

**National Workshop for Sharing the Experiences of NTFP-PFM
Southwest Ethiopia Research and Development Project**

June 3-4, 2013

Ghion Hotel, Addis Ababa

Table of Contents

1. Experiences of NTFP-PFM Southwest Ethiopia Research and Development Project (Project team members)	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 Major experience of the project.....	5
PFM experience	5
PFM institutions development	6
NTFPs and forest management	6
Linking PFM and REDD+	7
Enterprise development as basis for PFM.....	8
Impact of PFM on local people’s livelihoods and forest management	9
1.3 Major lessons from the project.....	9
1.4 Testimonies from community members.....	10
2. Other National and International PFM Experience & Lessons ...	14
2.1 Participatory forest policy development process: the case of SNNPRS (Ahmid Said)	142
2.2 Wild Coffee Conservation (WCC) through PFM project (Elias Kasahun)	153
2.3 13+ years of PFM in Ethiopia: what did we learn? (Tsegaye Tadesse).....	164
2.4 More tenure security needed to make PFM to serve its purpose in Ethiopia (Mulugeta Lemenih).....	186
2.5 Experiences of forest governance devolution: chronic challenges and issues for Reflection (Habtemariam Kassa)	197
3. Overall workshop discussion outputs	2220
4. Annexes	254.1
Opening Speech	25
4.2 Workshop programme	284
4.3 List of participants.....	25

1. Experiences of NTFP-PFM Southwest Ethiopia Research and Development Project (Project team members)

1.1 Background

The initiation of the NTFP-PFM Southwest Ethiopia Research and Development Project followed the involvement of the University of Huddersfield (UoH) and the Addis Ababa University in the implementation of the Ethiopian Wetlands Research Programme (EWRP) in the Southwest. That programme was implemented from 1997 - 2000 funded by the EU.

The implementation and the conclusion of EWRP resulted in two major outcomes - designing of NTFP-PFM R&D Project Phase I and the establishment of both Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA) in Ethiopia and Wetland Action/Sustainable Livelihood Action in the Netherlands. UoH and EWNRA have collaborated since 2000 and have been implementing the following projects in SW Ethiopia:

1. NTFP – PFM R&D Project Phase I (2003 – 2007)

The project was implemented in 3 Zones and 5 Woredas of SNNPRs. It was funded by EU (80%) with the Norwegian Embassy and CIDA contributing the remaining 20% (total budget Euro 1.4m). Implementers were Jimma University and EWNRA (Ethiopia), UoH (UK), Wagenigen University (The Netherlands) and Sustainable Livelihood Action (SLA) (the Netherlands), along with the SNNPR Government.

2. NTFP – PFM R&D Project Phase II (2007-2013)

Implementing partners of this current project are UoH, Sustainable Livelihood Action (SLA), EWNRA and the SNNPR Government. Funding agencies are EU (80%), and Royal Netherlands Embassy and Royal Norwegian Embassy contributing jointly the remaining 20% (total budget - Euro 3.3 million).

Overall objective of the two projects is to maintain the forested landscape by enhancing the value of the forest for the local communities, and thereby improving the livelihoods of local forest-dependent communities and ensuring the delivery of environmental services in a wider context.

Specific objective is to develop and promote local forest management and forest-based economic incentives with integrated practices of NTFP development for different people/forest scenarios.

Expected results

- Maintaining forest landscape in Southwest Ethiopia;
- Increased utilisation of NTFPs;
- Development of local institutions for the management of the forest (PFM) and business institutions; and
- Generating increased income for communities from forest based products (NTFPs, etc).

1.2 Major experiences of the project

1.2.1 PFM experiences

In 2003 the project started its intervention on pilot sites based on the existing country experiences. On the pilot sites it undertook a research and learning process for the application of PFM. Through a consultative process working with communities, government field staff and experts, a PFM guideline was developed. Based on this guideline, which has been revised several time after field testing, a simplified PFM process has been implemented across most of the forests in the project intervention areas.

The central idea of the project is securing local forest use rights combined with increased forest benefits so as to stimulate responsible and sustainable forest management by the local people. For this three interlinking actions have been identified:

- policy backing for local forest control,
- forest centred institutions, and
- forest based enterprise development.

The following stages in PFM development are followed in implementing PFM across the project area.

PFM Process - 1

- Awareness at the kebele level resulting in communities (gots) making a formal request to wereda administration to do PFM
- Got (community) level approach used to engage the community at the lowest level who identify with specific areas of forest
- Demarcation of kebele and got boundaries and the internal boundaries of the forest with farmland

PFM Process - 2

- Community PFM organisations make agreement with the government to co-manage the forest
- Process of discussing institutional options of what suits PFM
- Process of getting community to decide on members and associate members
- Development of election process for members of the got PFM Group
- Signing of PFM agreement between community and the government

PFM Process 3

- Forest resource assessment quick method
- Identification of forest products and methods for using them sustainably
- Developing and agreeing a forest management plan with the kebele
- Developing forest enterprises and building capacity in silviculture
- Building capacity in the community and government for monitoring of the forest, and building trust

To date PFM has been applied over an area of 105,957.6 ha of which 56,361.6 ha is forest land. Further, 126 PFM community groups have been organized with 6544 (560 F) members at household level.

1.2.2 PFM institutions development

One of the successes of PFM is its effectiveness in securing communities' rights to decision making power and access to the forest. In this process, communities enter into a forest management agreement represented through established legal institutions. A forest management institution is essential in this process in order to:

- Ensure long-term sustainability of the forest;
- Support and ease the institutionalisation of the PFM practices; and
- Balance forest management responsibilities with benefits coming from the forest.

Community-led institutions are at the centre of forest management endeavours in the PFM process. Only when the communities have legal representation will the government delegate the administration of the forests and related resources to the communities.

The project undergoes a participatory review process while establishing community institutions. The followings are done in order to ensure communities are well involved in the process:

- Putting options on a poster & keeping it at village sites so that communities get enough time to analyze it;
- Conveying a series of consultations and workshops to relevant stakeholders; and
- Letting stakeholders reach on consensus on selection criteria.

Through these review processes the need to have strong legal institution for PFM has been identified and also for the forest enterprise development activities which have been initiated. Through the consultation it was agreed that there is no institution that can effectively implement the dual purpose of forest management and forest enterprise development. Therefore, based on this agreement and through a series of studies and experiences with the establishment of different types of institutions, the project is now promoting and applying the combination of two different but complementary organisations- association and cooperative.

The Wereda Forest Management Association (FMA) is the legally registered institution which coordinates all the PFM Groups at the got level which are legally branches of the FMA. Cooperatives can only be viable is covering areas of more than one kebele. Hence the project has established multi-kebele coops, and membership is selected to ensure key skills, experience and motivation.

1.2.3 NTFPs and Forest Management

More than 200 trees, shrubs and herbs provide NTFPs in the Southwest forests of Ethiopia. Not all of these are directly exchanged for cash but life without them would be virtually impossible for the community. NTFPs contribute about 30% of the total cash and non cash livelihood income of households, who earn 73-100% of their cash income from NTFPs. This project has focused on honey and spices and has conducted a number of farmer-led trials on NTFPs.

Beekeeping trial results

With 32 trial farmers their attitude towards backyard beekeeping and hive preference were assessed for two consecutive years. Results included:

- All farmers decided to continue backyard beekeeping;

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

- Farmers were interested in working with top bar hives that are made of only mud or a combination of stick and mud rather than the traditional log hives;
- The focus on backyard beekeeping has reduced pressure on the forest by reducing the logs that are cut down for hive construction;
- Community awareness has increased about the declining bee flora and readiness to improve the situation including a concern for better local forest cover and its sustainable management.
- The production of honey has increased from 5 kg/hive (traditional) to 15 kg/hive (transitional);
- Better quality honey is produced because of careful follow up, hive management, as well as proper harvesting and post-harvest handling; and
- Annual income of ETB1070– 2520 per farmer has been realised from improved honey production.

In 2008/9 the number of farmers working on backyard beekeeping was about 200. The number of backyard beekeepers in the five project woredas is now more than 1492.

Spices Trial Results

Domesticated and introduced spices by the project are: Korroriga (*Aframomum corrorima*), Long pepper (*Pepper capenesis*), Indian cardamom (*Elettaria cardamomum*), and Black pepper (*Piper nigrum L.*).

76 farmers (29 F) were interviewed based on 2007 and 2008 harvest. Korroriga (*Aframomum corrorima*) is found to be best suited in the highlands while Indian cardamom (*Elettaria cardamomum*) is best in the mid to lower altitudes. On the other hand, Black pepper (*Piper nigrum L.*) was found to take long time before it produces the desired product but, it seems to perform best in lower altitudes. There were not enough data for analysis for Long Pepper (*Pepper capenesis*) but the situations seem promising for this in the higher altitudes.

From initial 80 trial farmers now there are more than 534 farmers involved in spice production. More than half of these are focused on Korroriga production.

Up-scaling best practices

NTFPs promotion (up scaling) was done in two settings in all project areas;

1. promotion in the agro-forestry system and in heavily degraded forests and forest fringes
2. managing and harvesting in the forest (for the indigenous species and beekeeping)

Up-scaling project initiatives include working with: Department of agriculture, Beza Mar PLC, Denit Yeri, Mekan Iyesus, MELKA, and Bebenos charity association.

1.2.4 Linking PFM and REDD+

One of the objectives of the project is the development of forest-based enterprises that are profitable and locally appropriate. These were identified as enterprises that will deal with NTFPs and Payment for Environmental Services (PES). Through a feasibility study REDD+ has been identified as one potential area for the project to work on PES.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

Based on a carbon stock assessment, forests in Masha/ Anderacha/ Gesha contain 282 tons CO₂ / ha (above & below ground biomass). When converted to agriculture 253 tons CO₂ from the trees will go back into atmosphere (some 29 tons CO₂ remain sequestered in trees in agricultural area). Globally deforestation contributes 17% of all GHG emissions.

REDD+ and PFM

PFM empowers local forest communities to sustainably manage and use forests while the PFM Association (PFMA) is a legally established local community institution (Got & Woreda) empowered to manage forests within their jurisdiction. Free, Prior & Informed Consent needs to be properly carried out and institutional structures developed for flow of REDD+ funds clearly identified for REDD+ to work.

Proposed flow of funds

- Got PFM group makes a communal free & voluntary agreement on the area of forest assigned to REDD+;
- This area will be demarcated & included into PFM Association Forest Management Plan (agreed with BoARD);
- REDD+ Agreement will be concluded with the Woreda Forest Management Association;
- Woreda FM Association will be “Coordinator” of all Got REDD+ Agreements;
- Woreda FMA will conclude sale agreement with Carbon Offset buyer(s);
- Funds received from Buyer will be placed in Woreda Carbon Trust Account;
- REDD+ Board of Trustees will include - Woreda Administrator (Chair), Woreda BoA Head, and Got PFMA Representatives;
- Woreda FM Association will distribute carbon funds to each Got PFM group in accordance with each Got’s REDD+ Agreement;
- Woreda FMA may claim admin expenses from Woreda Carbon Fund; and
- Carbon Funds received by Got PFMA may be used in accordance with the Association members’ wishes.

So far, progress has been made in developing carbon trading mechanism through preparing PDD document.

Future opportunity and perspectives - NTFP – PFM R&D Project Phase II will terminate as of July 7, 2013. However, the work started by the project will continue over the coming three years via the project, *REDD+ Participatory Forest Management in South-West Ethiopia (REPAFMA-SW Ethiopia)*. The project will be implemented in 5 woredas, 4 Zones of 2 regions (SNNPRs and Oromia). Funding is made available for the project from NORAD/DF.

1.2.5 Enterprise development as basis for PFM

Supporting a range of forest based, profitable and locally appropriate enterprises can enhance livelihoods by adding value to the forests; making forestry competitive with other livelihood options and reducing interest to convert forest land into other land uses.

The project has been promoting the development NTFP enterprises on three major NTFPs - honey, coffee and spice. It has used the integration of the Market Analysis and Development (MAD) approach to forest enterprise development.

The project supported 3 existing cooperatives by establishing a Union, and getting certification under the Utz Kapeh Scheme for coffee. During the second phase 18 tones of washed forest coffee was exported to Europe. However, problems with the union and the cooperatives and the integrity of the supply chain resulted in the loss of the contract showing that the major marketing challenge for forest coffee is more of bringing high quality coffee product effectively to the market than finding market links.

Ethiopian cardamom and Long pepper are the major forest spices found in the area which have relatively significant market values both locally and nationally. Study findings however, revealed that the quality of the spices from the forest need to be improved before any long-term marketing initiative and trade links can be made.

Forest honey production on the other hand, is a centuries old skill hence it is produced in significant volumes. The Project supports PLCs and cooperatives by providing trainings and technical support as well as organizing learning visits and participation on trade exhibitions. It has also created national market linkages with Beza Mar & Tutu honey, which have resulted in over 300 tones of honey reaching national and international markets. A rise in local price from 5-7 birr/kg to 50-60 birr/kg has been recorded.

The project has adapted and integrated the MAD approach of FAO to small forest based community enterprises and has established six multiple kebele forest product marketing cooperatives. This process has supported the community by increasing their bargaining power and ability to find markets for their products, raising their awareness of the link between forest management / conservation and income generation, developing a sense of ownership over the enterprises and the forest, and increasing participation of women and minority groups.

From the experiences it has been realized that there is a need to promote sustainable development of multiple income streams from the forest until it strikes a balance with forest management costs for the communities. Other potential income generating products identified for future implementation are: construction wood from dead wood and fern trees, bamboo, piloting sustainably sourced community timber production and community lead eco-tourism.

1.2.6 Impact of PFM on local people's livelihoods and forest management

In order to understand the impact of PFM on the livelihood of the community, an assessment was carried out by collecting empirical data. For this, a total of 17 PFM gots have been sampled from 65 forest management units (115 households and 174 individuals interviewed including government staff members).

Based on the assessment the introduction of PFM has resulted in regulated access with enforceable legal rights, and decision making rights over forest use and forest management. This has in turn resulted in a high sense of ownership. On the other hand, forest destructive activities have decreased as a result of the increase in community participation.

The data also showed that all negative activities such as forest encroachment, illegal harvesting settlement and fire have decreased while regeneration and number of healthy young seedlings have increased.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

In addition, skills in sustainable harvesting has increased and forest based income has shown an increase from an average of ETB 4967 /year to ETB 12,193 /year. This is highly linked with the marketing development support that was given by the project.

In general, 99% of the respondents believe that their livelihood condition is better and that this is linked to the project initiatives.

The challenges recognized through this study were the need to develop the incentives obtained from the forest products vs. efforts for forest management. Additionally, there is the challenge of allocation of forest land for investment (coffee and tea) and the limited integration and complementarity with the efforts by organizations pursuing investment and Biosphere Reserves.

1.3 Major lessons from the project

- PFM is an iterative learning process which requires time and a long process of consultation between the community and government.
- It is a process that we are still learning from and adapting to local contexts.
- PFM is not just about forest management but is also about governance, relations, business, and policy.
- Improving livelihoods through the development of forest-based enterprises with legal support, has been found to empower communities while concurrently add value to the forest.
- For long-term sustainability building the capacity of local government and the community to lead PFM is essential.
- Forest Management Associations have the leverage of standing for the communities they represent and to defend the rights of the got PFM groups, as well as negotiate on their roles (rights, revenue & responsibilities).
- Institutional arrangements need to reduce the complexity of forest management by dividing up roles & responsibilities.
- There needs to be separation of responsibilities for forest management & forest products marketing for efficiency and effectiveness of actions.
- The FMA is an asset for the woreda as the newly emerging PFM groups can automatically join it.
- The FMA having its office based at woreda is close to the local government and so can help integrate PFM into the government's regular development plans.
- Capacitating and empowering communities is as important as establishing and legalizing forest management institutions.
- PFM needs a meaningful support from all actors in all aspects to ensure sustainable forest management – policy support, actions and advocacy.
- Action is needed to improve the quality and negative reputation of forest spices from the SW to improve their prices. Without better returns it will not be encouraging for the communities.
- The marketing challenge for forest coffee is more of bringing high quality coffee product effectively to the market, than finding the actual market link.
- At this stage of PFM implementation, it is difficult to assert that communities are fully incentivized to manage their forests with income only from a few NTFPs. Therefore there

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities University of Huddersfield

is a need to promote a sustainable development of multiple income streams from the forest to communities.

- The existing traditional forest management practices of local communities have to be explored well and integrated with the PFM arrangements.
- It is very helpful to ensure forests pay their way; more options for maximizing forest incentives need to be explored and implemented for sustainability of PFM impacts.
- There is a need to design mechanism to enhance the role of women in the forest management.

1.4 Testimonies from community members

Ato Girma Gedeno, Sheka zone, Masha woreda, Shato NTFP trading PLC, manager

“Since the initiation of the project in 2003, I have been working closely with the project. There have been so many changes in the lives of the farmers in our area as a result of the works done by this project. The project together with the zone and woreda agriculture bureau has been supporting us mainly in capacity building.”

“Let me take honey as an example to show you some of the changes in our lives. We have been educated on the value of producing quality honey that takes the environment into consideration. Hence we fully understand and have replaced our log beehives with those we make from mud. We also have moved our hives to our backyard and can easily access them. Since the introduction of the modern beehives, farmers have started producing 150-400 kg of honey per year and thus have increased their income significantly. Many more farmers are recognizing the benefits and are starting to do this on their own. Thus, we have seen tangible results and we are witnesses to the success of the project.”

“It is not only with production where things have changed; we are also now capable of marketing our honey and earning much more than we ever expected. We are now organized as PLCs and cooperatives and can freely do our marketing. We collect the honey from the groups at the lowest administration level – the ‘*goḥ*’ and sell our products collectively then the benefits are shared also with all the members. Our products have high demand. Over 8,000 kg of honey has been sold to various agro industries in the past year including companies such as Apinec and Tutu honey. The demand is coming from as far away as the Tigray region.

“We believe this is a good start. Even cardamom (*kororima*) and long pepper (*timiz*) we can now produce on our farmlands with high potential for good market returns. Since the start of the project many have improved their lives, some have improved their houses, others have been able to purchase furniture for their houses, and most have started educating their children even to the level of higher education. So we highly appreciate what this project has brought to us. We believe what has started is sustainable and that we will do even much better in the future.”

Ato Tekalign Shodeno, Sheka zone, Andracha woreda, Ganiti Forest Management Association, Manager

“I have been involved in the PFM process since 2003. Sheka is a naturally blessed zone. In Andracha, the kobo system which is led by clan leaders to conserve the forest has been practiced for a long time. However, in the 1970s and 80s the management rights were taken from the community into the hands of the government. This of course did not lead to a good outcome.”

“But when we think of it now, even when the communities were managing the forest, the focus was on protection and sustainable utilization, with little or no attention given to the development. Our livelihood is completely linked with and dependent on the forest. When our children come of

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities University of Huddersfield

age they immediately start collecting cardamom and put up beehives in the forest so that they can start earning money and support their family.”

“At the beginning the project was implemented only in 2 kebeles and 2 gots. In the early days, communities were not convinced and were even worried that the forest that was being demarcated in order to be given away. Initially it was really tough to convince the community but the project persisted and continued to discuss the issue with the communities. In 2006, the first legal recognition came about. Since then demand from communities to expand the work has been increasing.”

“Eventually the organized groups recognized the need for a woreda level entity – a wereda Forest Management Association. This will unite all the got level groups while it will also be able to work closely with the local government bodies. Therefore, the Ganiti Forest Association was established at the woreda level in 2012. Under this association there are currently 39 gots (3 more in the pipeline) that are members. Each got has its own annual plan on forest management (protection, development and utilization). The Association’s roles include monitoring and evaluation of each got as per their plan, discussion on identified gaps and ensuring correcting measures are taken.”

“Some of the challenges faced at the beginning were lack of awareness, boundary conflict, and lack of trust and fear of losing the forest. Through time, however we were able to witness great achievements including legal recognition, change of perception resulting in sense of ownership, and skill development for forest management.”

2. Other National and International PFM experiences and Lessons

2.1 Participatory forest policy development process: the case of SNNPRS

Ahmid Said

The forest access situations in the southwest highlands of Ethiopia shows a complex combination of state tenure and customary use rights by local communities. Initially local communities had developed traditional forest access arrangements, but these were not recognised by policy makers. This resulted in a lack of sense of ownership leading to a short term mentality in the use of forest resources and high encroachment of natural forests.

The Federal Forest Proclamation was issued in 2007. Based on that new Federal policy, the Region was required to revise its existing Regional Forest Proclamation No 77/2004 and adapt it to the specific, social, cultural, ecological and economic context of SNNPRS and develop a Regional Forest Policy and Forest Regulations, with the necessary guidelines for implementation.

The NTFP-PFM project, along with other stakeholders, has supported the regional government for more than five years in a policy formulation process. This consisted of the following stages:

- Action Plans developed for the revisions of proclamation
- Based on the Action Plan the project signed Memorandum of Understanding to Strengthen the collaboration between the region and the project in light of revising Regional Forest Development, Management and Utilization Proclamation No. 77/2004 and develop rules and regulations
- The project provided both technical and financial support to (SNNPRS-BoARD) to facilitate the development of proclamation, regulation and guidelines through a multi-stakeholder consultation process.
- As part of the technical advice the region established a multi-disciplinary team that could drive forward the development of the regional proclamation and trainings were provided to the team on the different participatory approach.
- In this process the region recognized that:
 - Ensuring the participation of key forest stakeholders in the development of the regional proclamation will help it be better tailored to the SNNPRS context, and
 - Ensure that the policy will be more widely accepted and supported by a wider body of stakeholders during implementation.
- Consultation was made with 87 government representatives (15 F) and 170 local community representatives (12 female) in the project intervention woredas. The consultation was made at the specific sites in 34 kebeles in ten woredas and in eight zones.
- Once the consultation process was completed the drafting team developed a draft forest proclamation and presented it to a multi stakeholder workshop for further enrichment.

The new proclamation (147/2012) stipulates the need for community participation in forest management and clearly indicates the rights of the local forest dependent communities about the forest use. It also recognizes three types of forest ownership (state, community and private owned forests) and considers the forest use traditions of the local forest dependent community through a mutually agreed PFM agreement. It also allocates forest management responsibilities to the local community to manage state forests and to do this jointly with the government. The next stages will be follow up and technical support to finalize a forest Regulations and subsequently the Guidelines, as well as sharing the lessons of this process to other regions.

2.2 Wild Coffee Conservation (WCC) through PFM project

Elias Kasahun

The EU CIP IV project identified four hot spots of wild coffee for in-situ conservation. Unfortunately the CIP IV project discontinued operation before these could be formally managed to ensure the conservation of the wild coffee. The WCC-PFM project was conceptualized as building on the experiences of NTFP-PFM in order to contribute to the in-situ conservation of wild coffee biodiversity within the forest ecosystem. The project is currently implemented in two forest blocks, Kontir Berhan and Amora Gedel, within 13 Kebeles of Sheko woreda, Bench Maji zone. The underlying approach of the project is participatory forest management (PFM) in order to achieve the required in-situ conservation of wild coffee gene pool.

Progress to date

- Community awareness raised on PFM rationale, principles and steps
- Community and government capacity built
- Develop/fine tune simplified PFM steps
- Participatory boundary demarcation and classification of different land use types for the purpose of management have been completed in all 38 Gots of the project (14,793 ha natural forest, 13,563 ha coffee forest, and 5,171 ha agriculture & settlement areas)
- Establishment of community based institutions

Success

- Within a short period of time trust and a sense of ownership of the forest have been encouragingly built within the community and government partners in co-management of the resource
- Disputes and differences have been addressed through negotiation and debates so that forest boundaries have been demarcated successfully
- Participatory forest management plans have been produced reflecting the range of interests within communities and government partners
- Capacity of government partners is gradually building where government is running PFM up-scaling on its own

Challenges

- PFM still not mainstreamed in government routine activities
- Government partners are occupied by different duties leading to low participation in the project

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

- Complex socio-cultural backgrounds of people living in the project area require a series of negotiations and facilitation
- Generating concrete benefit out of the forest is not an easy task, as with agricultural products
- Still a lot needs to be done to sufficiently engage women and the poor in PFM processes
- High population increase in the area due to illegal immigration from other areas impacts on the forest and project activities
- Illegal small scale investments in the forests are taking place
- Insufficient law enforcement – there are cases pending for more than 9 months

Way forward

- Immediate facilitation of forest management agreement signing between woreda Agriculture Office and Got FMAs in 20 Gots
- Capacity building trainings for FMA leaders in areas of leadership, organization management, silviculture, biodiversity etc
- Facilitate the establishment of marketing institution
- Facilitate the scaling-up of the project into adjacent woredas and Kebeles
- Facilitate forest management agreement signing in the remaining 18 Gots

2.3 Thirteen plus years of PFM in Ethiopia: what did we learn?

Tsegaye Tadesse

Globally the experience was one of tensions and conflicts increasing between Forest Departments and communities as forest boundaries were unclear, top down laws were applied and local uses were not recognized. In late 1980s to mid-1990s this led to an era of 'people first' forestry projects, and it was a time when community participation for tree planting (FAO's FLCD) was taking place and woodlot establishment was believed to be a critical action to avert wood shortages (Community forests). Following this, JFM (Joint Forest Management) in India and the concept of user group forestry in Nepal were initiated. The 1990s were the time when a general trend towards decentralization and sharing of power with local authorities began. Community participation in forest management may be defined as the sharing of control, responsibilities and products and decision-making authority over forests, between forest departments and forest user groups (FUG), based on a formal agreement.

In Ethiopia PFM initiatives began in 1994 when Farm Africa organized a study tour to India for foresters, followed by development and implementation of the first PFM projects in the country by Farm Africa and GIZ. Since then a lot of actors have joined in the implementation and government bodies – federal and regional, have endorsed their support by signing agreements with communities, developing regulations and policies and finally with the MoA joining in the implementation of PFM in four regions and harmonizing the PFM implementation guidelines. To date, PFM is being implemented in four regions in the country (Oromia, SNNPR, Amhara and Benishangul Gumuz) by different actors on more than 800,000 ha of forest land.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

The achievements / impacts of PFM have clearly been seen in improving forest conditions, providing economic benefits through contribution to sustainable livelihoods and big social impacts where it has changed attitudes of communities and governments, as well as practitioners, and resulted in organized actions and mechanisms for mediating resource use conflict as well as good governance where community groups function democratically. Co-managing forests with communities has reduced the costs for the state in establishing and protecting forests.

Today there are a number of enabling conditions including:

- policy (federal and regional proclamations and government commitment on REDD+ through PFM, CRGE etc.),
- expanding and emerging markets (including NTFP potentials, forest certifications and REDD+/CDM), and
- growing awareness of PFM and climate change .

All support the development of PFM in the country.

On the other hand there still are some challenges in implementing PFM. These include conflict between community groups, unclear institutional arrangements for PFM groups, weak law enforcement, conflicting land uses such as encroachment and migration, limited capacity for implementation.

Lessons learned

- Communities are capable of ensuring forest conservation
- Government can accept / support ideas if presented with evidence
- PFM can contribute to forest restoration and improvement of livelihoods
- PFM can be practiced under various biophysical and socio-cultural settings
- People's participation in affairs that concern them guarantees sustainability
- It is not just tangible economic benefits and products but also the less visible aspects of empowerment in terms of decision making and good governance which are witnessed
- More emphasis should be given to 'protection' than 'use' and 'development'
- Still being done with *donor support* – after over 13 years!
- No structured technical support rendered to CBOs (by Forest Dept or by CPOs)
- Signing of agreements is being seen as the end of it – but is just the beginning
- Forest based incomes still not at a sufficient scale despite potentials
- Poor linkages with research

We have come a long way, but still have a lot more to do.

Tasks ahead

- Cost-benefit of PFM (the economics)
- Impacts of PFM on environment and livelihoods
- Management plans (formulation/implementation)
- Forest resource monitoring
- Expanding lessons to the lowland areas (also degraded areas?)
- Embedding PFM in government structures
- Making markets work for NTFPs
- In low NTFP potential: wood based income vs. alternative livelihoods
- Integrate gender aspects from the start
- Objectives of PFM (national level)

- Do we need some 'right sizing' of the approach?
- How do we see PFM working in high value vs. degraded forests
- Addressing 'elite capture'
- Benefit sharing schemes
- Create linkages with academic/ research institutions
- Keep up the spirit of working together – the PFM-Working Group has been instrumental in exchange of learning

2.4 More tenure security needed to make PFM serve its purpose in Ethiopia Mulugeta Lemenih

Ethiopia is among the worst hit by deforestation and its impacts. This has been written and talked about since early 1960s and still is an issue. Forests provide multiple benefits where up to 30-50% of household income is generated, contributes to national economic development through coffee and provides more than 90% of the country's energy. A number of ecosystem services including conservation, hydrological and climate regulation and adaptation etc come from forests. However, deforestation is still a great threat. The direct drivers are identified as demographic change, socio-economic conditions, and political and institutional contexts.

The major problem in Ethiopia is the fact that with changing political ideology, policies, laws, and regulations are also changed. This has led to a de facto open access situation.

Distorted incentives relate to property right shortfalls. These can be summarised as follows:

1. Farmers are charged as 'illegal'/'destroyers' of forest. Forest when it stays as it is, is a public/state property, not 'local property', while when converted to farmland it becomes private, Hence for an individual it is best to turn forest into farmland and get clear rights;
2. 'Unused state land' - Forests are identified as 'unused and potentially usable lands' mainly for landless/investors.
3. Popular conception 'forests are conservation arenas only', not as economic resource of use for development;
4. Farmland certification, which makes farmland secure, is done without parallel reform for forestry

PFM Challenges

- Challenges mainly relate to rights:
 - Forest/forestland property right still 'not strong' or formally recognized (i.e. insecurity exists); Forest Management Agreements are provisional, PFM communities are liable to dispossession and eviction.
 - Widespread infringements by law enforcing and justice organs of the 'forest rights' of PFM communities;
 - PFM is about Trust but no trust without formal endorsement ;

One means to address this situation is collective forestland registration and certification.

No access for communities to forest products like lumber, means that the return obtained from forest protection is not sufficient. The focus should not be only on conservation / protection of the forest. There is no reason why land certification cannot be extended to forestry in PFM context. Experience from Gesha woreda, Kaffa zone, shows that it is possible. 7575.6 ha of forest managed by 17 Got level PFM Groups is now certified as communal forest land and issued with a group certificate

Conclusion/Recommendation

- Experience from around the world including from Ethiopia shows communities and households when granted more authority and choice over forest, can make better efforts at sustainable forest management. Therefore, more formal right should be granted. This can take various forms: Lease; land certification; collective, household or individual
- Securing the tenure is essential this needs backing by law enforcement to result in successful community forestry projects.
- It is time at least for piloting many things such as forest land certification or at least long term lease forestry followed by SFM practices.

2.5 Experiences of Forest Governance Devolution: Chronic Challenges and Issues for Reflection

Habtemariam Kassa

Forest governance is usually described as how decisions are made about the management and use of forest lands and resources. In Africa, the state owns most forests. Communities claim access and use as their *de facto* rights, while government states enjoy *de jure* ownership rights. Degradation and deforestation are usually seen as a result of open access. This happens despite increased global recognition of the multifaceted roles of forests.

Forest governance reforms are part of the broader decentralization reform and increased recognition of community rights:

- 1970s – social forestry – help meet community needs through farm forestry
- 1980s – community forestry – use community institutions in achieving forest management and protection objectives
- 1990s – Joint Forest Management – recognizing and promoting the role of forests to local livelihoods and poverty alleviation besides conservation

11% of global forests and 27% of forests in developing countries are administered by communities. Forest reforms took in many countries after the mid 1980s. But rights of forest governance devolved were partial, leading to different variants of co-management systems.

Various forms of management include:

- Bio-reserves
- Natural forests
- Degraded forests /forest lands
- Commercial plantations - (e.g. joint ventures, out grower schemes)

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

Experiences from different countries range from initial strict protection to multiple use zones as a result of communities demand (Maya biosphere reserve), forest management, timber management, timber extraction rights, forest governance and establishment of tree growers' cooperatives on degraded forests.

Chronic challenges observed in most of the cases are achieving both conservation and development objectives at the same time, the fact that income from forests remain much less than that from other land uses (agriculture often outcompeting forestry), high transaction costs, unprepared government staff, bureaucracy, long process for establishing PFM, unstable policies, poor policy implementation and lack of funding and support plans by governments to ensure that community challenges are addressed and benefits are sustained after the projects are completed.

At community level the challenges include, uneven participation, inequity and marginalization of the poor, limited technical capacity of communities to prepare management plans, and elite capture. Another challenge is the legal and institutional aspects, where low impact on livelihoods, inequity and high transaction costs (participation, marketing), high initial costs, location and socio-economic specificity for wider use of a given management system or scaling up and out good practices – no any two areas have identical socio-economic and environmental conditions. Thus there is no blueprint management plan that would provide a blanket solution to all the problems.

Good practices include:

- Rights to forest use with responsibilities to manage increased rights with a capable forest agency to monitor use
- Increased emphasis on community participation coupled in some countries with establishment of more autonomous forest administration entities like boards, authorities and commissions
- Increasing the role of the private sector in forestry
- Different cost-benefit sharing arrangements between the state and communities
- Diversifying opportunities and market links
- Shifting the role of government – from use control to more enabling & capacity building (e.g. India)
- Ensuring that distant users also benefit
- Making certification process to be easier
- Enhance the economic contribution of forests in a managed landscape

Similar trends of partial devolution leading to variants of co-management are seen in the reviewed countries. However, even though access and use rights are improved, almost always there is significant external control with regard to management decision-making.

Issue for reflection regarding PFM in Ethiopia

From analysis of the Ethiopian PFM situation a number of questions can be identified which need attention. Some of these are as follows:

- A modeling of Chilimo forest (in 2007) shows that the forest will disappear without PFM, but PFM which may avert this also involves short-term cost to generate long-term benefit to communities.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities University of Huddersfield

- Have we really accounted/recorded all the costs & benefits of PFM to communities and to the state?
- PFM has two objectives – conservation & poverty reduction. Have projects given equal emphasis to both? Has the poverty focus been given appropriate emphasis?
- Are some of the assumptions about PFM always true?
- What are the pros & cons of exclusionary vs. inclusive approaches in selecting and involving forest users (from benefits per participant, equity, and impact on forests)?
- Have we sufficiently engaged communities and negotiated with the state regarding the short, medium and long term objectives of forests maintenance under PFM and the respective roles for the forest?
- How can we do more to assess and address displacement of deforestation (leakage)?
- How can we do more to link forest-dependent communities to markets and industries?
- How can we do more to increase the types and sizes of benefits from forests?
- How can we do more to improve distribution of responsibilities and benefits?
- How can we do better to understand the sources of conflicts and improve capacity to manage?
- How can we do more to examine and address shortcomings with CBOs and the legal options for CBOs to implement PFM?

Issue for reflection – from global experiences

From the global review, a number of issues are identified which should be considered around the world. Some of these are as follows:

- CBFM does not necessarily lead to reduced deforestation (e.g. Mexico, Brazil). We need to understand why this is the case.
- How can we maintain the balance of rights to use forest with the responsibility to manage it?
- Communities may opt for shorter term economic gains and for measures that reduce conflicts in resource management and use, in responsibility and benefit sharing, and in land use decisions. Thus, we need to recognize that a community level of management may not be the most effective management technique for long term sustainability.
- How can we simplify regulatory processes and adjustment of oversight processes of the state in a way that would improve the efficiency of co-management systems (rather than hindering them)?

To generate the required information to address these questions, we need:

- Forest monitoring system - that will track forest condition, forest management and protection by users and the diversity and extent of revenues from forests
- Independent and supportive research - that will undertake multi-site longitudinal tracking that assesses livelihoods, forest condition and governance variables overtime and generates relevant information for policy makers and practitioners

3. Overall workshop discussion outputs

Discussions have considered both presentations in the workshop as well as reports from the working groups. The focus was that participants should explore different ideas which could enable PFM implementers to identify strengths, weaknesses and possible areas of collaborations. Below are the major discussion outputs of the workshop under three headings.

To improve the balance between benefits and costs for communities in PFM, the following policy, regulations, guidelines and practices have been identified as essential

PFM might not be the only option available for forest management, but it is by far the best tested method we have in the country and it needs to be made better through practice. The government of Ethiopia has shown clear commitment to own and mainstream PFM in the country by initiating PFM activities through MoA. Further, PFM has been identified as the key means to implement REDD+ both in the REDD+ preparation plan and the CRGE. However, there still are critical policy gaps that need to be addressed in order to ensure proper implementation of PFM. In order to make forests pay their way, the following actions have been identified as the next steps.

- There is at Federal level a PFM regulation and guideline that is waiting endorsement. This needs to be facilitated so that clear policy guidelines are available at the national level to guide the regions.
- Benefit sharing arrangements need to be studied and clearly captured for inclusion in national level guidance for implementation
- Use of timber from the natural forest should not continue to be an impossible task. Piloting of such an initiative should be supported, so that it can feed into policy strategies at national level. This should be done without overlooking the ecological balance of the system, and with recognition that it can also assist positively in biodiversity conservation where ecological processes of disturbance are needed.
- An initial effort may focus on policy support to plant indigenous trees in farmland / backyard not only for domestic use but also for trade.
- REDD+ as a means of income generation is only one stream that is being considered. It should not be considered as the only means for income generation, but as an additional one that can supplement forest-based livelihoods. Its actual potential in livelihood support is yet to be seen as the current pilots in the country are yet to start selling credits.
- Other PES activities such as payment for watershed management should be discussed with government bodies as potential partnerships between the government and communities with forest land.
- Livelihood options in these forested landscape should not necessarily be only forest-based, but they have to be forest friendly. Implementers should be careful not to de-link communities from their natural resources as this may not have a favorable effect on forest maintenance.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

- Landscape level integration which considers all land uses (mainly agriculture and forestry) as well as social issues such as population dynamics and health need to be considered as PFM is implemented at a larger scale. Appropriate institutions should be involved in order to incorporate this in PFM
- There is a lot of research that needs to be done before PFM becomes perfect. For these studies, a range of research institutions and academic organisations need to be involved. However, researchers should also consider community knowledge in their work.
- We need to be careful in not making PFM too technical and hard to implement by community and government.
- We should start considering how to advocate for Joint Forest Ownership which will strengthen the trust that has been given to the communities and boost their confidence in government and make it worthwhile for them to invest their time.
- Policy support for developing appropriate PFM institutions is a key that will be required to move PFM further. This must consider support for the marketing of forest products as well as capacity for forest management.
- PFM should focus on making the grassroots communities the active facilitators of PFM. This will not only empower the communities to lead their own development but also reduce costs and address the issues of high turnover and loss of institutional memory that is usually seen in government offices.
- The harmonized guideline should clearly indicate the length of time required for each PFM activities along with estimated budget required to support scaled-up programmes.
- There is a need to strengthen the PFM-WG so as to have a common and strong voice to achieve impacts. We may consider incorporating a wider group in this working group to build a critical mass.
- More capacity building and awareness raising work is required for community and government on PFM.
- There is a need to ensure that coffee forests are not dying forests – with their canopies disappearing. Sustainable management of canopy and harvesting practices needs to be considered. The current trend is that there is some regeneration but intensive harvesting methods and trampling by cattle result in minimal regrowth of canopy trees. In some coffee areas there is almost no regeneration.
- The issue of compatibility of biosphere reserves and PFM needs to be thoroughly reviewed as there are varying issues and conflicts. PFM is a grassroots approach where communities are empowered with a right to decide how to sustainably utilize the resources. We have to ensure biosphere reserves do not take away that with a top-down approach.
- We also need to recognize the cultural value of forests and not focus on use value only.
- We need to ensure that the management plans which are developed by PFM groups are actually implemented.

Institutional arrangement most suitable for PFM

PFM stakeholders have been discussing the issue of which institutional arrangement is best fitting PFM for a long time. Such an institution needs to be inclusive, democratic, and able to perform sustainable forest management as well as social and economic / marketing activities while preventing elite capture. It has been agreed that with the current

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

arrangements in the country, there is no single institution that can address the overall issues of PFM. Earlier meetings and the harmonized PFM guidelines have suggested using cooperatives despite their limitations as they are easier to apply in the context of the country. However, projects such as NTFP-PFM have identified associations as additional suitable institutions for forest management. Therefore, in order to harmonise PFM at national level, this requires more work and agreement by all stakeholders. Harmonising institutional arrangement not only will make application of PFM easier but will also reduce confusions that will be created among community institutions.

Therefore, it has been agreed that more assessments and analysis are needed to identify feasible institutions for PFM and this needs to be one of the major discussion point in the next PFM working group meeting. It is agreed that a clear guidelines on how to proceed on this will be finalised in the next working group session with an understanding that this may subsequently require policy support.

Improving forest tenure security

Forest tenure security is identified as a key step in ensuring implementation of PFM to its full capacity. It was agreed that land use planning at national and regional levels should integrated PFM and that forest land certification should be given due emphasis. Certification will not only give community groups ownership over forest with guarantees for compensation but will also give them security and confidence in fully investing their time and energy in forest management. This will require detailed planning for implementation once accepted. In addition with their capacity built, they will have enough zeal to push court cases and monitor their forests properly. Therefore, legislation that supports forest tenure security is a key next step while political will is fundamental in bringing lasting results.

Plantation of trees by communities is encouraged. However, we have to clarify the issue of planting and trading in indigenous trees as some of these trees are labeled endangered. This creates a problem as even if people plant them on their land in order to sell them they will have to go through a long process of getting permits. This discourages the planting of such indigenous trees and leads to a preference for exotics such as eucalyptus. Therefore, the issue of secure tree tenure in community or individual woodlots needs to be addressed.

Forest land certification needs to be introduced, just like agriculture land certification. This will give the communities a sense of security and also reduce encroachment. Political will is fundamental. We need more of the will and proper management and commitment rather than mere proclamations.

4. Annexes

4.1 Opening Speech

His Excellency Mr. Sileshi Getahun, State Minister MoA

Opening speech on the occasion of National Workshop for sharing PFM experience from the NTFP-PFM Southwest Research and Development Project' organized by Southwest Forest and Landscape Grouping Honourable Members of Parliament, Diplomats, Distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen;

Good morning to you all. First of all I would like to thank the organizers of the workshop for giving me the chance to speak on this occasion and open the workshop.

Ethiopia is now entering a new historical era of economic development with one of the fastest growing economy in the world. The country has been attaining a two digit economic growth for the past several years. The history of many countries shows that such fast economic growth is often linked with declining environmental qualities. However, the government of Ethiopia, aware of this reverse relationship between economic growth and environmental quality, in collaboration with development partners, is striving to avoid any significant environmental externalities of the fast developing economy. The dedication of the government in ensuring a win-win development pathway can be seen in the policies and programs it develops and implements, such as the Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE). The CRGE development strategy is crafted to guide the government of Ethiopia to ensure carbon neutral growth by abating the carbon and other Greenhouse Gas emissions expected to be released from the fast growing economy. In this strategy forestry is one of core pillars.

Honourable guests, Ladies and Gentlemen;

In the CRGE plan the following targets have been set for the forest sector:

- Improved management of 5 million ha of high forests and 2 million ha of woodlands;
- Switching of more than 20 million households to more efficient stoves, and reducing the demand for fuelwood (firewood and charcoal); and
- Afforestation of 2 million ha, and reforestation of 1 million ha.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities University of Huddersfield

REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation plus enhancement of existing forests) is one of the initiatives of the CRGE that have been fast tracked. This is because:

- Forests losses account for 1/3 of total emissions today and offer a huge abatement potential through less deforestation and less forest degradation;
- Ethiopia has the second-largest afforestation and reforestation programme in the world, hence there are high chance for improving carbon sequestration, and
- REDD+ offers the opportunity to implement forestry abatement levers and monetise the respective abatement potential in a structured way.

Therefore, improved forest management related works by development partners, like those Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA) and its partners (the University of Huddersfield from the UK and Sustainable Livelihood Action from the Netherlands) are promoting, is in fact part and parcel of this crucial government long term plan, and therefore we highly value it.

Ladies and gentlemen;

Ethiopia's forests are also unique in many ways, particularly in terms of their genetic resources. They are birth place of *Coffea arabica*, one of the precious gifts of our forests to the global community. Coffee as you all know is also one of the most traded commodities in the world; hence it plays a considerable role in global economy, while for Ethiopia it is the mainstay of the national economy. The regional significance of the forests of Ethiopia is also considerable. The forests cover the largest mountainous landscape in Africa, and are the sources of several major international rivers such as the Blue Nile, the Baro-Akobo, the Genale, Omo, etc. These rivers are important not only for Ethiopians but also for several millions of people in downstream countries. The proper management of the forests sustains the flow of the rivers and the security of the livelihoods of millions of people and the economies of several nations, our own included.

The Ethiopian government acknowledges the role that non-state actors are playing in improving natural resources management in the country, particularly in forest management. Participatory Forest Management (PFM) has been introduced, tested and expanded across the country by non-state actors, with the support and facilitation of the government. These agencies have generated a great deal of knowledge, practical experience and skills, and in the process have built capacities of the grassroots as well as national experts. Based on the lessons gained from the works of the development partners, the Government of Ethiopia has taken up the PFM approach to forest management and is implementing a PFM up-scaling project. The project is currently

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities

University of Huddersfield

implemented in several regional states: Oromia, SNNPRS, Beneshagul-Gumuz, Tigray, and Amhara. This is a clear indication that whenever good practices are introduced and demonstrated by our development partners, the government is ready to pick them up, and up-scale them.

Distinguished guests, Ladies and gentlemen;

The works of Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA) and its partners, who have all been working with the Government of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Regional State, in promoting improved forest management, like most other NGOs that work on forestry and natural resources, has immense potential to support several government programs such as the GTP, CRGE and rural development strategies. As you all are aware, the government in collaboration with the World Bank has launched a REDD+ capacity building project through the Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership Facility program. One of the basic inputs towards the implementation of the program is local institution and capacity buildings. Therefore, the capacity built in local community as well as grassroots institution development work through your PFM projects are important inputs towards the realization of this project, and other similar REDD+ projects in pipeline and those to come. In fact, we are aware that your organization has been working to implement REDD+ process linked to PFM. We would like to encourage you to push this forward, as well as link it to the national system to enjoy the support government is ready to provide you. In this regard we welcome any further development activities you would like us to offer you.

I would like to congratulate EWNRA and its partners for your achievements through the project by bringing about 100,000 ha of biodiversity rich high forests under community management scheme in four woredas, as well as in promoting forest friendly enterprise development that has improved local livelihoods. I would also like to commend the partners for making a commitment to continue to work together in the form of the South-West Forests and Landscapes Grouping and developing capacity for high level analysis of the issues relating to forests and landscapes in that area. I am sure the experiences you are sharing with the stakeholders gathered here will be helpful as good lessons and best practices that can be picked up and used by many in their similar endeavours and in your team's future work.

Having said these, I wish you a fruitful and successful deliberation, and I now declare the workshop is officially opened.

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities
University of Huddersfield

4.2 Workshop programme

Time	Activity	Responsible person	Chair person(s)
08.15 – 09.00	Registration		
09.00 - 09.10	Welcome and arrangements		Afework Hailu / Adrian Wood
09.10 – 09.20	Remarks from EU Delegation		
09:20 - 09:30	Embassy of Norway		
09:20 - 09:40	Embassy of the Netherlands		
09.30 – 09.45	Formal Opening – Guest of Honour		
09.45 – 10.15	Project overview and history of project work and its future	Afework Hailu	
10.15 – 10.45	Tea / Coffee Break		
10.45 – 11.20	Southwest Ethiopia - Forests and Landscapes – value of the forests / costs of deforestation, and developing a project strategy	Adrian Wood	Hussein Kebede
11.20 – 11:50	PFM as the best method for maintaining the forests of south-west Ethiopia	Ahmid Said	
11.50 - 12.30	Discussion		
12.30 – 13.45	Lunch		
13.45 – 14.10	PFM institutional development: the experience of NTFP-PFM	Anteneh Tesfaye	Mohamednur
14.10 – 14.35	NTFPs and forest management: opportunities and challenges based on the experience of NTFPs-PFM R&D project	Sisay Asfaw	
14.35 – 15.00	Linking PFM and REDD+: potential and challenges	Peter Sutcliffe	
15.00 - 15.30	Discussion		
15.30 – 16.00	Tea / Coffee Break		
16.00 – 16.25	Enterprise development as the basis for PFM – incentivizing forest dependent communities to maintain the forest	Biniyam Abebe	Mulugeta Lemenih
16.25 –	Impact of PFM on local peoples livelihoods: experience	Endeshaw	

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities
University of Huddersfield

16.45	from NTFP-PFM project	Mogessie	
16.45 – 17.10	PFM Association and Forest Cooperative Leaders		
17.10 - 17.30	Discussion		
	Day 2		
08.30 – 09.00	Lessons from Day 1		
09.00 – 09.30	Participatory forest policy development process: the case of SNNPRS	Ahmid Said	Muktar Abduke
09.30-10.00	Forest land certification as a milestone to ensure tenure security for PFM community: experience from NTFPs-PFM in Sheka zone	Mulugeta Lemenih	
10.00 – 10.30	PFM Experiences and other models of forest management – CIFOR experience	Habtemarian Kassa	
10.30 – 11.00	Tea / Coffee Break		
11.00 – 11.30	Farm Africa and SOS Experience with PFM in Oromia Region	Tsegaye	Hamid Said
11.30 – 12.00	PFM for Biodiversity conservation – experience of the WCC-PFM project in Sheko	Elias Kasahun	
12.00 - 12.30	Discussion and preparation for working groups		
12.30 – 13.45	Lunch		Mulugeta Lemenih
13.45 – 15.15	Group Work – Future for PFM and Ethiopia’s forests, Challenges for sustainability of forest resources – four groups		
15.15 – 15.45	Tea / Coffee Break		
15.45 – 17.15	Working Group Presentations on lessons for the role of PFM NTFPs and forest enterprise development and Panel Response		
17.15 – 17.30	Conclusions - making the forest pay its way	Adrian Wood, Ahmid Said, Afewerk Hailu	Afewerk Hailu

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities
University of Huddersfield

4.3 List of participants

No.	Organization	No. of participants	Types of Organizations
	EU	3	NGOs
	Netherland embassy	1	
	Norwegian embassy	2	
1	JICA	1	
2	FARM AFRICA	3	
3	SOS SHAEL	1	
4	MEKAN YESUS	1	
5	SLUF	1	
6	CLIMATE CHANGE FORUM, ETHIOPIA	1	
7	GIZ	1	
8	MELCA	1	
9	FZS	1	Go-Federal
10	DF	1	
11	PHE	1	
12	NRM STATE MINISTER (Tigistu G/mesikel)	1	
13	NRM DIRECTORATE DIRECTOR	-	
14	FORESTRY CASE TEAM LEADER AND STAFF	1	
15	PFMUS PROJECT STAFF	1	
16	SLMP COORDINATOR AND REDD+ FOCUL PERSON	?	EIAR
17	LAEP	?	
18	DIRETOR GENERAL	-	ACADEMIC
19	FORESTYR RESEAERCH PROCESS DIRECTOR	1	
20	FOREST RESEARCH CENTRE	1	
21	Coffee research	-	
22	HOAREC-N	1	
23	CLIMATE CHANGE CENTRE	1	ACADEMIC
24	Mizan Tepi University	1	
25	WONDO GENET COLLEGE, HAWASSA UNIVERSITY (1)	1	
26	IBC	2	
27	EPA	1	

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities
University of Huddersfield

27	BEZA MAR	1	PRIVATE SECTOR
28	Tutu & her family	1	
29	Apinec	1	
30	BOA: BREAU HEAD; NRM PROCESS OWNER HEAD, FORESTYR EXPERTS	4	GO: REGIONAL SNNPRS
31	LAND ADMINITRTAION AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION HEAD	1	
32	BOF	1	
33	SOUTHERN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE; DIRECTOR AND NRM CASE TEAM (SARI)	2	
34	Livestock	1	
35	SHEKA ZONE OFFICE OF AGRICULTURE HEAD, Zone admin, Zone finance	3	ZONES
36	KAFFA ZONE OFFICE OF AGRICULTURE HEAD, Zone admin, Zone finance	3	
37	BENCH MAJI ZONE SAME	3	
38	OFWE	1	OROMIA
39	REGIONAL BOA HEAD	1	GAMBELLA
40	REGIONAL BOA HEAD	1	
41	LAEP HEAD	1	
42	FMA representative	2	Andiracha
43	Coop representative	1	Masha
44	PLC representative	1	Masha
45	Ethiopian Television	2	News Agency
46	Fana Radio	2	
47	Reporter Megazin	2	
48	NTFP-PFM staff	5	EWNRA staff
49	WCC	1	
50	EWNRA	5	
	Total confirmed attendants	75+11 = 86	