measurable indicators) at country level that can be used to track and measure change. This is reflected in the widespread view (of Project outsiders) that it is unclear exactly what FGLG aims to achieve (beyond establishing FGLG teams in participating countries and 'good governance' in a general sense). This has led to vagueness of purpose that is reflected in planning, reporting and monitoring by participating FGLG teams and a general focus on inputs and activities rather than outcomes. Project indicators of governance are strategic (global) and largely not measurable whilst country level forest governance indicators have not been clearly defined.
- ii. It is difficult to measure the 'added value' of FGLG for on-going country level governance processes and changes in forest governance. There have clearly been shifts in forest governance in participating countries and mostly these have been positive. It is likely that some of these changes would have taken place even without the Project (similar shifts have taken place in non-participating countries). Since the individuals constituting FGLG teams in participating countries are selected for their experience and capacity to contribute to governance issues, it is highly likely that these same individuals would have been closely engaged with similar governance related roles even in the absence of FGLG. This does not negate the impact of the Project but simply creates a problem for assessing its 'added value'. The concerned individuals mentioned that the relatively small level of resources available to be used through the FGLG has enabled them to be more effective and to operate as part of a 'team' giving them mutual support and legitimacy.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. IIED/WWF (2002) *The Pyramid: A Diagnostic and Planning Tool for Good Forest Governance*

<sup>12</sup> World Bank (2009) *Roots for good forest governance outcomes: An analytical framework for governance reforms*

- iii. FGLG is a relatively small Project in the participating countries and it is not working in isolation. All countries have a range of other on-going initiatives also aimed at enhancing forest governance and influencing governance processes. This creates a question of attribution i.e. where changes have taken place how much can these be attributed to FGLG?
- iv. The Project is not necessarily designed to tackle all aspects of forest governance in the participating countries. This would be a huge task. FGLG teams tend to focus their actions on areas where they can expect to have most leverage and achieve some results. That is why clear indicators are needed to show exactly what it is expected to change as a result of Project implementation and there may be some areas of governance which FGLG has not affected.
- v. Impacts of FGLG actions may take some time to appear (possibly after the end of the Project)

**Score Assessment**

- 1 Indicator completely achieved
- 2 Indicator largely achieved
- 3 Indicator partly achieved
- 4 Indicator achieved to a limited extent only
- 5 Indicator not achieved

Key: In = India; Ind = Indonesia. Shading indicates those countries where action/ impact was seen.

Table 7 - Impact against outcome indicators from both Project phases 2004-13

Specific objective: Improved forest governance in 10 countries in Africa and Asia - securing local rights, developing forest product legitimacy and combating climate change											
Impact indicators Phase 2 log-frame 2009-13	Assessment of impacts from 2005-13										Score
Outcome indicator 1: Policy reforms, investment decisions and institutional arrangements improved in favour of secure forest rights and small forest enterprise	There have been policy reform processes in 5 countries to which FGLG teams have made a significant contribution.										1
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
	Improvements in institutional and legal arrangements to secure forest rights have taken place in 4 countries to which FGLG has made a significant contribution										
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 2: Strategies being implemented to improve legality of forest products, institutionalise citizen engagement and contribute to broader forest governance improvement	Legality of forest products (including NTFPs) in 6 countries improved through processes where FGLG has had a significant involvement										2
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
	Greater levels of citizen engagement in forest governance (at strategic level) have taken place in 6 countries to which FGLG had made a significant contribution										
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 3: Initiatives to combat climate change through action in the forest sector pursued in ways that contribute to pro-poor forest governance and sustainability	REDD processes and climate policies in all participating countries have become more pro-poor as a result of FGLG involvement										2
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
	REDD processes and climate policies contributing to enhanced forest governance as a result of FGLG										
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	

	involvement in 4 countries										
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 4: International networks and processes better incorporate understanding about effective action for improved social justice in forestry	FGLG has contributed to international networks on REDD (covering three Asian countries) which are more focused on social justice issues. China-Africa learning platform (initiated by FGLG) is starting to generate awareness on forest governance issues amongst government and private sector in all seven African participating countries and in China.										3
<b>Impact indicators Phase I log-frame 2005-09</b>	<b>Assessment of impacts from 2005-13</b>										
Outcome indicator 1: Implementation of improved forest governance provisions in poverty reduction strategies, national forest programmes and decentralisation processes	Although all participating countries can demonstrate that governance and poverty reduction are key elements for policies and policy processes in the forest sector, in many countries there is a gap between these and the implementation reality that is poorly understood										3
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 2: Greater forest awareness and coordination between key decision makers at national and international levels driving sectoral and inter-sectoral strategies and processes	In all participating countries there is greater awareness of forest governance issues although this has not necessarily led to forest governance improvements or better relations between Govt and civil society										1
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 3: Implementation of strategies to reduce illegal or corrupt forestry activities	In 6 countries FGLG is having a significant influence on this although the effectiveness of such strategies has yet to be fully determined										3
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 4: Improved and transparent processes to monitor, discuss and address illegality in place	VPA processes taking place in 4 countries of which FGLG is having a significant level of engagement in 3.										2
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 5: Increase in forest enterprise compliance with legislation	Increasingly the legality and legitimacy of small forest enterprises is being improved in 5 countries with FGLG support										2
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 6: Stronger enterprise associations and information sharing networks on legal and sustainable practice	FGLG is directly contributing to better networking and information sharing practices in all countries but this is rarely institutionalised.										3
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 7: Clearer administrative rules and processes governing ownership and access rights	Formal rules and regulations have changed to improve access rights with FGLG support in 5 countries										2
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	
Outcome indicator 8: Inclusive policy and management frameworks linking local with national and international levels	Although the interpretation of this indicator is not clear, sub-national processes are linked to and able to influence forest policy and governance through formal or informal processes in 4 countries where FGLG is engaged at both national and sub-national levels										3
	Ca	Gh	In	Ind	Ma	Mo	SA	Ta	Ug	Vi	

Table 7 includes a brief narrative and score against all the outcome indicators from the current log-frame as well as the log-frame from the previous phase. Some of the indicators have been subdivided to give a better analysis of impacts as they are extremely broad. Individual countries that have contributed to the final score are shown in the table under each indicator. Information is based on

Project reports, discussions and interviews and self-assessments. Since the indicators are not quantitative, the assessment is inevitably rather subjective. Account has been taken of 'FGLG contribution' to all these scores. Therefore if there has been a change in the indicator but with no evidence of significant FGLG contribution to it, it has not been included.

Comparing the scope of the output indicators from both the phases of the Project with the more comprehensive forest governance framework shown in Annex 5 shows that there are certain aspects of forest governance that were not intended to be covered by FGLG. Areas that are absent or weak include: stability of forest institutions and conflict management and most aspects of quality of forest administration such as institutional separation of functions, cross-sectoral coordination, forest agency capacity and effectiveness and monitoring capacity. Also largely absent are aspects of forest product pricing, market institutions and efficiency, transparency and effectiveness of forest revenue collection.

According to this analysis, FGLG has made a moderate contribution to changes in various aspects of forest governance over the period 2005-13. Considering the complexity of the issues concerned and the extremely broad scope of forest governance this is a significant achievement for a small Project. The impact has varied considerably from country to country both in terms of the level of change and the areas of governance affected. Table 8 highlights the most significant governance impacts for each participating country where FGLG has had a significant contribution.

*Table 8 - Significant outcomes of FGLG countries*

<b>Country</b>	<b>Significant FGLG outcomes of FGLG 2005-13</b>
Cameroon	Established formal collaboration and support mechanisms (via memorandums of agreement) between FGLG and 2 ministries (MINFOF and MINEPDED) with a likely further agreement with the Ministry of Agriculture. This means that there is a now formal structure in place where key governance experts (from civil society) are contributing to enhancing forest governance across a wide range of programmes and themes.
Ghana	Strengthened the level and quality of engagement between various civil society forums and the Forestry Commission. This has enabled civil society to be better involved in strategic decision-making in the forest sector and has stimulated better government accountability to the wider public. This includes a strengthened role for civil society in the VPA process.
India	In the second Project Phase FGLG contributed to the formulation and subsequent rules and guidelines for the Forest Rights Act (2008) – especially the promotion of community forest rights. This has established the legal rights for forest dependent and tribal people to utilise local forest resources and will increasingly have an important impact on social justice. Earlier FGLG influenced the National Planning Commission to recognise the importance of NTFPs for national planning and development.
Indonesia	Strengthened the country's REDD+ process and programme by linking the national programme to sub-national (actual implementation level) and by increasing transparency, stakeholder participation in the REDD+ process. As a result, REDD+ is now much more likely to be implemented in a way that contributes to social justice and local needs especially as a result of the existence of an active network of 'alumni'.
Malawi	Provided evidence to influence discussions on policies and government actions in connection with the charcoal trade. It has challenged and led to the reform of State plantation logging rights. The model FGLG developed of clan-based community management of planted forests is now being scaled up across the Shire river catchment through a World Bank programme. FGLG has also ensured that the REDD+ process is more transparent and accountable to civil society voice.
Mozambique	Raised civil society and media awareness on the illegal timber trade that was leading to over-exploitation of forests and has led to action by government to combat corruption and engage in discussions with Chinese logging companies and timber traders for the first time. This has also had impacts for the local people who depend on these forest resources. FGLG also ensured that the REDD+ working group had adequate representation from civil society groups.
South Africa	Initiated a shift on the government's approach to working with outside stakeholders by organising and supporting small forest growers to lobby for a more favourable institutional

	and regulatory environment that will stimulate small-scale forest enterprises. This has been strengthened by the possibility of a government-sponsored enterprise support programme.
Tanzania	Raised government, civil society and media awareness of the extent and nature of illegal timber trade (including cross-border trade with neighbours). This has led to a more open dialogue between government and communities and a more active role for district-level law enforcement agencies.
Uganda	Contributed to a better response on the part of the Government to the voice of civil society and the media in respect of various actions that were being taken at high level such as the degazettement of forest reserves and transport of illegal forest products involving government. This has improved government accountability in the forest sector and led to a range of successful legal actions by civil society (often at considerable personal risk)
Vietnam	Raised awareness amongst Government of forest governance related issues generally and specifically in relation to community forestry and the need to improve the formal registration and implementation processes based on piloting. The result has been to provide an impetus to community forestry in the country and has fostered more productive engagement between farmers and government officials on community forestry issues.
International (and overall)	Greater profile and critical importance now given to forest governance by all international initiatives and related processes in the forest sector. Such profile and importance was much less evident in prior to 2003 and FGLG has contributed to this change. This has resulted in many subsequent initiatives around similar themes and a broader international network of practice focused around forest governance. This is providing a much more sustained push for action on forest governance across many countries including China which was previously not well linked into forest governance initiatives.

#### 4.2 International Level Outcome Impacts

Project output 4 is particularly concerned with achieving impacts on international policies and processes. The relevant outcome indicator for this is that ‘International networks and processes better incorporate understanding about effective action for improved social justice in forestry’. This implies that the aim of FGLG is to influence these processes - especially in the way that they utilise more effective tactics (learned from FGLG) for affecting forest governance. This is an ambitious outcome to achieve because there are many different international processes that all aim to influence forest governance in some way and they are working in multiple countries (including the 10 FGLG participating countries). On the other hand there is consistency in the aims of these processes i.e. to achieve pro-poor benefits and social justice, sustainable forest management and good governance.

FGLG has influenced these processes in two ways. Firstly, by networking, collaborating, disseminating learning and communicating with these other international processes and secondly, by direct involvement of FGLG participants in them. Both these have taken place during the course of the Project.

At international and at country level there has been a strong level of co-operation between FGLG and a range of international processes and initiatives in the forest sector including REDD+, FLEG-T, VPA, The Forest Dialogue, Growing Forests Partnerships, Forest Connect, African Model Forests Network and PROFOR. At international level this has mainly been through informal networks involving international partners (IIED and RECOFTC) and at national level through involvement of individual FGLG team members in these processes. This level of cross-learning, collaboration and communication has increased the profile of FGLG, has facilitated shared learning between different processes and has enabled a series of co-funded events, studies, reports, trainings, workshops and actions to take place within the participating countries that would otherwise have not happened had FGLG been working in isolation. Whilst FGLG has clearly benefited from this high level of collaborative working, it is less clear to what actual impacts FGLG has been able to have on these processes, many of which are better funded and more extensive than FGLG.

At country level there is considerable evidence to show that FGLG had an impact on other governance related processes – especially where this was explicitly a priority area of action for the country team. For example in Indonesia FGLG has had a significant effect on improving the transparency and level of participation in the REDD+ process and in Ghana it has contributed to the greater voice of NGOs in the VPA process.

It is difficult to determine any forest governance impacts that have resulted from the establishment in early 2013 of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform. Clearly there is now greater awareness amongst those involved in the actual launch event – especially as a result of the two studies that preceded it – but this is very limited in scale. At least one country (Mozambique) has reported a specific action as a result of this event but again the outcomes of this in terms of changes in policies and processes or compliance has not yet been demonstrated. Therefore, whilst the log-frame actions proposed around this China-Africa linkage have been implemented it is still rather too soon to understand how this will develop in future and to be able to determine any impacts. More time is still needed to develop this further.

Interviews conducted with non-FGLG global forest governance ‘experts’ showed good awareness of FGLG as a ‘brand’ closely associated with IIED (less so with RECOFTC) but only limited awareness of what FGLG’s approach actually is (for example, many thought it was an NGO network). People knew of the Project, but unless they had had some specific involvement with it, were often largely unaware of what FGLG actually did. Additionally there was very little recognition that FGLG had actually influenced national or international policies and processes in any significant way. This was also true for the FGLG-initiated China-Africa forest governance learning platform – although there was rather less awareness of this overall (perhaps unsurprisingly as it is a relatively new initiative).

### **4.3 FGLG Impacts (on people and forests)**

Project impacts are defined as the effects on forests and people (particularly on the target group of poor, marginalised people) that result from the changes in forest governance and that result in greater social justice. The log-frame narrative interprets this as the Project’s contribution to impacts on livelihoods of poor people and on forests. Defining, and especially quantifying, these impacts is rather beyond the scope of this evaluation and is limited by data availability. The Project log-frame identifies a number of sources of information that could be used to verify and measure these wider impacts at the country level. Some of these sources have been used in the brief reports prepared for the 3 countries visited during the evaluation (Annex 2). However, even if internationally or nationally available statistics show the direction of change of poverty, corruption, forest area, economic growth etc. it is impossible to determine whether FGLG has actually had any contribution to this or even whether this has been a result of changes in forest governance.

Realistically, the only statement that can be made regarding overall Project impact is based on an assumption that if forest governance is improving then impacts on social justice will also be positive. This assumption underpins current thinking on forest governance and is the driving force for most development interventions in the forestry sector. It is therefore a safe assumption to make. The critical factor is therefore to measure impacts on forest governance and assume that if these are positive then overall Project impacts will be too. Since there have been moderate impacts on forest governance it can be assumed that there will have been moderate impacts on forests and people.

### **4.4 Sustainability**

During the evaluation, questions about sustainability of the FGLG initiative were raised during most interviews and in group discussions in countries visited. Country teams were also asked to assess the sustainability of FGLG in their self-assessments. Answers were highly country specific, but the overall view of the country teams and of this evaluation was that the teams would persist in one form or another after the end of the Project in a way that will allow the FGLG approach to continue to operate.

Since there is no permanent institutional base for FGLG there is no infrastructure and no salaries to maintain. However, many of the actions of FGLG do require funds for travel, workshops and meetings, publications etc. Consequently the question of sustainability is intrinsically linked with availability of funding. Various possible scenarios were identified by the country FGLG teams. In some countries e.g. Vietnam, India, South Africa, it was felt that such funding could be sourced from within the countries or via Regional networks and partners without too much difficulty to enable the group to continue functioning – albeit at a slightly lower level than at present. In other countries e.g. Tanzania, Ghana, Cameroon, it was felt that the group could continue to function and have impacts – more as an informal network between individuals without significant levels of funding. The fact that no country informants felt that FGLG would cease operating at the end of Project illustrates the

strength of the support networks established, the commitment of the team members and the extent to which they are providing a valuable role.

Sustainability of the China-Africa forest governance learning partnership differs as it has had only a short time to establish itself, it does not yet have a track record of actions and achievements and it does not yet have wider recognition. After a positive start with this initiative, with further funding and support to enable it to continue the possibility of its impact and future sustainability is good.



## 5 LESSONS LEARNT

Based on the evaluation of FGLG over the period 2005-13 a number of lessons have been learnt.

### 5.1 Overall Effectiveness

The most important lesson from this evaluation is that the FGLG approach is valid and meets a particular need in terms of its role in influencing forest governance. The FGLG approach can be characterised as being innovative, informal, individual and influential. Experience has shown that it can be effective in influencing forest governance and contributing towards social justice. Because of their track records, FGLG teams in most participating countries are increasingly being recognised as appropriate participants to engage with different aspects of forest governance and in doing this they have demonstrated variable, but positive governance outcomes.

The particular strength of the FGLG approach is its somewhat informal and more individually-oriented approach to forest governance reform. This can contribute to forest governance outcomes that complement other on-going and more formal processes such as VPA processes or REDD + processes. For a relatively small outlay of about € 25,000 per year it is possible to draw in forest governance expertise from different sectors into the national forest governance discourse and provide key individuals with an informal setting for mutual support and collaborative action capitalising on their own personal networks and institutional bases. The flexibility of FGLG and the autonomy of FGLG teams to decide how to use their resources to greatest effect is one of the major strengths of the approach.

### 5.2 FGLG Teams

The Project has demonstrated a number of lessons on the composition and structure of the FGLG teams that have enabled them to be effective. Critical criteria include:

- Teams based on individual rather than institutional membership i.e. FGLGs are not intended to be representative, rather they represent a body of expertise. This is an important and innovative element of the Project.
- Informality and autonomy of the FGLG. These are both essential since they allow maximum flexibility in terms of membership, mode of operation and the specific governance areas that can be tackled. FGLG is best considered as a rather loose network of collaborators rather than a recognised institution.
- Quality of individual group members. They should have a demonstrated track record and recognised expertise relating to forest governance and with their own established networks.
- Membership drawn from both government and civil society. The most effective FGLG's draw their membership from both inside and outside the forest sector.
- The FGLG convenor with sufficient time available and with high capacity to coordinate and communicate. The convenor should be widely perceived as a 'safe pair of hands' able to bring together people with very different perspectives and with a visible profile based on capacity and experience. Getting the right person is critical.
- Quality and nature of the host organisation. This determines the image and credibility of the FGLG approach in the eyes of government and other civil society organisations. It is not necessary that the host organisation should have a high public profile as its main role is to manage funds and administer the approach.

### 5.3 FGLG Approach

The Project has generated a number of useful lessons relating to the FGLG approach critical to determining whether or not the teams are able to fulfil their potential for influencing forest governance outcomes and whether the FGLG approach itself is sustainable:

- National and sub-national engagement. A number of countries have followed a dual approach to FGLG by operating at both central and implementation (sub-national) levels. Central level engagement is essential to influence actual policies and processes in forest governance whilst implementation level engagement (often separately supported through collaboration with partners) contributes to generating quality evidence and learning to ground-truth these national processes and give them greater legitimacy. It also provides a means to better

understand and tackle the frequent issues affecting implementation. The duel approach has proved to be more effective than working solely at central level.

- Support for voice and awareness. Missing from most country FGLG plans have been actions to build and support awareness and voice of target groups to demand their rights and accountability in terms of better forest governance and service delivery. For FGLG such actions represent the other side of the coin and create a demand for improved forest governance than will reinforce the legitimacy and value of influencing actions of FGLG.
- Institutionalising the body of practice. The ‘body of practice’ represented by FGLG teams is insufficiently ‘institutionalised’ in the sense that experience in using tactics and personal and institutional networks are at the risk of being lost as a result of changes in the composition of FGLG teams (which are very likely to take place). Whilst the movement of individuals away from FGLG into other potentially more influential positions is a positive outcome of the Project, it is also critical to ensure that lessons and approaches are learnt and retained for future actions. Addressing this is a challenge for FGLG teams – improved country-level documentation, websites etc. can assist this as can more effective communication within the teams or within the wider group of ‘FGLG alumni<sup>13</sup>’. Note that it is not suggested that the FGLG itself should be institutionalised – only the approaches and experiences.
- Collaboration with partners. Active collaboration between FGLG and various other projects and institutions on particular actions or policy processes has contributed much to the effectiveness of the FGLG approach. It represents greater value for money, reduces duplicate effort and creates synergy. However, a more proactive approach to collaboration should be pursued by FGLG to seek partnerships of various different kinds (not just for funding) e.g. for field-based learning. For FGLG the benefits of this are clear as it extends the scope and range of the project. For collaborating partners the benefits include access to individual expertise (in FGLG), greater potential for influencing policies and processes that will improve the effectiveness of their field-based projects and cross-country linkages. Since most donor organisations are now highly concerned with ‘aid-harmonisation’ FGLGs involvement provides a means to do this.
- Individual action. There are many examples where there has been effective engagement of FGLG in country-level processes through the involvement of influential FGLG members rather than via FGLG as a recognised group. These individuals can be seen as a conduit between the views and experiences of the wider FGLG team and the actual process in which they are involved as individuals. The lesson to be learnt is that once the FGLG team has carved a niche for itself individual members will be asked to contribute to such processes and this can be considered as a valid achievement that validates the quality of the FGLG and its members.

#### 5.4 FGLG in an International Context

IIED and RECOFTC have provided the FGLG initiative with a platform for wider publicity and profile. Without these two international partners this would have been severely limited – as would have been the joined-up thinking and action with other international processes that has taken place. However, there still remains a general lack of clarity, awareness and understanding amongst external observers about the approach, actions and methodologies of FGLG. This leads to the conclusion that despite the volume of ‘noise’ surrounding FGLG i.e. IIED factsheets, website, documents, presentation and other media – much of this is not reaching the target audience of people concerned with forest governance at an international level. If this to be overcome then different tactics would need to be used.

---

<sup>13</sup> The term ‘FGLG alumni’ is used in Indonesia to refer to past and current members of the FGLG. It is a useful concept that could be used in other countries and that could be the basis for better social networking and institutionalisation of the FGLG ‘body of practice’

From an international perspective FGLG is inextricably associated with IIED whereas at national level (within the participating countries) IIED has appropriately maintained a very low profile in order to avoid undermining country FGLG autonomy. RECOFTC has had a higher national profile in Vietnam and Indonesia where it is closely associated with FGLG.

International learning events have taken place annually as a means of sharing experiences and ideas. These have been largely ‘internal events’ amongst Project participants that have not significantly contributed to wider dissemination of FGLG learning and approaches. The associated workshop reports, whilst valuable for the Project, are likely to be of less interest to outside stakeholders.

Given the modest scale of the Project and the fact that there are many other international initiatives and processes underway (including newer initiatives for linking China with Africa) it is probably over-ambitious to expect that FGLG as a small initiative in a crowded international field can really make a mark internationally and Project impacts at country level are more realistically achievable.

### **5.5 Methodologies and Innovation**

The learning group approach is an innovative methodology developed by IIED and now with a proven record of achievement. Despite the emphasis on innovative tools and methods during the early part of the Project, the range of tactics used by the FGLG teams has actually proved not dissimilar across the 10 participating countries. Although the quantity of Project’s physical outputs is impressive (Table 5 quantifies some of these) including those from the country teams and also from IIED and RECOFTC, there is less evidence of innovative tactics being used or even of specific targeting i.e. using a specific tool to influence or reach a particular target group. In connection with this there is also an absence of analysis of the effectiveness of different tools and tactics that can inform future learning groups of this kind.

Projects and programmes across the world produce huge quantities of workshop reports, study reports, policy briefs, press releases and media of different kinds. FGLG has added to this without a real sense of which approaches would be more effective (and cost effective) in forest governance reform (although some certainly are) and with a general reliance on ‘tried and tested’ methods. After almost a decade, the Project is well placed to do this analysis as it has a diverse range of experiences developed over a long period of time. The Project document identified some possible new methods using social media and IT although few of these have been tried by country teams resulting in a lost opportunity to evaluate how these might best be used in future and whether they can be effective tools contributing to forest governance reform. At present not all country teams have websites and few make use of more interactive social media.

### **5.6 Constraints of the FGLG Approach**

Despite the positive lessons from the FGLG approach there are several constraints which have hindered effectiveness. Some of these may have been mitigated to varying degrees in different participating countries but experience over the past decade with FGLG has shown that these are the main limiting factors:

- Ability to commit sufficient time to FGLG actions was the major constraint mentioned by many FGLG members. Inevitably the individuals with greatest skills and capacity are also in greatest demand from elsewhere (usually from their own organisations). Therefore time constraints tended to limit their greater contribution – particularly in the absence of any specific financial incentives. Since it is the individuals not the institutions who are the FGLG members, substitution is not possible and since funds are limited, payments e.g. on a consultancy basis are not possible (nor desirable). Paradoxically FGLG has been able to gather together the best individuals in the country teams – but because of these time limitations their contributions have been invariably constrained.
- Funding limitation was frequently mentioned as a constraint to greater achievement. However, it is unclear whether the availability of more funds at country level would necessarily lead to greater impact – especially considering the limitations of time (of individuals involved) and the productive level of financial collaboration that has been achieved between FGLG and other projects and organisations.

- There is a difference of approach between country teams to targeting and tackling country level governance issues. In some countries the teams have been highly focused – concentrating their efforts on a limited range of actions (not necessarily even covering all the 4 outputs of the log-frame). This has tended to give demonstrable impacts in the specific target areas. Where the approach has been to act across a wider range of themes, impacts have been less easily identifiable. The lesson is that a balance is needed between responsiveness and flexibility to seize opportunities as these arise and a planned and targeted approach to achieving governance impacts. Targeting appears to be more effective.
- The question of incentives was raised during discussions with FGLG team members i.e. what incentives are there for skilled and experienced individuals to participate voluntarily in the Project. Many mentioned that it was their commitment and accountability to other team members that drove their involvement (illustrating the effectiveness of the country team approach) although the opportunity to attend international events, engage in an international project with a high profile and to have an opportunity to publish were all identified as additional incentives. A lesson is that these types of opportunities need to be provided to the right individuals in order to provide sufficient incentive to secure their participation.

### **5.7 Project Design and Management**

A common theme identified during this evaluation has been the need for a more thorough country-level assessment of forest governance to support initial Project planning including: identification of specific strengths and weaknesses through systematic assessment (see Annex 5); development of country-specific outputs (targeted at weaknesses) and establishment of baselines with objectively verifiable outcome monitoring indicators. Without these, specific Project focus at country level remains unclear and Project achievement cannot be properly evaluated. The lesson is that with some initial investment of Project funds into country level forest governance assessment, country plans and programmes would be more targeted and Project reporting and monitoring requirements would be fully met.

Including 10 countries in the Project effectively reduces the resources available to each participating country and increases the associated costs of travel and project management e.g. for international learning events and project management (by IIED). There are clear benefits to the participants of FGLG teams in these international sharing and travel opportunities – but it is less clear what the added value of this is for Project outcomes (governance impacts). Some participants mentioned that they felt that they were missing out on the international opportunities (limited to two persons per year per country) and suggested that regional meetings on specific themes might be more productive. The level of contact between participants attending these international events seemed to drop off quickly after the event and the actual benefits of this are hard to identify. Consequently, the multi-country approach in 10 countries, although popular, may be too diverse and too widespread for effective sharing and contribution to Project outcomes. The lesson from this is that although the international learning events may have had some benefits for Project outcomes, more consideration is needed to means of improving this impact i.e. through fewer countries (regional or thematic targeting); greater levels of follow-up after the events by facilitators or by the use of e-conferencing or similar approaches.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

FGLG has had a moderate impact on forest governance and consequently on social justice. Clearly there is no silver bullet for improving forest governance and various other approaches are also being used (with some effect) but the FGLG approach can support and enhance the effectiveness of these in a relatively cost-effective way. Ultimately a multi-pronged strategy is required for creating sector reform

These recommendations based on the approach, performance and lessons of the current phase have been developed as a means to improve any similar future initiative following the FGLG approach that may emerge and to ensure that lessons learnt are incorporated.

### 6.1 Consolidate and Disseminate Lessons from the Learning Group Approach

IIED has been instrumental in developing the FGLG approach and supporting its implementation in 10 countries over the past decade with some positive impacts on forest governance and social justice. Despite this, the approach and its underlying rationale is not well known or understood outside the immediate area of the Project and participating individuals and organisations. A recommendation from the previous evaluation in 2009 was for IIED to facilitate a process of reflection around the learning group approach in 10 countries to develop and document a shared vision of the underlying rationale. To a limited extent this was addressed during the international learning event in 2009 in Indonesia. However documentation for external consumption around the learning group approach (what, why, how etc.) is still weak<sup>14</sup>. This recommendation still remains valid on 2 levels. Firstly (as before) to consolidate and capture lessons around the approach (theory of change) amongst the participating countries and secondly to present these lessons in a form that can be widely understood and valued by a much wider external audience. After almost a decade of pursuing the learning group approach there no single document that explains its rationale and demonstrates its effectiveness - especially in the context of governance reform. There may be similar experiences from other IIED facilitated learning groups that could also be combined with this. This would be of considerable interest in all sectors where initiatives and processes are underway for enhancing governance. As a follow up to this it would be useful to produce a guideline 'to managing and supporting learning groups' that would have wider application.

### 6.2 Analyse the Effectiveness of Different Tactics

There is a wealth of experience within FGLG of pursuing different tactics and methodologies in ways that contribute to forest sector reform. Within countries there is good knowledge about what works under different circumstances. For example several country teams have made extensive use of TV media, others have used the printed press or websites whilst others have found reports, information gathering and policy analysis to be more effective tactics. This wealth of ideas needs to be captured in an objective way to determine what means have proved to be most effective and under what circumstances. This will assist future initiatives with similar strategic aims to be more effective and targeted i.e. having identified the message and the target group – what are the best options? This type of analysis might also be used to question the value of some of the more predictable and perhaps overused tactics such as policy briefs, press releases, workshop reports to determine whether more effective means can be identified and used. Documentation and analysis should not only focus on successes but also on failure i.e. tactics that appear to be less successful. Documenting this should not be considered a sign of a failed Project, but a sign of a Project willing to learn from mistakes and contribute to improved knowledge.

### 6.3 Enhance IT Usage

Considering the geographically dispersed nature of the FGLG initiative and the number of different people involved, relatively little use has been made of social media and the internet more generally as a means for internal communications and sharing as well as dissemination and awareness raising outside. A possible exception to this is the 'FGLG alumni' concept used in Indonesia that lends itself

---

<sup>14</sup> Note that the IIED briefing 'Shifting Power in Forests' is somewhat outdated.

well to social networking. Any future initiative of this kind will inevitably have an increasing dependency on such communication methods to increase the spontaneity and effectiveness of communication as well as reducing Project costs such as travel and publications and enhancing transparency (especially through better engagement with wider civil society and with youth). The Project document included an action to develop a communications strategy (under activity 4.3) that has not really been implemented. At this end of Project stage – a useful Project output would be for a comprehensive analysis of communications media used (with a focus on IT) and a series of recommendations that can be used for the future. Even a superficial overview of present IT usage indicates that very little use is made of facebook/twitter/linkedin and others and many country FGLG teams do not have websites or blogs for disseminating ideas, inviting comments and publishing actions or findings. A decade ago when the first phase of the Project was being developed there may have been a justification for this in terms of IT capacity and access to on-line communication. Nowadays this is no longer the situation for all participating countries.

#### **6.4 Assess Country-wise Forest Governance Status**

There are now comprehensive systems available or still being developed for analysing and monitoring forest governance (Annex 4 is an example). These can be used as a framework for future work on forest governance reforms and for monitoring progress and change. Prior identification of particular strengths and weaknesses in the forest governance framework for a country will allow a more targeted approach to be taken to governance reform i.e. what needs to change and what the indicators of this will be? This help to focus Project efforts and improve effectiveness of reform processes and will enable the aims of forest governance reform to be articulated in a way that clarifies Project outputs and outcomes and enables impacts to be measured through monitoring of relevant and verifiable country-specific indicators against a baseline scenario. The process of doing this analysis can also contribute to developing a shared vision and shared goals for forest governance which will bring together different stakeholders in a productive way.

#### **6.5 Invest in Impact Studies**

A particular difficulty with this evaluation has been to assess the impacts of shifts in forest governance on forest dependent people and on forests themselves. Various countries FGLG teams have conducted studies to generate evidence to raise awareness and initiate actions on governance reforms but there are fewer examples of studies conducted to show the impacts of changes in governance. Investing in these types of studies would contribute to wider awareness of the value of improved forest governance amongst policy makers as well as providing a means to identify any unanticipated consequences and further actions required. Normally such impact studies contributing to project monitoring and evaluation would be in-built as part of project design.

#### **6.6 Establish a Central Archive/Repository of FGLG Material**

The most comprehensive repository of FGLG related materials (documents, videos and presentations) available at present is on the IIEG FGLG webpage. During the course of this evaluation it has become apparent that much material exists that is not available on this site. Some countries have established FGLG sites (usually via their hosting organisations) although again much material is missing from these. After almost a decade, a complete repository of all materials easily accessible via one site would be a useful record of Project achievements and outputs. It would be relatively easy to establish at this stage although this will become harder to do after Project completion and as individuals familiar with these materials are less engaged.

#### **6.7 Enhance the Role of IIED (International Project Facilitator)**

IIEDs role as Project facilitator and manager has been pivotal for ensuring coherence of approach and coordination of actions across 10 countries. The following recommendations are aimed at enhancing this role for any future projects. It is recommended that in future IIED (and any international partners) should provide (in addition to current roles):

- Facilitation and technical backstopping for country-level forest governance assessment and analysis at the start of the initiative
- Facilitation of regular regional (rather than international workshops) with more consistent follow-up to provide on-going support to country teams for action. This will allow greater

levels of participation (more participants from each country – including more key non-FGLG members) and a more focused contribution of these events to project aims.

- Support for more analytical work to synthesise and document country level lessons and experiences e.g. What has been achieved? What are the critical areas for future engagement? What are the best tactics to use? etc.
- Capacity development and quality assurance for FGLG teams to improve the quality of annual plans and reports (that can be more widely disseminated).
- Support for establishing collaborative agreements that will enable country teams to be less financially dependent on a single project as source of funds
- Contribute to a more consistent approach for joining-up central and field-level actions in all participating countries. This would require support for new methodologies e.g. getting policy-makers to the field and others for bringing the field issues to the centre. Also assistance for greater levels of collaboration (including funding). The FGLG approach is proven to be effective and as such may be of interest to field-based initiatives for enhancing their impacts.

### **6.8 Improve the Level of Donor (EC) Engagement**

The EC is commended for supporting an innovative and flexible approach to forest governance reform through the Project. Consequently, one of the slightly surprising findings of this evaluation is the limited level of engagement that the EC has had with the Project at both delegation and central (Brussels) level. At country level it is recommended that there is more regular contact between EC delegations and FGLG teams – through structured rather than informal means e.g. report sharing, invitations to Project events etc. This may help to identify possible field-level linkages with other EC projects and will also help to keep delegations informed about innovative approaches that could be applied to other sectors.

Whilst there is some central contact between EC Brussels and IIED this could be improved to form the basis for a much more productive dialogue on initial project design (especially on the log-frame) and annual narrative reports. In particular it may provide an opportunity for better linkage with other processes supported by EC e.g. via VPAs and may prove to be complementary to these processes by providing a different type of support (informal, innovative and individual)

### **6.9 Improve Linkages with other Projects (including EC Projects and Others)**

Almost all country FGLG teams have had some success in establishing linkages between the Project and other donor supported initiatives in their respective countries. However there have clearly been some missed opportunities for such collaboration that were not identified or made. These would invariably have been for the mutual benefit of FGLG and the collaborating projects by creating linkages for identifying, communicating and acting on field-based issues that require central level policy shifts to address them. One means of for improving such linkages would be to identify potential opportunities and specifically incorporate them in annual plans as actions. Similarly other projects and programmes need to be given greater awareness of the value of FGLG for their more effective implementation e.g. by providing them with a central level platform for raising sector governance issues.

### **6.10 Involve Existing FGLG Teams in New Project Development**

FGLG teams in 10 countries now represent a valuable and experienced human resource in forest sector governance. Most of the individuals involved are aware of the recent development of the China-Africa forest governance learning platform and recognise the potential that this may offer for forest governance in their respective countries. However there is little awareness of details of what is actually being proposed for the future and, considering the considerable capacities of the teams, very little opportunity for their direct involvement in crafting a new initiative. A few individuals who attended the workshop in China in 2013 have been involved in some discussions – but this has not been broadened or shared sufficiently at country level. Should a new donor funded project arise, there is a risk that this may not capture all the ideas and experiences of the FGLG teams and that it may lack their ownership and commitment as a result. It is recommended that means of involving all FGLG teams in any further Project proposal preparation is initiated.

## ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Evaluation of the work of the Forest Governance Learning Group, 2009 to 2013

#### 1. Background to the initiative

The Forest Governance Learning Group (FGLG) is an informal alliance of in-country teams and international partners, currently active in seven African and three Asian countries<sup>15</sup>, facilitated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). It aims to connect those marginalized from forest governance to those controlling it, and to help both do things better. A shared belief motivates the Group: that forestry can contribute to the eradication of poverty and sustainability, but only with good forest governance – the right leadership, institutions, policy decisions and practical systems. After an inception phase starting in 2003, it has been supported since 2005 by the EC, and the Dutch and British governments – to the value of approximately 5 million Euros.

The overall objective of the current phase is: ‘Socially just and sustainable management of forests in developing countries’ with a specific objective of improved forest governance in ten countries in Africa and Asia - securing local rights, developing forest product legitimacy and combating climate change.

In each country, FGLG teams deliver the following four outputs to achieve these objectives:

- Forest rights and small forest enterprise. Policy reforms, investment decisions and institutional arrangements in favour of secure forest rights and small forest enterprise.
- *Legitimate forest products*. Strategies to improve legality of forest products, institutionalise citizen engagement and contribute to broader forest governance improvement.
- *Pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation through forestry*. Initiatives to combat climate change through action in the forest sector contribute to pro-poor forest governance and sustainability.
- *Trans-national learning and preparedness*. Understanding improved in international networks and processes about effective action for improved social justice in forestry.

In each country there are four interconnected parts to the work:

- Team of ‘governance-connected’ individuals from a mix of agencies with experience and ideas
- Policy work on forest livelihood problems due to people being marginalized from decisions
- Development of practical guidance and tools for making progress
- Creating and taking opportunities to make governance improvements

FGLG country teams are well networked, motivated and targeted in their approach – each team works to an annual workplan, as well as a five year workplan, and these are made publicly available on the web. Country teams, backed by IIED and international partners, carry out focused studies, learning and training events, network building, supported uptake of governance tools, develop and exploit direct opportunities for governance reform, and employ various means of communication in order to reach specific audiences. Inter-country capacity-building work and engagement with key international policy processes aims to achieve creative transfers of insight from one location to another, and to install findings in international policy.

The main partners involved in FGLG are:

- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) – facilitates the group
- Civic Response – convenes the team in Ghana
- Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment – convenes the team in Uganda
- Centre for Development Management – convenes the team in Malawi

---

<sup>15</sup> Ghana, Cameroon, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, India, Vietnam and Indonesia. The initiative also includes work with partners in China.



- Enviro Legal Defence Firm – convenes the team in India
- Natural Resource Development Centre - convenes the team in Indonesia
- Tanzania Natural Resources Forum – convenes the team in Tanzania
- Forestry South Africa – convenes the team in South Africa
- Centro Terra Viva – convenes the team in Mozambique
- The Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Central Africa (NESDA-CA) – convenes the team in Cameroon

The Regional Community Forestry Training Centre for Asia and the Pacific (RECOFTC) – convenes the team in Vietnam

Contractual partnerships have also been established with partners in China, as part of a component of the project which is developing a ‘China Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform:

- Global Environmental Institute, China
- The China representative of Internews Europe

In addition IIED has an ongoing contractual partnership with the headquarters (Bangkok) office of RECOFTC – the Centre for People and Forests - which provides particular support to the Vietnamese and Indonesian country teams.

Previous assessment by country teams shows that FGLG’s policy research, tool development, advocacy, media and networking have generated substantial impact. For example:

- A legal timber partnership agreement between the EC and Ghana has been shaped in favour of community forestry and enterprise.
- Parliamentary action in Malawi is de-criminalising charcoal production and pushing more sustainable livelihoods for the first time.
- High-level action has been taken on illegal logging and unscrupulous Chinese investment in Mozambique.
- The President in Uganda has been forced to stop the give-away of forest reserves to exploitative agribusiness.

The website for the FGLG, where news, reports and work plans for the FGLG country teams can be found, is: <http://www.iied.org/forest-governance-learning-group>

In 2009, the FGLG was evaluated by an independent consultant<sup>16</sup> who, amongst other things, outlined the results that country teams had achieved over the four year period 2005-2009. Another independent evaluation is now required under the terms of the EC funding and this will continue to outline FGLG’s impact and aggregate this information, thereby giving a long term view of the impact that each country team has achieved over the last nine years.

While the aims, objectives and approach of the second phase differ from the first phase, these are not significant. Forest governance issues remain central to the programme as does sharing learning and lessons. The emphasis has shifted from the development of practical tools to, for example, strategies that aim to improve the legality of forest products as well as how initiatives in the forest sector that aim to combat climate change can contribute to improving forest governance.

FGLG at both international and country level is an ambitious initiative. However, resources are limited. The extent to which these limited resources have been used tactically and effectively to lever other resources in pursuit of this ambition will be an important issue for the evaluation.

## 2. Objective of the evaluation

The objective of the independent evaluation is:

- To assess the performance, achievements and impacts in relation to the action’s overall goal, specific objective, outputs and activities. More specifically, the evaluator will assess the

---

<sup>16</sup> Blomley, T. (2009) ‘Evaluation of the work of the Forest Governance Learning Group 2005 – 2009’, IIED, UK

project design for addressing the stated goal, purpose and output; the project's performance and achievements; project implementation, management and administration; and lessons learned. The evaluation will liaise closely with in-country EC Delegations.

### **3. Tasks for the evaluation**

The evaluation will involve four main tasks. An indication of the relative time and effort expected to be devoted to each task is given below. A more precise balance of the evaluator's effort across these tasks will be worked out with the evaluator. Similarly, the balance between conducting these tasks for the initiative as a whole and within each country context will need to be discussed and agreed upon:

#### **3.1 Assess the approach of the FGLG initiative [about 20% of the evaluation effort]**

- Reflect on the context of forest governance action and discourse in the countries involved in the FGLG initiative and internationally since 2003 and assess the general premise, political timeliness and appropriateness of the approach of the initiative
- Assess the approach and design of the initiative – its theory of change, objectives, outputs, objectively verifiable indicators and their means of verification. This will include explorations of relevance, specificity, efficiency, effectiveness, creativity, innovation, impact, flexibility, sustainability and institutional relationships.
- Reflect on issues of appropriateness and flexibility of the approach to changing context and timeliness during the course of the initiative.

#### **3.2 Assess the performance of the FGLG initiative to date [about 40% of the evaluation effort]**

- Assess what progress has been made to date in achievement of the initiative's overall objective, specific objective, outputs and objectively verifiable indicators.
- Determine whether the activities undertaken by the initiative have been timely, effective, efficient, adequate and appropriate in terms of meeting the outputs and specific objective.
- Determine the extent to which identified risks/assumptions have impacted on the project or have been mitigated by the project (and assess whether the right risks were identified).
- Assess whether the funding resources made available to the project have been adequately accounted for
- Assess the management and administration of the initiative: how effectively and efficiently IIED coordinated and led the initiative; the capacity of IIED and its key partners (including the international partners and consultants) to implement the initiative; collaboration between IIED and its partners, and amongst partners, through the initiative; administration, including finance, by IIED and its partners; reporting within the initiative and by IIED to the EC and others on the progress of the project.
- Assess how effectively the initiative has addressed gender and generation issues and how it has ensured that both men and women will benefit from its activities and outputs.
- Assess the effectiveness and performance of the different partnerships that the programme has forged with public, private and civil society organisations.
- What evidence is there to show that this initiative has offered value for money?
- Assess the impacts of the initiative – direct and indirect, expected and unexpected - the evidence of changed decisions and discourse, of levels of engagement and relevant activity catalysed. Why have certain expected impacts been achieved and why have others not? How effective have the methods used been? What effects can be attributed to FGLG and how? Which cases illustrate this best? What is the added value of country teams being part of a wider group? How sustainable and replicable is the FGLG initiative without IIED's input? This section should build on the work done by Blomley in his 2009 evaluation (see section 3.2 pp14-24) and follow his scoring method so comparisons can be made between these two funding periods.

#### **3.3 Draw out lessons from the experience of the FGLG initiative [about 30% of the evaluation effort]**

- Identify lessons on working with partners: the extent to which the FGLG initiative has played a useful catalytic and facilitative role across a range of stakeholder interests, and what can be learned from this approach.

- Identify lessons on innovation: the extent to which the FGLG initiative has been successful or not in developing and/or implementing innovative approaches and best practice.
- Identify lessons on project management: lessons learned about the organisational arrangements for managing the FGLG initiative.
- Identify lessons on communications and paths to policy influence.
- Identify lessons that have contributed to the long-term impact and sustainability of FGLG.

### **3.4 Make recommendations based on the evaluation [about 10% of the evaluation effort]**

Based upon the assessment of the approach, performance and lessons learnt, make recommendations to IIED and its partners as appropriate, with a particular focus on the next phase of work of the FGLG.

### **4. Evaluation methodology**

The evaluator will provide independent opinion and assessment. The evaluator will have the assistance of IIED staff (and FGLG country teams where appropriate) to:

- Undertake a thorough review of all the project documents and communication products. This will include the work plans agreed between IIED and its partners, and all progress reports, policy analysis documents, tools and advocacy outputs (a Drop-Box will be set up where all electronic material will be stored)
- Review annual reports submitted by IIED to the FGLG donors.
- Visit country teams in Cameroon, Mozambique and India (this group of countries was arrived at following discussion and agreement with FGLG country teams). Country teams will facilitate appropriate field and stakeholder visits for the evaluator.
- Using the experience from the site visits the evaluator will engage through email and telephone with the other country teams and project partners where a personal visit was not possible.
- Identify a sub-set of stakeholders from the global community interested in forest governance issues – and contact and interview these people.

### **5. Expected outputs**

- The evaluation will be presented as a single report and it will be comprised of:
  - One page outlining the key conclusions and recommendations for IIED's director and strategy team;
  - A three page executive summary.
  - No more than 30 pages for the full report which will include a section that provides a clear description of the methodologies used both to gather and analyse information,
  - Annexes and references to be appended to the full report as appropriate.
- The evaluator will prepare an accompanying PowerPoint presentation that highlights the key findings of the report.
- The evaluator will present his/her evaluation findings to a meeting that will include: EC representatives; the IIED FGLG team; and selected other individuals from IIED and DFID. This meeting may occur in either Brussels or London.
- The evaluator will consider comments on the draft report and presentation in the preparation of the final report.

## ANNEX 2 – COUNTRY REPORTS (3 COUNTRIES VISITED)

### A. Cameroon FGLG

#### Background

This annex summarises the findings of a short evaluation visit to Cameroon during the period 8-11th October 2013.

The FGLG team in Cameroon (known as GREG-Forêts or *Groupe de Réflexion et d'Etude sur la Gouvernance des Forêts*) became active in 2006. GREG-Forêts is hosted by an NGO (NESDA-Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Central Africa) which took over this role from CIFOR early in the first phase of the project. The GREG-Forêts convenor works for the African Model Forests Initiative (RAFM) and thus there are close links between RAFM and GREG-Forêts with a number of collaborative actions. Other members are drawn from civil society organisations, donor agencies, INGOs, the private sector and government. About 40% of GREG-Forêts members are women. The GREG-Forêts team is characterised by the high profile its individual members most of whom are nationally (sometimes internationally) prominent in their particular spheres. This has significant advantages in terms of their ability to engage with and directly influence Government but the downside is that team members are busy and in high demand to attend meetings, workshops and other events. Although the GREG-Forêts team appears to have a coherent identity and there appears to be a good level of both formal and informal communication within the team and between the team members and government, others who are external to the FGLG initiative have indicated a surprising lack of awareness and knowledge of GREG-Forêts. This would seem to imply that individuals are more closely associated with their own organisations and institutions rather than with GREG-Forêts and that GREG-Forêts operates as a 'closed shop' with less engagement with those who are outside the boundaries of its own team.

#### Cameroon Forest Governance Context

FGLG initiative is relevant in the country for a number of reasons:

- Cameroon has about 20m ha of forest with about 42% geographical coverage (2010 figures)<sup>17</sup>. The forest sector contributes to about 1.9% of GNP<sup>18</sup>
- There are increasing pressures on forest from mining, commercial agriculture, smallholder farming and commercial logging
- 30.4% of Cameroon's population lives in severe poverty<sup>19</sup>. Many of these poor people are marginalised, forest dependent and indigenous people who practice subsistence farming for their livelihoods. Their rights to use their local forests for subsistence agriculture and small scale forest enterprise are frequently not clearly established and in many cases are still contested. The forest sector thus has significant potential to contribute to social justice, equity and poverty reduction.
- Cameroon is ranked 144 under the corruptions perception index with a score of 26<sup>20</sup>. The forest sector continues to be characterised by illegal or unsustainable logging and weak governance.
- Forest and forest landscapes form important means to mitigate climate change (as carbon sinks and to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions). Forest loss and degradation also contribute to Cameroon's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions with 51.5% of these emissions resulting from land use change (usually conversion of forest to other land uses or forest degradation)<sup>21</sup>

<sup>17</sup> FAO (2011) The State of the World's Forests

<sup>18</sup> The primary sector (agriculture, forestry, fisheries) contributed 23.4 % of GDP in 2011 according to the African Economic Outlook 2012.

<http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org/fileadmin/uploads/aeo/PDF/Cameroon%20Full%20Country%20Note.pdf> (accessed on 13/10/13). Figure of 2% taken from FAO (2011) The State of the World's Forests

<sup>19</sup> UNDP Human Development Report (2013)

<sup>20</sup> Corruption Perception Index (2012) Transparency International

<sup>21</sup> Cameroon's RPP (January 2013) <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/cameroon>

- Cameroon's evergreen forests are internationally important biodiversity hotspots and provide habitat for a range of globally threatened and endemic species. However, there is an annual deforestation rate of 0.9% and 11% of all species are under threat<sup>22</sup>. In many protected areas the rights of indigenous people to the use forest are contested.

During the period 2003-13 there were a number of internally and externally driven developments and initiatives taking place in Cameroon's forest sector. These have provided opportunities and openings for the GREG-Forêts team to engage on key aspects of forest governance including:

- Sub-regional forest sector initiatives and donor partnerships (in which Cameroon is a key player) such as the Congo Basin fund (between DFID and ADB) for establishing PES mechanisms and other forest sector initiatives in Central Africa
- Cameroon's involvement in FLEG-T process and the voluntary partnership agreement (VPA) with the EC for ensuring legality of timber exports to Europe
- Increasing importance being given to independent monitoring and the role of civil society in Cameroon and some reduction in 'forest infractions' in large concessions<sup>23</sup>
- An increase in the number of 'small titles' issued for logging – less well regulated and more prone to over-harvesting (possible as a result of the VPAs which affect larger concessions)<sup>24</sup>
- Increasing timber exports to China (now the 4th largest destination for Cameroon's forest products)
- Cameroon's involvement with the REDD+ process. A readiness preparation proposal (RPP) was prepared during this period and will subsequently be supported by the World Bank through their FCPF and others
- The Forest Policy review process which is still ongoing
- Revision of the 1994 Forest Law and associated revision of the Forest Code
- Revision of the manual on community forests
- Elaboration of the national biodiversity strategy and plan (NBSAP)
- Institutional reforms including the division of the former MINEF into 2 separate ministries (MINFOF and MINEPDED)
- National anti-corruption drives including the establishment of KONAC the national anti-corruption committee and anti-corruption units in all ministries (including MINFOF)
- An overall improvement in the relationship between government and civil society where government often seeks out support and advisory contributions from recognised civil society organisations and individuals (including in anti-corruption actions)

### **Core Areas of Engagement and Tactics**

Given the wide opportunities to engage with and potentially influence different aspects of forest governance in Cameroon, GREG-Forêts has been broadly opportunistic and flexible, covering a wide range of governance aspects rather than adopting any particular thematic focus. Annual plans, narrative reports and discussions with GREG-Forêts members indicate the following core areas of activity at present:

- Small forest enterprises and natural resource streams and policy reforms to support these
- Green business and supporting policy for this
- Legitimacy and legality of forest products including engagement with the FLEG-T process
- Governance issues relating to the REDD + process
- Human wildlife conflict and the relationship between biodiversity conservation, rights and poverty

<sup>22</sup> African Economic Outlook (2012)

<http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org/fileadmin/uploads/aeo/PDF/Cameroon%20Full%20Country%20Note.pdf> (accessed on 13/10/13)

<sup>23</sup> Global Witness (2013) A review of independent monitoring initiatives and lessons to learn

<sup>24</sup> Global Witness (2013) Logging in the shadows

GREG-Forêts uses a range of tactics to work within these forest governance themes including the establishment of sub-groups within GREG-Forêts (working groups) to concentrate on specific themes. The nature of the group's tactics has evolved over the last decade. Initially, GREG-Forêts was a framework for sharing ideas, lessons and experiences (on forest governance) leading to individual capacity development. More recently this has shifted towards the establishment of a more clearly defined coalition group with a focus on having influence and impact on the forest governance discourse using the tactics that have been learnt and shown to be most effective. Some actions have been supported solely through FGLG funds – but more usually they are a product of diverse institutional collaboration and partnerships around a particular topic and with joint financial contributions. Tactics include:

- Team members utilising opportunities for promoting the group's views on governance when they are invited to participate and contribute (as individuals or as representatives of their own organisations) to on-going debates and forums in the forest sector. GREG-Forêts is now widely recognised as a player in forest governance related discussions. The prominent profile of group members enables this.
- Formalisation of working relationships between GREG-Forêts and government e.g. through MoUs to support and influence on a more regular basis
- Active lobbying and advocacy by GREG-Forêts members (individually or as a group)
- Holding meetings with ministries
- Holding seminars and I-learn events on current 'hot' topics. I-learn seminars in particular have been well attended and have become a trademark feature of GREG-Forêts
- Studies and research leading to the production of informed reports
- Preparation of policy briefs (based around studies and research)
- Production and dissemination of publications

### **Achievements and Impact**

Annual reports produced by GREG-Forêts list a number of achievements. Because the tactics used are almost inevitably collaborative it is not always possible to attribute such achievements solely to GREG-Forêts. However the role of GREG-Forêts has frequently been catalytic with the group initiating and supporting actions along with other collaborators that have resulted in these achievements. Since supporting such collaborative action was always an intended mode of operation for FGLG the question of attribution is almost inevitable.

Examples of key achievements (outcomes) over the period 2009-13 include:

- Established partnerships leading to formal agreements (MoUs) between GREG-Forêts and MINFOF and MINEPDED which will enable GREG-Forêts members to continue to provide on-going support and advice for implementation of government programmes. A further MoU with the Ministry of Agriculture is likely in future
- Influenced Forest Law revision to strengthen the rights of communities to NTFPs (also affects concession management where these rights are also present)
- Promoted advocacy with the Ministry of Agriculture to invest in programmes targeted at areas where human wildlife conflicts are a problem in order to support alternative livelihoods opportunities for affected people.
- Improved management of royalty fees at subdivision level to ensure greater transparency and community targeting (after GREG-Forêts had challenged such fund allocation processes)
- Challenged the requirement for community forests to carry out EIA (prohibitively expensive). This has not yet been solved – but the debate has been opened up.
- Contributed (through individual member involvement) to ensure more effective participation, transparency and accountability (better governance) in national processes such as FLEG-T, REDD+ and NBSAP development
- Created opportunities for formal and informal discussion on issues of corruption (including the engagement of one GREG-Forêts team member into the MINFOF anti-corruption unit)
- Raised awareness at state level (especially with the Prime Ministers Services) of the role of GREG-Forêts and of key forest governance issues

These outcomes are those which can be most specifically attributed to GREG-Forêts. There are other achievements listed in reports and documents but these have invariably involved other partners and organisations so they cannot be so clearly attributed to the project. All these governance outcomes would be expected to have positive impacts (on people and forests). Since there is very limited impact-related information available - the extent of these impacts cannot be readily assessed.

### Evaluation of the function of the project in Cameroon

Scoring: 1 = high; 2 = moderate; 3 = low; 4 = none; 5 = unable to assess

Criteria		Score
Relevance	High (in the current context of Cameroon) – see list above	1
Effectiveness	Team has been effective for several reasons. High capacity and quality being the most important. This has enabled them to become involved in a diverse range of actions on governance. Members' time commitment to other activities is a constraining factor.	2
Efficiency	The overall cost of the project is relatively low and there has been considerable success in collaborating with others on particular actions. This has ensured greater value for money than if GREG-Forêts was working in isolation.	2
Sustainability	Sustainability of the initiative is high. GREG-Forêts is valued as a valid national forum for forest governance and individual members are committed to it. The lack of permanent institutional structure and the flexible mode of operation of the team will enable it to continue with minimal external support and the establishment of formal linkages with government will contribute to this. Potential for further support from in-country partners is high	1
Specificity	GREG-Forêts effort is spread thinly across many themes in the forest sector many of which already have multiple actors, initiatives and projects also working on them. Specifically attributable achievements of the initiative are limited but there is more evidence of achievements through wider collaborative action	3
Outcomes i.e. impacts on forest governance, institutions and processes	The list above identifies some of the main attributable impacts of the initiative on forest governance. Whilst these are valid achievements, there have been no major governance shifts in Cameroon over the period of the initiative and in some cases the situation has even deteriorated.	3
Impact (on target groups)	Impacts for target beneficiaries (as a result of impacts on governance). This is very unclear and not possible to assess due to a lack of specific and quantitative impact data or other evidence.	X
Creativity/innovation	A few examples such as the initiation of I-learn events (based on tools used during the International Learning events) indicate the use of innovative approaches. However there is a general reliance on workshops/discussions as tactics for influencing change.	3
Flexibility	The initiative has shown some flexibility over the 10 year period and has been able to adapt to new opportunities as they arise or reduce emphasis on others if they appear to offer fewer opportunities for change	2
Institutional relationships (coherence)	Strongly developed through members individual networks and formal partnerships with government	1

### Evaluation

There have been few major changes or shifts in forest governance in Cameroon over the period 2009-13. Of those changes that have taken place – few can be specifically attributed to the FGLG initiative. Nevertheless, GREG-Forêts has managed to achieve recognition as a team of key and influential individual players in forest governance and it has been able to use the resources available to it from

the Project to try to exert influence in a range of different areas and using different tactics. A major deficiency of the initiative in Cameroon is its inability after 10 years to clearly track changes in forest governance and to provide evidence of the impacts of these on people and forests. Monitoring of key governance indicators against a baseline and greater ‘downstream’ presence to understand better what is happening on the ground would have been highly beneficial.

## B. Mozambique FGLG

### Background

This annex summarises the findings of a short evaluation visit to Mozambique during the period 12-16th October 2013.

The FGLG initiative in Mozambique has been active since 2005 and has gone through a number of identities and hosting arrangements over the period until 2013. The aim of FGLG continues to be to keep an effective dialogue between different actors in the forest sector alive. Initially it was based within the Governments’ *Direcção Nacional de Florestal e Fauna Bravia* (DNFFB) and convened through the University of Eduardo Mondlane’s Faculty of Agriculture and Forest Engineering. Partly as a result of media attention on government involvement in illegal harvesting and over-exploitation of forests – in part brought about by FGLG work – the institutional arrangements for FGLG became untenable and *Justiça Ambiental* (a national activist NGO) took over the convening arrangement for FGLG on behalf of the Amigos da Floresta network group in 2007. Amigos da Floresta is a civil society coalition group that emerged as a response to the media revelations (partly as a result of FGLG supported work). In 2009 at the start of the second phase of the FGLG initiative the convenor moved to *Centro de Ingridade Pública* (CIP) and chose and was supported in remaining as the convenor – again on behalf of the wider *Amigos da Floresta* group. In 2011 the convenor again moved, this time to *Centra Terra Viva* (CTV) which has continued with this role until the end of the initiative.

Members of FGLG are drawn from various civil society organisations, INGOs such as WWF, government, academics and the private sector. More than 50% of FGLG regular participants at meetings are women. The necessary changes in the hosting and coordination arrangements (institutions) and the associated name change (whereby for a time the initiative in Mozambique was simply known as Amigos da Floresta) have led to some confusion regarding the identity of FGLG which, as a result, is still not firmly established or well-known even after about 8 years of support. The same changes to the organisational structures along with divisions amongst civil society organisations have also resulted in some disruptions to the activity programme over the period of the initiative although these problems appear to have somewhat stabilised over the past couple of years.

The limited profile and rather limited achievements of FGLG in Mozambique have resulted partially from the unstable and frequently changing FGLG arrangements in the country. However, it is also evident that the group has considerable underutilised capacity. The quality of members is high and there is recognition amongst them that there are still many key governance challenges to be addressed in the forest sector.

### Mozambique Forest Governance Context

FGLG initiative is relevant in the country for a number of reasons:

- Mozambique has about 50% forest coverage (39 m ha)<sup>25</sup> of which about 13 m ha lies in National Parks and other Conservation areas and about 14.7 m ha is subject to slash and burn agriculture. Forestry makes a 3.1% contribution to GDP.<sup>26</sup>
- Forests are under pressure from slash and burn agriculture, commercial agricultural development, small-scale firewood and charcoal collection and fires as well as poorly regulated and unsustainable commercial timber exploitation – including the destructive small-scale ‘simple licence’ concessions

<sup>25</sup> FAO (2011) The State Of The World’s Forests & National Forest Inventory (2008)

<sup>26</sup> FAO (2011) The State Of The World’s Forests



- Despite being the fastest-growing non-oil economy in Africa, 60.7% of Mozambique's population still lives in severe poverty<sup>27</sup>. This consists largely of small-scale farmers using forest and forest land to support or supplement their subsistence needs and sometimes practicing small-scale forest enterprise – often illegally – a means for earning cash incomes. About 11.9 m people rely on fuelwood charcoal and NTFPs<sup>28</sup>. The forest sector thus has significant potential to contribute to social justice, equity and poverty reduction.
- Mozambique is ranked 123<sup>rd</sup> under the corruptions perception index with a score of 31<sup>29</sup>. The forest sector continues to be characterised by weak governance, poor regulation of existing laws and weak implementation of what would be considered as powerful forestry regulation and land laws.
- Forest and forest landscapes are important components to mitigate climate change (as carbon sinks and to reduce emissions). Forest loss and degradation contributes to Mozambique's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions although data on the country's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from the forestry sector are not available.
- There are international hotspots of biodiversity in Mozambique's coastal forests which provide habitat for a range of globally threatened species and a number of endemics. However, there is an annual deforestation rate of 0.58%.

During the period 2003-13 there have been various developments and initiatives with implications for Mozambique's forest sector. These have provided opportunities and openings for engagement of FGLG on aspects of forest governance. They include:

- The organisation by Government (with support from a pre-FGLG IIED project – Proagri) of an annual National Forum on Forests for wide stakeholder participation on current forest sector issues. This was discontinued after 2011 after which CTV with support from FGLG and others organised a 'Forestry Dialogue for Civil Society'
- Increasing focus on forest related issues as a result of reports and widespread media coverage e.g. seizure of illegal timber being exported to Asia and the involvement of government officials with private sector logging companies<sup>30</sup>. This greater focus became evident through work by Amigos da Floresta to raise awareness amongst civil society and to promote greater activism and media attention on these issues.
- A series of corruption scandals that have led the government (in 2012) to propose new anti-corruption laws and to reshuffle staff
- Increasing Chinese private sector investment and trade in Mozambique's forest sector. For example 90% of Mozambique's timber exports now go to the Chinese market<sup>31</sup>. Both this and the earlier and influential Mackenzie reports were supported by FGLG
- Development of the REDD process in Mozambique (with support of the Government of Norway and World Bank through FCPF). The RPP was approved in 2012 and a decree on REDD pilots was issued by the Government in August 2013. The process has been criticised by some civil society organisations and led to a division amongst civil society organisations in their response and engagement with REDD.
- Establishment of the South-South REDD initiative supported by FGLG and others that has established collaborative links between Mozambique and Brazil on REDD.
- More recently government attention has focused more on Mozambique's large untapped coal, oil and gas reserves that will substantially transform the economy in the future. This has led to some diversion of interest away from the forest sector.

<sup>27</sup> UNDP (2013) Human Development Report

<sup>28</sup> UNFCCC (2013) Emissions reduction profile for Mozambique

<sup>29</sup> Transparency International (2012) Corruption Perception Index

<sup>30</sup> For example Mackenzie (2006) Chinese Takeaway report (supported by FGLG)

<sup>31</sup> Tran-Thanh, Buckley & Mayers (2013) Inception Report of China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform, IIED

### Core Areas of Interest and Tactics

FGLG has tended to operate as a broad coalition of civil society groups that have used activism and lobbying as important tools to influence government. Unfortunately several government staff involved with FGLG at the start subsequently lost their jobs prompting a restructuring of the make-up of the FGLG team. The civil society organisation base to FGLG (largely urban based NGOs) does mean that it is perceived by government to have little mandate from the grass roots and is therefore treated with some suspicion and as being ‘self-serving’. Coupled with the internal conflicts between the organisations that are represented within FGLG this has limited the opportunities it has had to work with government and influence forest governance. Annual plans, narrative reports and discussions with FGLG members and others indicate the following key areas of engagement:

- Forest rights (especially for communities and small forest enterprises)
- Corruption, illegal logging and overexploitation of forests – especially focusing on support for small-scale logging enterprises and means by which communities can benefit from these
- Climate change and Mozambique’s REDD process – especially since the initiation of the REDD process in Mozambique

FGLG in Mozambique has used a range of tactics to engage in the forest governance discourse including:

- Collaboration and networking with other stakeholders to discuss forest sector issues through various multi-stakeholder platforms
- Awareness campaigns linked with education
- Research and studies e.g. documenting the impacts of forest policy and regulations; illegal timber harvesting
- Promotion and support for SMEs in forestry (in the handicraft sector) through marketing events
- Public consultation events
- Participation in on-going processes e.g. REDD strategy development
- Advocacy, lobbying and media campaigns including radio and TV debates

Since FGLG has a relatively low profile with Government and in civil society many of these tactics have been carried out in the name of one or more of the member organisations of FGLG and the name of FGLG is relatively poorly known in the country outside the immediate group.

### Achievements and Impact

FGLG in Mozambique has had some successes – particularly by raising awareness of critical forest governance issues with the public and with government. Unfortunately, despite this greater awareness and some supporting evidence from field based studies there is little indication that this has led to significant shifts in governance during the project period. Some key achievements (governance outcomes) over the period 2009-13 include:

- Improved public consultation and participation in the REDD process. An FGLG member is now also a member of the REDD technical working group that is developing the national REDD strategy. This also led to the better incorporation of gender-related issues in the Decree proposal that will allow pilot REDD projects and studies to take place.
- Acted to influence government (along with others) to establish a land fund to support registered communities under the progressive land law legislation
- Built awareness of the need to reform the simple licence system to include 20% of royalties (taxes from timber) to local communities
- Raised awareness about the overexploitation of forests under the ‘simple licences’ that tend to lead to overexploitation. This awareness subsequently contributed to changes in regulations that now require the preparation and approval of management plans before these annual licences can be issued. Compared with previous years, only about 20% of the previous number of licences was issued in the current year as a result. This indicates that more forest is being brought under systematic and more sustainable management (assuming that management plans are well prepared and are being implemented)

- Engaged with the National Forum on Forests and subsequently initiation of ‘Forestry Dialogue for Civil Society’ that will continue to work with government in the forest sector
- Jointly initiated cross-country learning with Tanzania (on illegal logging)
- Promote forest-based SMEs by supporting their participation in trade events and fairs
- Worked with the media to disseminate messages on corruption in the forest sector to the public and to government
- Government’s *Direcção Nacional de Terras e Florestas* held a meeting with Chinese logging and timber transport companies (May 2013) to explain the government’s approach and regulations on sustainable timber harvesting. This was a direct response to the International learning event (as part of the China-Africa Forest Governance Learning Platform) held in China in early 2013.

### Evaluation of the function of project in Mozambique

Scoring: 1 = high; 2 = moderate; 3 = low; 4 = none; 5 = unable to assess

Criteria		Score
Relevance	High (in the current context of Mozambique) – see list above	1
Effectiveness	Team effectiveness has been limited for several reasons including changes of the host organisation, weak relationships between government and civil society, internal divisions amongst FGLG members (reflecting wider national divisions) and the decreasing emphasis and attention being given to forest sector by the government and others in the light of recent oil developments in the north of the country.	3
Efficiency	The overall cost of the project is relatively low and there has been considerable success in collaborating with others on particular actions e.g. joint studies and workshops. This has ensured greater value for money than if the team was working in isolation. However action plans and reports indicate various planned activities that did not take place (with unclear reporting of the reasons).	3
Sustainability	Sustainability of the initiative is uncertain at this time. FGLG does not have a prominent or influential place in the forest sector outside of its immediate civil society members and given the fractious nature of civil society it may not persist (at least in its present form) as a common platform into the future without further external support.	3
Specificity	It is difficult to specifically attribute achievements of the initiative to FGLG although there is some evidence of achievements made through wider collaborative action with various partners.	3
Outcomes i.e. impacts on forest governance, institutions and processes	Whilst there have been some impacts on forest governance (see list above) some of these may have occurred even without FGLG and most are the result of combined efforts between FGLG and others. Documentation of FGLG outcomes has been weak.	2
Impact (on target groups)	Impacts on target beneficiaries (as a result of impacts on governance). This is unclear and not possible to assess due to a lack of specific and quantitative impact data or other evidence.	X
Creativity/innovation	Some opportunities to expand the influence of FGLG through other tactics have been missed e.g. closer collaboration with other donor-funded initiatives and an inability to develop tactics for better engagement with key government organisations.	3
Flexibility	The nature of FGLG has enabled it to respond to its evolving membership and management organisation. However this has not been sufficient to adapt to the somewhat polarised relationship between government and civil society. Consequently FGLG is still viewed by some as a group of NGO activists working outside government.	3
Institutional relationships	Weakly developed relationships with some key partners reflecting some mistrust amongst civil society organisations and between civil	3

	society and government in the forest sector	
--	---	--

## Evaluation

FGLG in Mozambique has not proved to be a particularly effective model for influencing forest governance or as a catalyst for change. Although the capacity of the group has been high its internal divisions and the frequent changes in hosting arrangements have weakened its capacity to engage with and get credibility amongst government. It is largely perceived as an alliance of NGOs with little government ownership or understanding and very limited government involvement.

Despite the challenges that FGLG has faced, there has been much positive engagement in critical dialogue around forest and land issues between government (at central and regional level) and civil society and over the past decade FGLG has been successful in identifying and working with ‘champions of change’ within Government. Some of the dialogue has led to actions that were achieved despite considerable initial government reluctance e.g. reforms of the simple licence system, and it has only been through concerted pressure from FGLG and other civil society actors and individuals that has happened. Given the difficult circumstances of Mozambique reflected in the weak relationship between civil society and government this is not a small achievement – although with greater consistency and stability of FGLG itself and considering the favourable land laws (compared with other countries) more could have been achieved over the project period.

## C. India FGLG

### Background

This annex summarises the findings of a short evaluation visit to India (Orissa and Delhi) during the period 24-29th October 2013.

The FGLG in India was established in 2006 during the first phase of project support. Since this time the group has been hosted and convened by different individuals and organisations on a rotating basis. During 2009-11, the convenor was from the Enviro-Legal Defence Firm (Dehi) and most recently by Landesa – Rural Development Institute in Bhubhaneswar (Odisha). FGLG group members are drawn from civil society organisations of different kinds including NGOs and legal firms, from government (at both national and state level) and academic institutions. Membership is specifically individual rather than institutional. Members brought into the group are selected on the basis of their profile, experience and individual networks in relation to forest governance in India. As a result they are in high demand from their own organisations, through their own networks and because of their active participation in other groups. Depending on the specific themes being tackled by FGLG membership has shifted from time to time in order to bring new skills and perspectives into the group. Recently individual members have been assigned specific roles/tasks within the annual workplans that has helped to increase their level of engagement and focus.

Since group members are based in different locations in India, whole group meetings are expensive and difficult to organise, consequently FGLG meets only once or twice per annum with more informal communications amongst group members at other times.

### India Forest Governance Context

The FGLG initiative is highly relevant in India for a number of reasons:

- India has about 23% forest cover (69 m ha) and the forest sector contributes about 0.9% of GDP<sup>32</sup>. However this small percentage does not reflect the high level of dependency of rural people on forests especially in the more remote parts of the country where forests are used to support the subsistence livelihoods of poor farmers and forest dwellers. Of a total population of about 1.2 billion, 71% of live in rural areas and a high proportion of these depend on forests for their livelihoods.
- Forests in India are under considerable pressure from unsustainable harvesting especially for fuelwood and other locally used forest products, shifting cultivation (especially in tribal areas

<sup>32</sup> FAO (2011) The State Of The World’s Forests

and the North East), grazing, fire, commercial timber extraction, illegal logging, agricultural development, urban expansion and infrastructure development.

- The high rate of economic growth in India hides the huge inequities that still exist in the country. For example those between urban and rural populations, between different states and between different districts within states. 28.6% of India's population lives in severe poverty<sup>33</sup> - this consists predominantly of rural people concentrated in geographically remote and often in tribal areas. There is a strong correlation between poverty, tribal populations and forests. The forest sector thus has significant potential to contribute more to social justice, equity and poverty reduction.
- India is ranked 94th under the corruptions perception index with a score of 36<sup>34</sup>.
- Whilst historically forests in India were state controlled there have been recent attempts to decentralise management and control to local communities. Initially this was through the process of joint forest management (JFM). More recently the Forest Rights Act (2006) recognises the rights of forest dwellers to forests and secures their tenure. However this more recent legislation is still characterised by weak and slow implementation and lack of change in structure and attitudes within forestry and other institutions charged with a supporting and implementing this role. As a result, forest dependent people continue to have their rights to forests withheld.
- Forest and forest landscapes are important components to mitigate climate change (as carbon sinks and to reduce emissions). Forest loss and degradation contribute to India's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions although data on the country's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions specifically from the forestry sector are not yet available.
- India has a number of internationally recognised biodiversity hotspots. These are concentrated in the most forested areas (Western Ghats, Himalaya and NE India) which contain a number of globally threatened species and many endemics.
- In recent years deforestation rates in India have declined and forest cover is now slowly increasing due mainly to new plantation establishment. Overall forest quality (degradation) continues to decline.

During the period 2005-13 there have been a number of significant developments affecting forest governance in India. These have created opportunities for engagement and influencing by FGLG on critical aspects of forest governance. The most important of these include:

- Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (recognition of Forest Rights) Act 2006 (usually referred to as FRA) and the associated rules and notifications issued in 2007
- More recent amendments to the rules under FRA which were made in 2012 and the associated development of guidelines for implementing FRA
- Donor initiatives continue to emphasise participatory forestry where such projects are supported in different states (with USAID's Forest Plus and JICA projects being the main examples)
- India's 12th 5-year plan 2012-17 which for the first time had inputs from a planning commission sub-group on NTFPs
- Revived interest in Joint Forest Management (JFM +) in the light of the FRA and the PESA (1996). Alongside this has come a renewed push for community forest management and community forest rights in some states e.g. Odisha.
- India's first National Forest Congress (2011)
- Establishment of the Forest Certification Council of India in 2010
- Government of India's National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC) 2008 and separate State Action Plans on Climate Change (SAPCC) in most states. Under NAPCC there are a

<sup>33</sup> UNDP (2013) Human Development Report

<sup>34</sup> Transparency International (2012) Corruption Perception Index (2012)

number of national level initiatives including the Green India Mission (2008), the Compensatory Afforestation Management and Planning Authority (CAMPA)

- Establishment of a REDD Cell within the Ministry of Environment and Forests to take forward actions on REDD. This is supported by various other specialised institutions.
- Increasing recognition by government of the respective roles of government and civil society in the forest sector coupled with a willingness to work together on important problems.

The current project phase from 2009-13 has therefore come at a critical time for forest governance in India. The FRA (2006) significantly shifted the governance landscape from predominantly state control towards control by local forest dwellers and their rights and this has had important repercussions from the centre down to forest level and has raised many issues relating to making this shift actually happen. It has also broadened the state's responsibility for forests from the Ministry of Environment and Forests to also include the Ministry of Tribal affairs (charged with implementing FRA). This has led to new opportunities to engage in forest governance – particularly in crafting rules aimed at putting the new legislation into practice, building new capacities, developing institutional relationships and sharing information and ideas.

### **Core Areas of Interest and Tactics**

Based on the specific forest governance context of India, FGLG's overall objective is defined as '*improving and strengthening forest governance in India through promotion of local rights especially community rights – benefits and control over forest resources*'.<sup>35</sup> This has led to the identification of several areas of interest on which FGLG actions have been focused:

- Supporting the implementation of FRA by various institutions (government, non-government and community)
- Strengthening community forest rights and the capacities of community-based institutions including the establishment and management of NTFP enterprises
- Tackling the contradiction whereby India is a major importer of forest products and at the same time has successfully established a huge plantation resource that is underutilised
- Supporting India's REDD preparedness

The group has used a range of tactics to engage with and address these issues including:

- Independent studies (often to build evidence at state level and feed this up to national level)
- Contributions (as individuals) to working groups, networks and task forces and as advisers to draft and discuss legislation and associated rules and guidelines
- Publications and wider dissemination of these
- Advocacy and awareness campaigns e.g. on Community forestry and JFM in Odisha
- Piloting and supporting implementation at field level

### **Achievements and Impact**

- Contributed to FRA formulation (prior to 2007)
- Contributed to drafting the 2007 Rules under FRA and more recently the Amended Rules (2012) which have incorporated elements aimed at addressing field-level implementation issues. Some elements in the amended rules such as the inclusion of post-claim strategies is directly attributable to FGLG (strategies to provide state support for new title holders e.g. additional labour days under the national MGREGA scheme in the 12th Plan)
- Provided on-line support to MoTA for implementing and monitoring progress with FRA at National level
- At the request of the State Government in Jharkhand, provided support for FRA implementation (also in in Odisha and Chhattisgarh)
- Made inputs to FRA rules at state level (Odisha) and initiated discussions and consultations (including public hearings) as part of this process

<sup>35</sup> Social Justice in Forestry. FGLG – India workplan 2010-2013

- Assisted MoTA in sourcing additional funds (from UNDP) for supporting their role in FRA implementation, monitoring and administration
- Provided support for orientation of district administrations on FRA
- Jointly supported (with OTELP) field level implementation of FRA in Odisha using Community Resource Persons. Supported their capacity development.
- Contributed to reducing the role of state forest department in JFM committees in Odisha (by withdrawal of forester as member secretary and entire management by villagers)
- Used the FRA as a basis for a campaign to secure community forest rights claim settlements of community forest management groups in Odisha. Also contributed to capacity development at community level to understand and build awareness of FRA as a means to further community forestry and forest rights. Contributed to the JFM policy-making process in Odisha
- Contributed as resource person to training to tribal leaders (in Rajasthan) on FRA and PESA implications and problem solving
- Contributed to campaigns on NTFP trading by communities to bring them outside the provisions of the Forest Act (1927) e.g. bamboo and kendu leaf
- Contributed (as member of sub-group in Planning Commission) to bringing NTFP sub-sector into the 12th 5 year plan. This will result in greater recognition of the contribution of NTFPs to national economic development being given, priority being given their research and development and will assist in gaining access to national funds for further development support and their linkage with other rural development programmes. Also this creates the potential for NTFP development support being provided through JFM +
- Contributed field-policy evidence to assist in bringing a minimum support price for 12 NTFPs
- Contributed to discussions on bringing NTFPs/MADPs under the national working plans code
- Conducted a study and draft paper to stimulate discussions and piloting as part of sustainable forest ecosystems management (under Forest PLUS) for easing marking and transit permits for plantation timber
- Contributed to promoting landscape level biodiversity governance for India (through publications)
- Contributed to piloting under bilateral programmes for greater focus on community development e.g. in JICA funded programmes in several states
- Contributed to national consultations on REDD + bringing in perspectives of community forestry stakeholders. Based on this made recommendations about revitalising JFMCs, revision of JFM guidelines (to bring uniformity in benefit sharing across all states), networking of community based institutions and safeguarding rights under REDD+
- Established linkages with field based REDD pilots e.g. in Meghalaya, to bring practical field based issues and experiences to national policy level

### Evaluation of the function of project in India

Scoring: 1 = high; 2 = moderate; 3 = low; 4 = none; 5 = unable to assess

Criteria		Score
Relevance	Highly relevant to India current forest governance context with implications for huge numbers of poor people living in or near forests	1
Effectiveness	The FGLG approach has been particularly effective because of (i) the high profile of its members (ii) the dual level of engagement (at national and state level) and (iii) the targeted action	2
Efficiency	Considering the scale of the issues at country level compared with the availability of resources through FGLG and the level of engagement and achievement that has been made, efficiency has been high. This has been enhanced by collaborative working to share resources with others similarly engaged.	1
Sustainability	Group capacity and level of engagement is currently high and this is likely to continue after the end of the project although the loss of funds will require seeking support from elsewhere in order to maintain group	2

	cohesion and common purpose.	
Specificity	FGLG has been focused on a limited range of themes identified as being most important in the current context. This has enabled it to deliver on these. Attribution is difficult to assign solely to FGLG for any changes because there are many organisations and individuals working on the same issues.	2
Outcomes i.e. impacts on forest governance, institutions and processes	These have been mainly under output 1 – the other outputs have shown fewer impacts.	2
Impact (on target groups)	This has been assumed e.g. that enhanced community rights are leading to positive livelihoods impacts – although there appears to be little empirical evidence to demonstrate this in practice	x
Creativity/innovation	The approach of FGLG has been a planned one. For example a shift after the first phase of support from state-working towards national level action – based on opportunities and issues that have become apparent during the first phase.	2
Flexibility	Membership of the group has been fairly flexible (as shown by the rotating ‘hosting’ arrangements, membership by individuals and ability to ‘co-opt’ expertise to provide additional inputs.	2
Institutional relationships	Good linkages with national and state governments and increasingly wide recognition of FGLG as a player in the general area of forest governance.	2

### Evaluation

FGLG in India is composed of an experienced and influential team consisting individuals from within and outside Government and from within the forest sector and others. This strong positioning has enabled the Project to be particularly effective in relation to the process of FRA formulation and implementation (including regulations and guidelines). This has had direct implications for large numbers of forest dependent people and has enabled FGLG has become established as a trusted partner for the Ministry of Tribal Affairs. The position is strengthened by its downward links with projects and field based actions in several states including Odisha, Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand, allowing it to achieve a good balance between central level engagement and grass roots implementation support. Potential for sustainability of the initiative is good. Considering the scale of the outcomes (although not measured) in relation to the Project investment, FGLG in India is particularly cost effective.



**ANNEX 3 – PERSONS MET (OR INVOLVED IN EVALUATION DISCUSSIONS)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Country</b>
<b>India</b>		
Sanjoy Patnaik	Landesa – Rural Development Institute	FGLG Co-convenor India
Sanjay Upadhyay	Enviro Legal Defense Firm	FGLG Co-convenor India
D Suryakumari	Centre for People’s Forestry	FGLG member India
Sushil Saigal	Forest-Plus	FGLG member India
Prof. K C Malhotra	Indian Statistical Institute (rtd)	FGLG member India
RC Sharma	Indian Forest Service (rtd)	FGLG member India
Vishaish Uppal	WWF India	FGLG member India
Pranab Ranjan Choudhury	Consultant	OFSDP (JICA) – Odisha
Barna Baibhaba Pande	FES	India – Odisha (meeting participant)
Meena Das Mohapatra	FES	India – Odisha (meeting participant)
Nirmalendu Jyotishi	FES	India – Odisha (meeting participant)
Pravat Kumar Mishra	RCDC	India – Odisha (meeting participant)
<b>Mozambique</b>		
Carlos Serra	Ex- Centro Terra Viva	FGLG convenor Mozambique
Berta Rafael	Centro Terra Viva	FGLG member Mozambique
Cristina Louro	Centro Terra Viva	FGLG member Mozambique
Rito Mabunda	WWF Mozambique	FGLG member Mozambique
Renato David Timane	Direcção Nacional De Terras e Florestas	Govt. Official, Mozambique
Hilario Akissa	Direcção Nacional De Terras e Florestas/MINAG	Workshop participant Mozambique
Ivo Medeira	LUPA Project	Workshop participant Mozambique
Carla Maruza Esculudes	Amudela/FORMIN	Workshop participant Mozambique
Gilda Homu	Kuwaka/JDA	Workshop participant Mozambique
Tania Libanze	Kuwaka/JDA	Workshop participant Mozambique
Julieta Matavele	Centro Terra Viva	Workshop participant Mozambique
Marcos Pereira	Centro Terra Viva	Workshop participant Mozambique
Maria de Lurdes Massingue	MICOA	Workshop participant Mozambique
D Matlombe	ABIODES	Workshop participant Mozambique
Tania Mabu	Centro Terra Viva	Workshop participant Mozambique
Orlanda Alfazoma	Livaningo	Workshop participant Mozambique
<b>Cameroon</b>		
Chimère Diaw	African Model Forests Network	FGLG convenor Cameroon
Angeline Engelo Ndo	NESDA	FGLG member Cameroon
Dominique Endamana	IUCN Cameroon	FGLG member Cameroon
Prudence Galega	NESDA	FGLG member Cameroon
William Mala	Independent	FGLG member Cameroon
Serge Menang	World Bank Cameroon	FGLG member Cameroon
Julie Gagoe	African Model Forests Network	FGLG member Cameroon
Stanley Dinsi	CIFOR Cameroon	FGLG member Cameroon
<b>International Partners</b>		
James Mayers	IIED	FGLG Project Manager UK
Duncan Macqueen	IIED	UK
Elaine Morrison	IIED	UK
Brian Barban	IIED	UK
David Gritten	RECOFTC	FGLG focal point, RECOFTC
<b>EC</b>		
Julia Falconer	EC FLEGT and REDD Facilities (DFID)	Brussels, Belgium
John Bazill	EC EuropAid	Brussels, Belgium

David Sanmiguel Esteban	EC EuropAid FLEGT team	Brussels, Belgium
Bernard Crabbé	EC EuropAid FLEGT team	Brussels, Belgium
Daniel Jones	EC EuropAid FLEGT team	Brussels, Belgium
<b>Uganda</b>		
Godber Tumushabe	Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment	FGLG convenor Uganda
<b>Vietnam</b>		
Nguyen Quang Tan	RECOFTC Vietnam	FGLG convenor Vietnam
<b>South Africa</b>		
Norman Dlamini	Forestry South Africa	FGLG convenor, South Africa
<b>China</b>		
Filip Noubel	Internews	China
<b>Malawi</b>		
Bright Sibale	Inspirit	FGLG convenor Malawi
<b>Indonesia</b>		
Yani Septiani	Ministry of Forestry	FGLG convenor Indonesia
<b>Tanzania</b>		
Cassian Sianga	Tanzania Natural Resources Forum	FGLG convenor Tanzania
<b>Global Governance Specialists</b>		
Andy Inglis	Independent	UK
James Acworth	Independent	UK
Saskia Ozinga*	FERN	UK
Mary Hobley	Independent	UK
Peter O'Hara	Independent	UK
Yurdi Yasmi*	ICRAF	Indonesia
Karen Edwards*	Independent	Indonesia
Hugh Speechly	DFID	UK
Paddy Abbott	LTSI	UK
Tom Blomley	Independent	UK
Note: * indicates contact by email only		

## ANNEX 4 – A FRAMEWORK FOR FOREST GOVERNANCE<sup>36</sup>

Governance components	Sub-components	Quantifiable Indicator
Transparency, accountability and public participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transparency in the forest sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public availability of forest data, plans, laws, budgets and other information relevant to forest use and management</li> <li>• Public notice of an pending forest agency actions</li> <li>• Transparent allocation of timber and NTFP concessions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decentralisation, devolution and public participation in forest management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest communities have institutional roles in creating public forest management rules and plans</li> <li>• Accessibility to forest resources by local communities</li> <li>• Supporting framework for participatory forest management</li> <li>• Forest agencies are responsive to public input</li> <li>• Participatory processes structured to promote consensus</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability of forest officials to stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback to stakeholders about forest resources and their management</li> <li>• Presence of autonomous organisation for monitoring activities</li> <li>• Influence and interest of civil society organisations on forest issues</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability within forest agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management in the forest agencies/departments is oriented towards accountability</li> <li>• Clear statement of forest management strategy or goals</li> <li>• Goals and objectives of forest management disseminated to rank and file officials</li> <li>• Forest officials evaluated and held accountable for failures to meet stated goals</li> </ul>
Stability of forest institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General stability of forest institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk posed to forest management from changing forest agency budgets, leadership or organisation</li> <li>• Risk posed to forest management from changing or inconsistent laws and policies and their implementation</li> <li>• Risk posed to forest management due to unreliability of tenure rights</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management of conflict over forest resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived fairness of distribution of rights</li> <li>• Level of conflicting claims over public forests</li> <li>• Prevalence of violence or use of arms by forest users</li> </ul>
Quality of forest administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willingness to address forest sector issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment to legality, certification, and sustainable management of forests</li> <li>• Support for adoption of forest practices code</li> <li>• Support for private certification</li> <li>• Support for codes of professional conduct among foresters and civil servants</li> <li>• Institutional separation of key functions – legislative, administrative and control</li> </ul>

<sup>36</sup> World Bank (2009) Roots for Good Forest Outcomes: An analytical framework for governance reforms

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Signatory to and quality of implementation of international commitments related to forestry</li> <li>• Maintenance of workable forest policies</li> <li>• Collaboration with regional partners to harmonize forest policies and legal frameworks</li> <li>• Cross-sectoral policy coordination</li> <li>• Ability to revise and respond to change</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity and effectiveness of forest agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public confidence in forest agencies</li> <li>• Capacity of forest agencies</li> <li>• Human resources, skills, and knowledge</li> <li>• Equipment and tools</li> <li>• Stability of budgets and quality of budget process</li> <li>• Quality of forest resource management</li> <li>• Quality of information about the forests</li> <li>• Quality of planning and impact assessment (including cross-sectoral coordination)</li> <li>• Activities in the forest are in accord with plans</li> <li>• Commitment to sustainability</li> <li>• Effectiveness of enforcement institutions</li> <li>• Fairness and responsiveness of forest officers (and police, if involved in forest enforcement)</li> <li>• Effectiveness of prosecutors and courts in forest matters</li> <li>• Forest extension and environmental education efforts</li> <li>• Independence of civil service from political pressures</li> <li>• Taxes on forest products and services uniformly applied and collected</li> <li>• Availability of incentives to practitioners of responsible forest use and management</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corruption control within the forest sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revenues from forests accounted for</li> <li>• Budget transparency</li> <li>• Audits of forestry projects</li> <li>• Existence of government anticorruption institutions and measures, including channels for reporting corruption and whistle-blower protection</li> <li>• Effectiveness of anticorruption institutions and measures</li> <li>• Clear code of business conduct for forest industries</li> <li>• Presence of strong nongovernmental watchdogs</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous forest inventory of plots established and measured regularly</li> <li>• Documentation and record of forest management and forest activities to facilitate monitoring</li> <li>• Results of M&amp;E are incorporated into new forest management plans</li> <li>• Result of monitoring are readily available to the public</li> <li>• Local people are involved in monitoring of forest resources</li> </ul>

Coherence of forest legislation and rule of law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of domestic forest legislation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forest legislation effectively and efficiently implemented by forest agencies</li> <li>Avoids legislative overreaching</li> <li>Avoids unnecessary and cumbersome requirements</li> <li>Enhances transparency and accountability</li> <li>Informal rules, where present, are consistent with formal rules</li> <li>Forest legislation is consistent with participatory governance</li> <li>Gives local actors a stake in good management</li> <li>Developed with public involvement</li> <li>Clearly states how local people can play a meaningful part in planning, management, and allocation of forest resources</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of civil law implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forest laws are actually applied</li> <li>Labour, safety, environmental, human rights, and other laws are applied in forest settings</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of criminal law implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suppression: Credible and graduated sanctions, consistently applied</li> <li>Detection: Capacity to detect illegal activity</li> <li>Prevention: Number of forest-related crimes</li> <li>Organized crime</li> <li>General crime</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of forest adjudication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to courts or arbitrators</li> <li>Fair, honest, and independent</li> <li>Affordable, rapid</li> <li>Enforceable outcomes</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Property rights recognised/honoured/enforced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal and informal rights to forest resources in harmony</li> <li>Security of property rights to forest resources, including carbon</li> <li>Quality of forest surveys, records, and cadastre</li> <li>Contracts and agreements honoured/enforced</li> <li>Legality of land-lease contracts with international investors</li> <li>Support for community/small/medium enterprises</li> </ul>
Economic efficiency, equity and incentives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of ecosystem integrity: sustainable forest use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of supply and demand for forest products and their alignment sustainable forest use</li> <li>Minimum safeguards for sustainability included in forest management plans</li> <li>Forest stakeholders have reasonable share in the economic benefits from forest use</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incentives for sustainable use and penalties for violations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Payments for protecting environmental services from forests</li> <li>Forest law enforcement should target illegitimate operations</li> <li>Expected returns from illegal use lower than the expected penalties imposed for illegal use</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forest products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>International market prices used as reference prices for traded products</li> </ul>

	pricing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internalization of effects of social and environmental externalities arising from forest resources use</li> <li>• Removal of distortionary subsidies within the forest sector</li> <li>• Forest resource allocation based on market prices</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial timber trade and forest business</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International market prices used as reference prices for traded products</li> <li>• Internalization of effects of social and environmental externalities arising from forest resources use</li> <li>• Removal of distortionary subsidies within the forest sector</li> <li>• Forest resource allocation based on market prices</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equitable allocation of forest benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equitable pattern of land and forest resource tenure</li> <li>• Adequate access and use rights where ownership is with the state (or contested)</li> <li>• Equitable share of timber and NTFPs</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competitive forest sector</li> <li>• Use of appropriate incentives in forest management</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest revenues and expenditures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficient system of revenue collection for timber and NTFPs</li> <li>• Taxes, levies, and charges based on ensuring normal profits</li> <li>• Efficient system of public expenditures for forestry</li> <li>• Public expenditure tracking system (PETS) operational in the sector</li> </ul>