Table of Content

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

AFE	Amhara Forest Enterprise
IBC	Institute of Biodiversity Conservation
AASC	Agriculture Affairs Standing Committee
AAU	Addis Ababa University
ABoA	Amhara Bureau of Agriculture
BERSM	Bale Eco-Region Sustainable Management
BoARD	Bureau of Agriculture and Rural Development
BPR	Business Process Reengineering
BSC	Balanced Score Card
CBD	Convention on Biodiversity
CBWD	Community Based Watershed Development
CSE	Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DA	Development Agent
EARI	Ethiopian Agricultural Research Institute
EC	European Community
ECFF	Environment and Coffee Forest Forum
EDRI	Ethiopian Development Research Institute
EFAP	Ethiopian Forestry Action Programme
EIAR	Ethiopian Institute Of Agricultural Research
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority
EPE	Environment policy of Ethiopia
EWNRA	Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association
FfE	Forum for Environment
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
IFMP	Integrated Forest Management Project
ISD	Institute of Sustainable Development
JFM	Joint Forest Management
JPTC	Justice Professionals Training Center
LSDARD	Legal Study, Drafting and Awareness Raising Department
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOCT	Ministry of Culture and Tourism
MOCTD	ministry of Coffee and Tea Development
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

MoNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MOWR	Ministry of Water Resources
MPs	Member of Parliament
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NRMEPA	Natural Resources Management and Environmental Protection Authority
NREPASC	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Affairs Standing Committee
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
NTFP-PFM-RD	Non-Timber Forest Products Participatory Forrest Management Research Development Project
OFWE	Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise
ORDA	Organization for Rural Development of Amhara
ORS	Oromia regional State
PASDEP	Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PNRM	Participatory Natural Resources Management
PSNP	Productive Safety Net programme
REDD+	Reducing Emissions of green house gases from Deforestation degradation through better managing their 'forest carbon stocks'
REDFS	Rural Economic Development and Food Security
RIPPLE	
RLAUP	Rural Land Administration & Utilization Proclamation
SDPRP	Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program
SLM	Sustainable land Management
SNNPRS	Southern Nation, Nationalities, Peoples Regional State
SPFMEP	Scaling-Up Participatory Forest Management in Ethiopia Programme
SSLFMEP	Strengthening Sustainable Livelihood and Forest Management in Ethiopia
TVETC	Technical and Vocation Education Training Center

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

FARM-Africa is an international non- governmental organisation that aims to reduce poverty in Eastern and South Africa. FARM-Africa works in partnership with marginal farmers and herders, helping them to manage their natural resources more effectively and build sustainable livelihoods on their land. FARM-Africa's projects in Ethiopia, Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and more recently Southern Sudan, concentrate on the three main thematic areas namely community forest management, pastoral development and smallholder development and land reform. FARM-Africa has been involved in the forestry sector in Ethiopia since 1992. It is increasingly known that successful and innovative projects alone by themselves cannot bring the desired result of building sustainable livelihoods and natural resource management and therefore, since the early 2000s, influencing and supporting national and international development policies has been a key strategic aim for FARM-Africa.

FARM-Africa and SOS Sahel work in partnership with forest communities to support them to manage this key natural resource sustainably and profitably through Participatory Forest Management (PFM). SOS Sahel has 20 years experience of working in the Sahelian Drylands in both West and East Africa. In 2005, SOS Sahel Ethiopia registered as an independent national NGO and in the past few years has focused on managing a successful process of inclusive, equitable and sustainable natural resources management, which links smallholder farmers and pastoralists to new market outlets, and which mainstreams gender in pastoral development.

FARM-Africa and SOS Sahel recognise that forests are a vital resource in enabling agricultural development and long-term food security, not just for the people immediately surrounding the forest, but for farmers across Africa. Forests provide water catchments, prevent soil erosion and improve soil fertility. Therefore, whilst in the short-term it would be economically advantageous for farmers to clear forests, sell the timber and grow crops; this would be unsustainable in the long-term and have a hugely negative impact for many thousands of others in the wider population.

Due to high population growth, poverty and a lack of viable economic alternatives to agriculture have encouraged the conversion of forests to agricultural and grazing land and the unsustainable removal of biomass for charcoal and fuel wood. Over the last twenty years, forests have been declining at a rate of over 141,000 ha. per annum (FAO 2009). Forest area now stands at 13 million hectares, 11.9% of Ethiopia's total land area, which compares with average forest cover of around 21.4% for Africa. The rate of deforestation, estimated at over 1.1% per year, compares with a rate of 0.62% for Africa, and 0.18% global (FAO 2009. *Loc. Cit).*

With the objective of halting the current trend of forest resource decline, and recognizing the importance of Forest resources to the rural poor and the role of sustainable natural resources management for economic development, FARM-Africa and SOS Sahel –Ethiopia has been piloting Participatory Forest Management Approach in several forest areas of

Ethiopia and is currently working to mainstream PFM into the policy and practice of forest management in Ethiopia through the two forestry, BERSM and SSLFMP, programmes in collaboration with other actors.

The FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel's PFM methodology aims to balance sustainable utilization of forests and protection by securing sustainable rural livelihood through securing forest user rights and sustainable natural resource management. PFM can simply be defined as an approach where two or more social actors negotiate, define and guarantee amongst themselves a fair sharing of the management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for a given territory or set of natural resources. This partnership is usually between government authorities and organised community groups residing in and around natural forests including plantation forest. PFM is a participatory process creating space for community members to participate in the management of natural resources in their locality and to take part in initiatives to improve their livelihoods.

The two Participatory Natural Resources Programmes of FARM-Africa and SOS-Sahle, the Bale Eco Region Sustainable Management Programme (BERSMP) & Strengthening Sustainable Livelihoods and Forest Management Programme (SSLFMP) have more or less the same specific objectives focusing on different geographical locations which give them synergy to maximize impact. Both are specifically aiming to:

1.   further contribute to the long-term conservation and improvement of forest condition in Ethiopia through adoption, expansion and implementation of Participatory Forest Management (PFM) in four regions and Bale Eco region.

2.   increase the contribution to poverty reduction and improvement of livelihoods in forest dependent communities through identification and development of viable timber and NTFP enterprises

3.   ensure the adoption of PFM by federal and regional forest policy, regulations and practice so sustainably managing forest resources and protecting the user rights of local communities including indigenous populations.

These specific objectives are complimentary and can be considered as the three pillars for the programme strategy to achieve sustainable natural resource development and reduce environmental degradation while at the same time building sustainable livelihood.

To assure the effectiveness and sustainability of the PFM approach in Ethiopian forest policy and practice, the approach must be a prevailing practice with a clear policy guide within the federal and regional government policies. For this reason, this assignment of developing a strategy to explicitly incorporate PFM approaches and formally recognize forest use rights of local communities into forest policy would be imperative,

Overview of PNRM in particular PFM implementation

Globally, forest degradation has been a major challenge since the turn of the century and still the world average is showing a negative growth in forest coverage where the problem is serious in Africa and Latin America. To date Ethiopia is facing severe deforestation and the major factors contributing are population growth unmatched with economic development and forest clearing for agriculture, grazing for livestock and unsustainable use of forest products coupled with the bad luck of having incompetent forest management institution throughout the history of the country.

This low level of institutional capacity or lack of attention by successive government is owing to lack of appreciation for the critical roles forests play in agricultural productivity and also the perceived economic growth demands made environmental issues last in development priority list. Not only of having weak institutional capacity in terms of staffing, budget, and technical skills to carry out proper forest management activities and meet the country's need, but the forestry institution has also been rigid in conventional forests management style as like the most developed countries who do not have the social, economic and environmental problems we face. The forestry sector is unable to get not only of proper institutional setting but also lack of forest policy and strategy to guide forest development and utilisation efforts to address the supply-demand gap in forest products and contribute to the national economic development.

Due to institutional related problems ranging from capacity to lack of proper approach and policy gaps, ensuring sustainable resources management or at least preventing depletion of forest resources became a challenge beyond comprehension and we still are unable to abate deforestation and degradation of forests and it is our main development problem whether we recognise it or not.

The root causes of deforestation and degradation are not being solved with the conventional forest management approach adopted all over the world in developed countries. This is mainly due to the fact that our cultural, economic and social situation is totally different than that of developed countries whom we learnt 'scientific' forest management from. Partly also due to the institutional nature of the forestry sector that prior to the 1990's most forests of the world were being managed by forestry departments. E.g. In India, Forest Departments control 22% of the national territory; in Indonesia, 74% and in Thailand 40% of the nation's land (Hobley 1996) and in Ethiopia all the remaining forest land were managed under the very weak forest department and yet a very centralised institution unwilling to yield to devolution of some management responsibilities to communities. Forestry institutions, being the most centralised institution could not think of communities as part of the solution to forest degradation but rather consider them as opponents of conservation and this thinking still lingers in the minds of some foresters and as a result could not trust the community for their potential being an equal partner in forest management.

The facts that extensive woodlot projects that started in response to the unprecedented drought and flood occurred in mid 1970's were failing because of the top down planning approach of the forestry institutions. This fact gave way for the emergence of participatory development planning approaches of PRA in late 1980s. In early 1990s many social scientists started to get involved in forestry development planning and implementations to compliment social issues of development. During the mid 1990s, Communities began to capitalize on the opportunities extended by governments to take control of a resource, to invest on it, to improve its productivity and to enjoy the benefits that accrued. Particularly in India where the forestry service has a very strong protectionist stance since the colonial time and has well seen the failure of protectionist management approach started to show significant positive results in Joint forest management where community groups negotiated for certain forest products in return of some forest management responsibilities.

The continued deforestation and the successful experience from other developing countries gave way for the initiation of PFM projects through actors like GTZ, FARM Africa and SOS Sahel and others together with the forestry service. PFM was started in Ethiopia in the late 1990s almost in the absence of regulatory forest protection efforts due to the weakness of the forestry institution, lack of law enforcement, and lack of effective policy guide. The piloting of PFM continued with a sluggish progress the first five years, which actually was a learning period for PFM actors and a time for communities to gain confidence in the process, and today a total area of more than 300,000 ha is under community–government joint management which is a great success given the three main challenges mentioned above.

PFM was being piloted and implemented in a policy environment where there is an overall policy provision for people's participation but not explicitly directing and solving pertinent issues related to PFM implementation. The two old forest proclamations, 192/1980 and 94/1994 call for people's participation in their preambles but not in the articles and the current proclamation no 542/2007 is a significant move towards community participation which emphasis on the need for community participation in the planning implementation and benefit sharing of forest management. The current proclamation, as the old ones, at least in the proclamation does not understand community participation as being 'mass mobilization' of the earlier natural resources conservation approaches of the 1980s. The draft forest regulation discussed by stakeholders is a huge step in securing community rights towards sustainable management of forest resources of Ethiopia.

Currently, the planning period we are in (2010/11-2014/15) is with great opportunity where the need for community participation in forest management is getting attention by federal and regional governments and the new global developments particularly the possibilities of accessing finance through initiatives like REDD[+] and securing other environmental benefits of forest landscape that enhances agricultural productivity are encouraging The government has also identified incremental areas of investment for the planning period and natural resources management and climate change are areas selected for investment among the agricultural sector and this provides a good opportunity to expand on the links of forestry to rural livelihood improvement through scaling up PFM.

2. CONCERNS OF ACTORS ON POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION, COMMUNICATION AND CONTEXT ANALYSIS

2.1. Policy and legal framework context analysis

2.1.1. Broader Policy Framework on PFM

1. Constitutional principles

The constitution lays the foundation for community participation in natural resource management. According to Article 40(3) of the Constitution, the right to ownership of land and land based resources are exclusively vested in the state and the people. In effect the state is a trustee to the property rights of the Ethiopian people. This is to say that natural resources of the country are jointly-owned by the state and the people. As Ethiopia is following a federal form of governance, this power of administering communal property vested in the state is further divided between the federal government and the respective regional states. The former has a power to enact laws concerning the modalities of utilization of the resources as well as conservation of land and other natural resources. The regions on the other hand administer land and natural resources on the basis of federal laws. In addition to this the Constitution explicitly acknowledges the right of the people to participate in national development and to be consulted with respect to policies and projects affecting their community (Article 43(2)). This right essentially includes the right to develop community forests and the right of communities to at least be consulted and give approval before any forestry related projects are implemented.

In addition, an obligation is placed on the government and any government entity to respect the right of the people in getting full consultation to implement any environmental project. Article 92 in particular places that people have the right to full consultation and to the expression of views-in the planning and implementation of environmental policies and projects that affect them directly.

Taking reference to the foregoing constitutional provisions it is clear that the Ethiopian people at any level:
- are recognized as joint owners, together with the state, of forests and other natural resources,
- have the right to be consulted during planning of forest related projects,
- can involve in the implementation of forest development and utilization projects.

There is thus sufficient enabling ground at the constitution level to implement PFM in Ethiopia. But constitutional provisions are broader views of governments. It demands detailed rules to see these principles implemented on the ground. So the subsequent

subsections will look at the details within the federal and regional laws and analyse if these laws have put equal consideration of the need for PFM implementation in forest governance.

2. Conservation Strategy

The Conservation Strategy of Ethiopia (CSE) is the prelude that placed the setting for an Environmental Policy in Ethiopia. This work compiled in 4 volumes underscored the conceptual necessity for participation in resource management and puts it as `naturally prescribed`. Participation is perceived by the strategy as a *sine qua non* for conservation, and it must be used as the core of any planning on conservation. The CSE gives details on why community participation is needed, and suggests the steps required to ensure participation, including social integration, search for information, diffusion of information, and complete involvement in planning and implementation.

In summary the CSE puts the requirement for community participation in the overall conservation of natural resources. Forestry activities fall within in the broader vision of natural resource conservation and management. It hence goes without saying that the Strategy prescribes participation of the local communities in order to bring about effective implementation of forest conservation. But again this statement lacks details. More than any legal instrument in Ethiopia, this document brings into the fore the justification for why community participation is needed. It also discusses on steps that it takes to realize participation of communities in conservation.

3. Environment Policy

The Environment policy of Ethiopia (EPE) is basically an output of the CSE and is formally adopted by the Council of Ministers in 1997. It places a high significance to forest development as it puts a separate attention to `forest, woodland and tree resources` as one among the 10 sectoral programme areas. Apart from this the policy treats community participation as a major cross sectoral issue that need to be addressed in the overall environmental management framework. Policy provision No. 4.2 on `Community Participation and the Environment` seeks to ensure that all phases of environmental and resource development and management, from project conception to planning and imple-mentation, as well as monitoring and evaluation are undertaken based on the decisions of the resource users and managers. In order to dispense such a task the policy places the following mandatory actions:

- *develop effective methods of popular participation* in the planning and implementation of environmental and resource use and management projects and programmes; *[emphasis added]*
- develop the necessary legislation, training and financial support to empower local communities ... *to ensure genuine* grassroots decisions in resources and environmental management;
- *authorize all levels of organization to raise funds locally from the use of natural resources to fund the development, management and sustainable use of those resources; [emphasis added]*

- increase the number of women extension agents in the field of natural resource and environmental management; and
- ensure information flow among all levels of organization including the Federal and Regional States and the people at the grassroots level by developing a two way mechanism for data collection and dissemination.

Despite seemingly obvious gaps on implementation, the policy seems to give ample emphasis on the need and the modalities of community participation in resource conservation and use.

4. Ethiopian Forest Policy and Strategy

The Ethiopian Policy and Strategy on the development, conservation and use of forests, adopted in 2006, under its introductory part states that the strategy is developed to bring sustainable development through community participation. The policy strategies pursued include a systematic control of forest resources from possible threats of theft and misuse. The strategy devised to overcome this problem is through community participation by way of protecting priority state forests, planting tree species that has the natural propensity for fire resilience, sustaining participation through availing trainings and institutional support. The law places a right to the community from the proceeds of the trees planted by them.

Apart from these few provisions, there does not seem to be a complete set of benefits accruing from community managed forest resources. In fact the strategy does not recognize community ownership rights. It is hence difficult to assert that PFM is ever recognized as an approach to be considered in conservation and utilization of forest resources.

In addition there are some policies and generic guides although not directly but indirectly supportive of community participation and some these include:

- Ethiopian Forestry Action Program (EFAP, 1994) and regional forestry action programs
- Wildlife Policy and Strategy (2007)
- Wildlife Legislation (2007).
- Rural Land Administration and Land Use Plan Policy & Strategy (2004),
- Rural Land Administration & Utilization Proclamation (RLAUP, 2003),
- Environmental Impact Assessment proclamation (2002), and
- Growth and transformation Plan (GTP) 2010/11 to 2014/15)

5. Convention on Biological Diversity

On the sphere of international agreements, the CBD takes a primary place when it comes to ensuring participation of local communities. Negotiated during the Earth Summit in 1992, the CBD highlights under Article 1 the importance of sustainable use of biodiversity and its components and equitable sharing of benefits arising out of the utilization of biodiversity resources by allowing among others; appropriate access to genetic resources. The Provisions that are pertinent to participatory forest management include Article 8(j),

Article 11 and Article 15. Article 8(j) provides for the recognition and promotion of indigenous knowledge and practices of local and indigenous communities. Though note directly related Article 11 of the CBD provides for incentive measures for sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity. Article 15 which provides for regulating access to genetic resources including arrangements to ensure equitable benefit sharing on agreed terms. These agreed terms can take the form of a legal, policy or administrative measures.

Ethiopia has ratified the CBD in 1992. As all international instruments that Ethiopia ratified are considered to be part and parcel of the body of laws of the country (as per Article 9(4) of the Constitution), the CBD has an important place in laying the foundational basis of PFM in Ethiopia.

2.1.2. National legal framework on PFM

It is now more than 10 years since PFM started in Ethiopia and the results so far are so encouraging given the participatory tradition that the country has and the lack of explicit policy guide concerning community based resource management and communities' involvement in state forest management. FARM-Africa, SOS-Sahel Ethiopia and their implementing partners have effectively tailored the PFM approach. Although there is lack of explicit 'forest policy' provision that enshrine community rights in forest management, community groups and government forestry service negotiated, defined and guaranteed amongst themselves management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for those forest areas under PFM guided by overall policy provisions discussed above. The results so far achieved are based on the provisions of the Federal and regional policies and proclamations. Some of the provisions under the forest and forest related laws are discussed below.

Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation No 542/2007

The preamble of the Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation No 542/2007 states that the sustainable utilization of the country's forest resources is possible through ensuring the participation of, and benefit sharing by the concerned communities. Article 9(3) of the same Proclamation stipulates that forest development; conservation and utilization plans shall be formulated to allow the participation of local communities in the development and conservation and also in the sharing of benefits from the development of state forest. Some aspects of benefit sharing modalities are envisaged under this law. For instance, Article 10 (3) of the law puts that the local community may reap grasses, collect fallen woods and utilize herbs from a state forest in conformity with the management plan developed for the forest, which actually appears to be more about recognising traditional use rights. Article 18 of the Forest Proclamation discussing on powers and duties of regional states stipulates under sub-article (3) that regional governments shall encourage forest development programs, which involve the participation of farmers and semi-pastoralists, and provide technical support.

The Draft Forest Development Protection and Utilization Regulation is a significant step forward in providing specific legal provisions for guiding forest management practice. The draft forest regulation defines roles and responsibilities of the forestry institution and the community in forest management and moreover gives provisions on the establishment and registration of forest development associations. It is clear that the draft forest regulation is issued to provide implementation modality for the forest proclamation and further clarify gaps observed in the implementation of forest management. Though it provides clarifications, yet in some cases it has some ambiguities which will be discussed later but nevertheless it is by far much applauded document by PFM practitioners.

2.1.3. Regional legal framework on PFM

1. Oromia Regional Forest Proclamation (Proclamation No. 72/95)

This law issued in 1995 attempts to explicitly recognize community participation in the conservation of the resource. The proclamation starts by asserting what community forest means in article 2 definitions part and reads "*community forest means the state forest that user right and management responsibility is transferred to organised community or developed by organised community on communal land".* The pertinent provisions of this law regarding PFM are Articles 4(3), 4(6), 9(5), 11(1) and 12(1).

It is a paradox that all the umbrella national policies like the CSE, EPE and the Oromia forest proclamation 72/2003 are more explicit on the community participation than the latest federal forest proclamation No 542/2007 which should have benefited from experiences gained in community participation.

2. Revised Rural Land Administration and Use Determination Proclamation No. 133/ 2006

According to Article 5 of the Regional Land Administration Proclamation, the task of administering land will be carried out based on public participation. And according to Article 2 (5) and Article 2 (23), land administration essentially includes the enforcement of rights and obligations of communal holdings used by the local people in common for forestry purposes. Though the specific purpose of this law is to determine holding rights and security of rural land holding, it mentions that participation is an important element of the process.

The law, however, do not prescribe how this enforcement of rights is carried out. It does not also guide one as to how public participation is undertaken with respect to rural land administration.

3. The Draft Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation of the SNNPR

Currently, the region is preparing its law on Forest Development, Conservation and Utilization Proclamation. This law has incorporated basic elements that encourage PFM implementation in the region and is hence discussed at more depth.

The preamble of the law affirms that it is through meaningful participation of the communities and assurance of benefit sharing from these resources that forest resources can be sustainably utilized in Ethiopia. In its substantive part the law has recognized community ownership of forests with in the broader frame of ownership (i.e. together with state and private ownership). This is articulated within the definition given to community forests under Article 2 (16) of the draft law.

The law has also opened up an opportunity for state forests to involve community participation in development and conservation of the resources. But this is subject again to a strategy on forest development, conservation and utilization specifically devised for the purpose. The regional administration is required, under Article 9 (4) of the law, to prepare a forest management plan in order to ensure such type of participation in state forest management. The law further underscored the need to ensure that proceeds from the sale of state forest products should devolve to communities with a view to ensuring their benefits as well as develop a sense of ownership. The details of this are, however, yet to be issued within subsequent directives.

This is quite a good and relatively an unprecedented approach. Care should be taken when drafting the intended subsidiary legislation. It needs to amply define details of the intended benefit sharing mechanism, guide who can participate in this type of development and conservation, what the modalities of participation are, what the specific benefits that the individual participants may get from it etc.

> The SNNPRS draft forest law is quite progressive in the elements included in it in order to solve the hurdles occasioned for the implementation of PFM in Ethiopia

Again there is a room opening for community participation within protected forests. Under the definition part, it recognizes the fact that the good relationship between the people and the forest resources should at all times be maintained. On the substantive part of the law, it reaffirms that communities can engage in such activities as apiculture, development and utilization of spices, forest coffee, animal fodder etc. There is also a responsibility placed on the regional administration to support communities through appropriate trainings under Article 8 of the draft law.

An important provision recognizing benefits is compensation for the community stewardship of forests. Article 8(4) stipulates that communities living in and around natural forests should be given special rewards and incentives for the effort they exerted in maintaining the resources this far and for its future upkeep. This provision is an important step towards implementing PFM in natural forest areas of the region.

Part four and five of the draft proclamation gives provisions to facilitate community participation/PFM under its articles 15 to 19. There are specific provisions for community forest development and protection, and utilization and administration of community forests. The draft proclamation further clarifies community's participation, rights and responsibilities on forest resource management.

The modalities of utilization of the proceeds from the artificial plantations as well as from any other services is yet to be determined through directives. The law also provides stronger penalities on offenders. The penalties include both imprisonment and fines. Another innovative approach provided by the draft law is the application of a summary procedure on a flagrant offender. A criminal charge will immediately be produced against such a person. The law also urges the establishment of special courts for handling cases related to the misuse of forest resources. This law is quite progressive in the elements included in it in order to solve the hurdles occasioned for the implementation of PFM in Ethiopia.

In general, there are several policy backgrounds that enable the implementation of PFM in Ethiopia. This background is in a way supported by federal and regional legal framework. There is however a gap in visionary approach. It is a constitutional principle that laws related to natural resource administration are adopted by the government. Regional states are expected to administer the resources based on the federally set standard. When it comes to PFM concerns, however, the regional laws are explicit and better in approach than the federal forest specific law.

2.2. Institutional framework context analysis

Studies indicate that the forestry sector is not given much attention to enable it contribute to the national development while benefitting grassroots communities. In the near past the sector has seen institutional transformations – at times being led by a strong arrangement, but more often depicting neglect of required attention.

At the federal level, one cannot with full confidence assert to which entity the sector really belongs and federal institutions like MOA, IBC, EPA, MOCT, and etc share some responsibilities of forest management. The Ministry of Agriculture is the government body that is legally endowed with the responsibilities of forest resources development and conservation. Within the federal ministry, due to apparent lack of attention, the sector is masked in one sub process as a result of internal organizational transformations (through the just completed Business Process Reengineering). On the other hand, the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority structured under MOCT is mandated by law to manage national parks and game reserve areas.

Though detailed specificities within organizational arrangements differ from region to region, the main actors in forest administration are the Environmental Protection Land Administration and Use Authorities, Bureau of Agriculture, and the emerging Forest Enterprises in Amhara and Oromia regional states.

At the regional level there are practical problems related to planning and channelling budgets to planned activities. Though the government is steadfastly advocating decentralization and empowerment of local actors, development of regional plans is still heavily dependent on federal planning processes. All policy provisions and the GTP

acknowledge the need for community participation in resources management but PFM planning slips through from the periodic plans of the regional bureaus because of the gap of understanding community participation in forest management.

Discussion held with the head of a planning and programming department of one government office with mandates over forest management indicated that unless the Federal Ministry embraces the concept of PFM and includes it as part of its annual plan and send it as a package, it has a zero chance of being considered as an actionable objective within the region. Budgeting for planned activities follow the same line of thought. The regional council will be motivated to support regional plans with the necessary budget if it is determined that the regional plan concurs with the federal.

Although having suitable institutional arrangement with the adoption of participatory planning and incorporation of PFM planning process in regional plans requires consolidated effort, there are encouraging developments at national level and in some regions.

Currently one can unmistakably say that natural resources conservation and management has been progressively given due attention than earlier development planning periods as in Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program (SDPRP), which covered the three-years period (2002/03-2004/05) and then the Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP), Ethiopia's guiding strategic framework for the past five-year period 2005/06-2009/10. The current Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP), which is a medium term strategic framework for the five-year period (2010/11-2014/15) has given more emphasis than its earlier generations. The GTP in its Agriculture and Rural Development plan has identified Integrating crop, livestock, marketing, natural resources development as well as agricultural research, extension etc... undertakings as strategic directions. In the Agriculture and Rural Development plan of the GTP, one of the implementation strategy considered is crop production and productivity where the focus is to anchor on natural resources protection and development to improve agricultural productivity.

> *There are significant positive developments for the scaling up of PFM within the forestry policy and practice than ever before.*

The GTP is characterized by scaling up of best practices from earlier generic plans and focusing on increasing productivity of labour and land and it recognizes community participation in resource management and therefore it is now a good time for PFM approach to show its potential and integration into the national agricultural development programme.

Currently PFM is being taken as a potential forest resources management strategy at Federal and Regional levels. For the first time, the federal government has taken up PFM approach as a viable forest management strategy and this can be seen from the fact that the new European Community supported project named Scaling up of PFM in Ethiopia programme (SPFMEP) which is being implemented by the Federal Ministry and has allocated a budget of 1.5 million Euro of the total 7.5 million Euro programme budget.

Another complementing project to this is the FARM/Africa SOS Sahel programme called Strengthening Sustainable Livelihood and Forest Management in Ethiopia Programme (SSLFMEP) which is also funded by EC and being implemented through regional government authorities in four regions, Amhara, Benshangul, Oromia, and SNNPRS.

According to some views, the budget allocated by the federal government with in the agricultural development sector is higher for the natural resources considering other natural resources projects such like PSNP, SLM and etc... and government investment is likely to increase in the coming planning years. The housing of a PFM scaling up project within the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Regional authorities is part of the strategy to scale up and mainstream PFM into forest policy and practice it also shows a positive developments in the institutional environment. The existence of these two projects and the current five year development plan opens windows of opportunity for scaling up and mainstreaming PFM into forest policy and practice.

The GTP also recognizes the impact of Natural Resources Management and Climate Change and the sector has gained focused attention. As the climate change issues are getting increasing attention, examples such like of the REDD+ initiative of the Bale Eco-region Sustainable Management Programme will give leverage to mainstreaming PFM and as well give an opportunity of experience on gaining global finances for natural resources management and as well national economic development.

Although one of the challenges in natural resources conservation is the institutional arrangement or the placement and frequent restructuring of the forestry service within the MOA, current developments with regards to forestry management is encouraging. At Federal level the Natural Resources Development and Conservation Directorate has two case teams, watershed development and small scale irrigation development where the watershed development case team had the soil and water conservation, PSNP and public works, rural land administration and land use and the forestry sub- processes. As the watershed case team seems to be congested with many activities, the ministry has now decided to bring up the watershed development case team to the level of vice directorate and forming a forestry and watershed case teams.

This new development of having a forestry case team is a positive development and this decision is currently awaiting the approval from the Ministry of Civil Service. In the proposed forestry case team, although PFM/Community based forest management is not organised as a core process, Community participation /PFM is taken up as part of the job process of the forestry experts in the case team. This development show that there is a conducive institutional arrangement to scale up and mainstream PFM than previous years and it is further suggested to the Prime Minister's office to make the forestry case team to the level of vice directorate level. This is a significant positive development for the scaling up of PFM within the forestry policy and practice than ever before. When the forestry sector is restructured to be at a vice-directorate level it is hoped that there will be community participation /PFM case team which will be responsible to guide sustainable forest management with the involvement of the rural community. Not only of translating provisions of community participation in the policy but issues related to effectively tapping into carbon finance and other related Green Growth Initiatives that requiring proper institutional setup would be addressed. The proposed institutional arrangement will

somehow solve most of the issues revolving around institutional arrangement of the forestry sector. The current rearrangements of job processes, within the federal ministry is encouraging and further bringing the forestry team as a directorate requires that all concerned actors should work towards getting the credible evidence on the social, economic, financial, environmental, benefits of the forestry sector to the attention of the Prime Minister's office.

The development with mainstreaming PFM at regional level particularly in Oromia region is encouraging that now PFM is adequately addressed in the Business Plan Reengineering (BPR) study and local community development core process is identified as one of the five core process of forest development and utilisation directorate of the Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise (OFWE). The local community development core process has two positions of PFM and Forestry extension process performers at enterprise, branch and district levels and when necessary additional position of Forestry extension agent (equivalent to Development Agent) is identified at a district level to serve as a link at local community level.

The institutional arrangement of OFWE is to be appreciated but at the moment due to the absence of DA within the enterprise, the current arrangement is that community outreach activities are carried out partly by Development Agents of BoARD based on the memorandum of understanding signed between the two. As the job process of DA's of Bureau of Agriculture is not including PFM, it is not possible to make them accountable and this somehow need to be addressed either by having DAs at forest level or giving back this responsibility back to BoARD and work community outreach activities in collaboration with BOA. This lack of forestry DAs at local community level is related with the confusion of which institution in Oromia is mandated for forest development activities given that 90% of seedling production and planting still remains with BoARD.

Although there are some limitations like as the positions of DAs at woreda level is vacant, the plan for OFWE is to cover all forest priority areas (the 34 Regional Forest Priorities Areas) under Joint Forest Management/ PFM within the coming five years with the support of the SSLFM, Scaling up of PFM in Ethiopia (S-PFM-EP) and GTZ –Ambero-GTTEC, the sub component of SLM programme. The good thing about these entire projects is that they are implemented through government structure with only advisory and budgetary support from these projects. The experience of OFWE is a good example of institutionalising PFM and the major task would be to sustain the community groups involved in JFM starting from now. The SNNPRS has also identified PFM as a management strategy backed by a strong policy to manage the south west forests found in three zones, kaffa, Sheka, and Bench Maji with the support of GTZ, Nabu Project, FARM-SOS Sahle SSLFME Programme, NTFP-PFM-RD projects of Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA), and Federal Scaling up of PFM in Ethiopia project. It is assumed that through the support of these projects over the coming five years PFM will be mainstreamed and covers most of the natural forests of Ethiopia.

In general there are a lot of institutional developments that would encourage PFM implementation in the coming years.

3. FRAMING ISSUES OF MAINSTREAMING PNRM

3.1. Framing political and legal issues of mainstreaming PNRM

3.1.1. Lack of proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels

Generally speaking, there are a number of policy provisions recognizing community participation as a tool for natural resource management. The use of terminologies such as "participation" or "community participation" is common to spot in natural resource related policies. Some provisions even go beyond the mere mentioning of "participation" and dissect the concept into rights formulating it and procedures for its implementation. For instance, the Environmental Policy of Ethiopia accepts customary use rights of communities as a key guiding principle of the overall environment policy of the country. On the other hand, however, the forest policies and laws in question are simply using terms as "involvement" or at best "participation" and does not mention of customary rights. Owing to the legacy of wide spread concept usage in the predecessor legal instruments on natural resource conservation, community participation is understood and equated with 'mass mobilization' within the federal forest strategy. It is not defined in a way that gives a lee way for sharing rights and responsibilities, and assuming authority and accountability. In the forest policy document, the Amharic word "*Hibreteseb[1]*"- is understood as to mean 'community', 'public' and 'users' which implies there is a need to clarify who the 'Community' is in the forest policy and subsequent policy provisions including the forest regulation.

Federal forest policies and laws lack a visionary approach in advocating PFM as a strategy of forest management. The federal forest policy and strategy does not recognise traditional use rights and forest community and "community ownership" of forest resources as part of the recognized ownership types. Though there is an argument that the forest proclamation recognises community ownership with in the broader definition of "private ownership", there is no explicit indication to affirm such thinking. The Forest Proclamation (No. 542/ 2007) defines private forest as " ...*a forest other than state forest developed* by any private person and includes a forest developed by members of a peasant association or by an association organized by private individuals, investors and governmental and non-governmental organizations" [emphasis added]. Though a number of actors including NGOs and associations are mentioned, this definition leaves out natural forests and customary user rights by communities of existing forests. In other words private /community ownership is allowed only on plantations developed "privately", literally dropping out natural forests which are essentially state owned. Therefore this gap should be filled through amending the provisions within the strategy and the federal proclamation.

---

[1] "*Hibreteseb*" Is an Amharic word equivalent to the "Society"

There is also a gap on the implementation of community rights within the regions. The GTP is explicit in terms of recognizing community participation. The specific provision within the GTP reads "**...** Forestry development, protection and utilization will be done with increased effectiveness by the participation of communities" As an example, in Amhara region, the physical annual targets of forest management are amply put in the regional government's five year GTP plan document. But the notion of "increased effectiveness by the participation of communities" is not taken up at regional level. Regional authorities literally await directives in the form of guidelines to come from the federal ministry to take up community participation within its full meaning to mean PFM. Due to this lack of understanding and confidence there is a problem of translating provisions of the GTP into the regional plans and what is mentioned in the GTP is understood to mean mass mobilization.

The problem of concept clarity over "participation" and "community" is also reflected with in the draft forest regulation currently tabled for endorsement by the council of Ministers' Office. The Regulation does not explicitly define who the community is and who is entitled for sharing benefits whether it is the whole rural community around a particular forest or a membership based forest user groups involved in forest management process. The understanding of benefit sharing from forest management has a notion of being infrastructure developments which benefit the whole rural community. This perception seems to emanate from lack of proper understanding of what 'participation' mean and among some policy makers and practitioners participation is not understood as sharing rights, responsibilities and authorities but is equated to mass mobilization. Whereas, in the CSE, "mass mobilization" is considered as the exact opposite of participation and it reads *"When we plan and then try to hijack the community along, it is not participation. It is bulldozing, also respectfully called mobilization, the exact opposite of participation".* To clarify this conceptual problem at policy level, the first step should be to adopt the harmonized stages of PFM and acknowledge as a means to ensure community participation. However, it is possible that the case can be elaborated while formulating implementation guideline for the Regulation. There is a possibility to retract it and introduce the PFM concept into it. This may also bring about a chance to recognize customary rights that are well captured within the Environment Policy of Ethiopia.

> *Action 3.1.1: Policy support actions need to be taken to ensure proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels including in the forest policy and practice.*

3.1 2. Lack of legal recognition of community institution and empowerment of community associations.

Practical experience tells us that collective community action will not be effective unless communities have their own institutions responsible for organising collective action and ensuring fare share of benefits among members. The PFM projects since the start have

been struggling with the right form of legal community institutions that exactly fits the interest of the participating forest communities. Different PFM actors have been trying different form of organisation and in majority of the cases establishment of forest cooperatives is taking dominance. The participation of community groups in natural resources management is increasingly growing and it has reached now where the magnitude needs the government's attention to resolve the problem. There are community institutions established as watershed users association, community forest users associations, area closure users associations, water users association, forest users associations /J/PFM community groups/ which all these community groups initially start by environmental protection activities and then start harvesting benefits from their effort. The main challenge of these community institutions is that they have to be legal institutions to secure their current and future benefits from their collective action and as they are dealing with resources legal issues will immerge on course of implementation and they need to have the right to be sued and sue. This need of legalisation of community institutions is a challenge in PFM implementation process and the current trend of establishing forest cooperatives is taken as alternative for the absence of proper legal framework. Organising forest management groups as forest cooperatives is not the best form of organisation as the byelaws of the service cooperatives is adopted for forest management groups with forest protection and forest marketing roles. The cooperative promotion office experts explain that the objective of establishing forest cooperative is to create market outlet for the forest products produced by community groups and they don't advise for a community group to establish cooperative if not financially sustainable as the repercussions of their failure will undermine cooperative development.

As the establishment of forest cooperatives is opted as an option due to absence of legal framework to legalise forest user groups/forest management groups /community institutions for natural resources conservation but not strictly meeting the criteria of financial sustainability to form cooperatives and yet this practice is common in ORS and SNNPRS. The harmonised and simplified PFM development process needs to address the legalisation of community forest management groups and yet avoiding the logistical problem of forming forest cooperatives. The harmonisation process therefore needs to look into new options for establishing forest management institutions which are representative, accountable and legal entities.

The first and the best option is the legalisation of community associations involved in natural resources conservation and development in the form of forest users association, watershed users association, closure-area users association, water users association etc.

The national law that is governing charities and societies proclamation no 621/2009 and regulation no 168/2009 understands associations as 'Mass-Based Societies' like professional, women, youth etc associations., and according to the Civil code of 1960 Associations are defined as 'a grouping formed between two or more persons with a view to obtaining a result other than the securing or sharing of profits'. In this case it is impossible for forest users association to be legal and at the same time share benefits of their efforts among members. The issue is not as such challenging if MOA and MOWR (Ministry of Water Resources) who has a similar issue of water users associations and as

well other actors of Natural resources conservation agreed to include natural resources based community institutions in the definition of associations with particular provision of sharing benefits of their role /objectives.

Some partners whom the this study team talked to heighted the need to underscore that the Ethiopian constitution under article (31) on Freedom of association, article (40) the right to own property in common can be considered as a legal provision and other laws need to be explored and work on legality of associations sharing benefits of conservation. This need to be discussed in depth and seen in light of other initiatives like SLM where currently watershed associations are being legally registered at woreda justice office and need to jointly explore all policy provisions and share understanding of this provision to include benefit sharing.

The harmonisation task force together with other actors need to look into the form of legal community institutions to be formed and give clear future direction which way to go. The options could be;

1) As mentioned above, legally recognising forest management groups as forest users association by amending the charities law to include natural resources based community institutions and these institutions be registered and administered by the charity law so that the woreda justice office will register them and in the mean time amending the federal forest regulation and avoiding ambiguities in Article 21 sub article 2 &3 of the draft forest regulation that gives the duty of registering forest community institutions to the Supervising Authority and respective regional Authorities and also to the Cooperative promotion office.
2) Amending the cooperative law by recognising forest management groups even if they are not financially sustainable and forest products sale would come after years of effort while some forest have few NTFP for sale however, they need conservation and sustainable management to support community livelihoods. This should not be regarded as something which is against the cooperative principle of enhancing economic efforts through creating market out let.
3) Linking community management groups to village/kebele administration so they can get close administrative support such as opening bank account and using the keble Administrations stamp. This also needs directives from the regional administrative councils to incorporate forest management groups in the kebele administration as the case is in Tanzania, village environmental committee. This option does not seem to be effective in Ethiopian case but we should not dismiss the possibility and explore more options as possible.

The simplification of the PFM process need to give emphasis on the simplification of the process of forming legal community institution and this will most likely follow the first option of registering community organisations by MoA/justice bureau of the respective regions. PFM actors should simplify the PFM process by establishing forest management groups and work for the legalisation of these community groups as there is now synergy between the two PFM programmes and also other actors in the natural resources management involved in forming community institutions. The legalisation issue is critical

for the success of PNRM and is empowering the community to have representative, accountable and legal entities that claim environmental rights and services from the sector responsible.

Action 3.1.2 efforts should be excreted to legalise community institutions in the form of simple and legal institutions that empower community groups.

3.1.3 Lack of legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM

Weak institutional setting is often a reason for failure to monitor forest policy implementation. The situation is worse as one goes from the federal to the Zonal and Woreda levels where the actual resource management activities are carried. At some places where PFM groups have been institutionalized forest offenders are rarely apprehended. At the rare occasions when the offenders are taken hold of, it is often the case that they slip away the grips of criminal justice being exercised in the locality or at the appellate level. At Bonga, it is reported that conviction rate is only a meagre 5 to 10 % of those alleged to have violated forest laws. Compounding the problem, public prosecutors often fail to capture the whole essence of conservation ideals in the charges they frame against offenders. For instance, informants stated that a person presented before a court was served with a charge incriminating him with cutting trees while it was known that he cleared a total of 3 hectares of forest land. Lack of knowledge associated to such type of poor framing of criminal charges can be overcome through administering tailor made trainings to prosecutors. Another issue is the lack of programmes corroborating evidence for forest ownership. Law enforcers often lack evidence for affirming to whom a certain span of forest really belongs to. This problem can be offset if supportive mechanisms are put in place. This includes communal forest land certification and registration of PFM by-laws.

The implication of lack of legal enforcement on the overall management of the natural resources is tremendous and has incalculable damage to the national economy. It can be equated as losing all the roles of the environment playing in the economy and nullifying all forest development efforts being excreted by government and community. It is impossible to halt deforestation just by 'awareness raising' without addressing bad environmental governance issues related to lack of proper understanding of the issue and above all issues related with embezzlement of judiciary power and authority. Therefore mainstreaming environmental issues within the judiciary system is imperative.

Action 3.1.3 Ensure legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM

3.2. Framing institutional issues of mainstreaming PNRM

3.2.1. Lack of a strong forestry institutions at the federal level

In almost all cases PFM approaches started in Ethiopia by NGOs working in the natural resources sector and implemented at local level with reduced involvement of the personnel as we go from the Regional BoARD to forestry officers at Woreda level. Although PFM is started with supportive legal frame work, its expansion and institutionalisation is constrained by several factors. As said in many occasions, the main development challenge in Ethiopia is not lacking a good policy provision but the institutional capacity and governance related commitment for policy implementation.

The week institutional capacity is reflected by the fact that forestry sector is represented at federal level at a senior expert level (forest development, protection and utilisation job performer) and currently the ministry has approved to upgrade to a case team level. It is very difficult to make accountable the Natural Resources Conservation and Utilisation Directorate with one or two foresters for not coordinating, supporting and building capacities of the region for the proper implementation of the forestry policy and strategy. With the current weak institutional setting it is difficult to realize the forestry sector play its due role in the economic development of the nation.

The contribution of the forestry sector to the national economy and its potential to accelerate economic development of Ethiopia is huge. Mulugeta (2009) puts six potential economic roles the forestry sector can play as 1) means of foreign currency earning, 2) import substitution, 3) contribution to GDP, 4) employment generation, 5) livelihood support to rural livelihood and 6) provision of environmental services to other development sectors. He further estimates, although not reflecting the picture in the GDP, an annual gross financial turnover of USD 2.02 Billion from forestry sector. Another estimate done by Tsegaye (2009) based on global economic values of some forest ecosystems; he estimates the forest ecosystems value to be worth more than USD 6 Billion/year. Mining effectively these economic and ecological services requires a strong institutional setting with a visionary and comprehensive development strategy. In the current setting within the Natural Resources Conservation and Development Directorate, the Business Processing and Reengineering (BPR) has not adequately seen the actual and potential economic role of the forestry sector and hence the forestry job process of forest development, protection and utilisation are limited to two senior experts level. This not only has limited the development and contribution of the forestry sector but made the forestry sector under represented and forestry became the responsibility of many institutions without clear accountability.

According to a policy brief issued by Forum for Environment (2009), the issue of institutional setting for the forestry sector is a long-standing and unresolved issue over half a century since the early 1950s when the forestry division was first established within MOA. The sector had been restructured many times and currently, forest management and conservation issues are mandated to several institutions at federal level, such like MOA,

Wildlife Authority (MOCT) EPA, IBC, all with different strategies and approaches to manage the resources. At regional levels also there are some variations among regions and the federal arrangement and although it is not expected to have a replica of institutional arrangement in all cases but the variation among regions with similar resources base is believed to be resulted because of the lack of clear shared development vision concerning the forestry sector among the regions and the federal. One can conclude that these variations at the regional level have resulted because the existing set up at the federal level is unable to give a visionary leadership for the forestry sector and regions are taking desperate actions to secure the economic contribution of the forestry sector.

Therefore, it is wise to suggest a long term action regarding the institutional arrangement at federal level.

> ***Action 3.2.1 :*** *The long term action would be to carry support activities that would lead to the establishment of a separate institute for the natural resources sector bringing together the responsibilities of natural resources management and environmental protection mandates under one institution- Ministry of Natural Resources. All the scattered responsibilities of natural resources management, protected area management, different NRM programmes, roles of IBC, land use and administration, and Environment Protection roles all to be under the suggested new ministry, Ministry of Natural Resources Management and Environment protection, taking the institutional arrangement for natural resources as an example from SNNPRS. The restructuring should also include the extension system where of the three development agents at kebele level the one assigned for natural resources development should also go to the ministry and linked with kebele development managers.*

3.2.2. Lack of action to improve the current institutional arrangement to bring effective resource management at the federal level within the MOA

The current week institutional arrangement in terms of limited manpower, budget, and lack of clear strategic guidance, is resulted in poor performance of the sector and also reflected on the challenges of adopting and mainstreaming new promising natural resources management approaches which are divergent from the old conventional approaches. The experience of PNRM or PFM in the country is gaining extensive recognition and the housing of a PFM scaling-up programme within the NRD of the federal ministry is a step forward but the capacity to efficiently support and guide the new programme seems limited.

The current global development gives us an opportunity of drawing out global financial resources if we are prepared enough to comply with international requirements and this could be realised in a short period of time and gives leverage to our natural resources development effort.

As mentioned in the context analysis, the sector is getting increasing attention than the earlier development planning periods as in SDPRP and PASDEP. The GTP, the current development plan (2010/11-2014/15) is an improvement towards natural resources compared to the earlier generic plans. The current development and the attention given to

the sector and the recognition of the structural revisiting within the ministry has led the ministry to decided to bring the forestry sector to the level of case team within the watershed vise directorate level. This is a significant step made within the ministry and yet it would not be enough to address the many forest management issues of the country and still difficult to play a leading role of increasing forestry's role in the economic development of the country with just the capacity of a case team where the sector deserves a ministry due to its important contribution to the national economy.

Therefore, it is wise to suggest a short term actions regarding the institutional arrangement at federal level.

> *Action 3.2.2: Therefore, it is suggested to have a forestry directorate or at least a vise directorate within the ministry which is capable of guiding the forestry development, protection and utilization and supporting, guiding and coordinating regional actors to attain the desired result the nation is expecting from the sector.*

3.2.3. Lack of strong institutional arrangement at regional level giving emphasis to forestry extension and forest development objectives.

There are new institutional arrangement almost in all regions, OFWE, AFE, NRMEPA, are taking over forest management responsibilities of their respective regions with AFE taking responsibility for the productive forests or plantation. These developments are encouraging and it somehow shows the proper institutional arrangement is on the process of evolving. In Amhara region, the forestry agency has taken over the management responsibility of plantation forest and the natural forest is still under the management of ABoA (Amhara Bureau of Agriculture) where the region has allocated some budget for the development and protection of the priority areas in the region. The institutional arrangement for the forestry sector in Amhara region is still under discussion but following the right path where they have mandated the forestry enterprise with profit oriented management responsibilities and other development and protection roles remain within the agriculture bureau. This arrangement still needs further thinking and it is very clear that the bureau, with a very limited man power as in the case of the federal ministry, cannot efficiently undertake forest management responsibilities of the remaining protection forests of the region. It is a good decision that the new SSLFM Programme has established operational links with both the forestry enterprise and the agriculture bureau where both have major role in forest management and the mainstreaming of PFM should address them.

The institutional arrangements of Oromia is that OFWE is responsible for the implementation of the regional forest policy and strategy and ahs a plan to establish a forest fund from revenue generated and use the forest funds for supporting rural development, studies and initial capital for establishment of enterprises, support upgrading of existing enterprises, and to replenish capital to salvage those enterprises from dissolution. The idea is a step forward in the institutional arrangement of Ethiopian forestry sector and must be appreciated. However, OFWE needs a clear policy on the forest fund utilisation where the fund should be used explicitly for a) the development and

protection of natural forest, b) the management of protected areas/ biodiversity hotspots, c) the provision of forest extension services; d) the promotion of commercial forest plantations and forest industries and the list could be long but the purpose of the fund according to OFWE (regulation no. 84/2007) is biased towards profit oriented commercial forest plantation management. Unless conservation efforts are getting investment priorities from the forest fund, the neglect of natural forest would happen as in the case of Shashemene Forest Enterprise before the establishment of OFWE. The desire of the forestry agency to be financially sustainable would naturally predispose them towards conventional management approach and would undermine forestry's role to rural livelihood improvement and PFM approach. It is understandable that the balancing of community involvement and financially being self-sufficient is uncharted water for the forestry enterprise with the limited experience on both ends.

The current development seems that not much attention is given to natural forest management and the effort is put on generating more money and be financially self sufficient. This might be because the enterprise was granted a onetime budget as an establishment cost and then is expected to cover all its management costs which actually seems encouraging in showing the economic potential of the forestry sector but sustainability of such actions need to be critically looked in. Currently there are many concerned individuals who stress that the utilisation and development efforts in oromia are not balanced and emphasis seems on harvesting activities. Although this might be exaggerated, the current effort of OFWE is not certainly convincing that the area of plantation development is more than the area harvested. The current level of investment and effort on forest development reveals the level of commitment by OFWE and its staff particularly on areas not bringing immediate income.

Some reports indicate that community groups (Dodola, Chilimo, Borana) involved in PFM are complaining for the lack of technical and administrative support and to the extent that the new programmes of GTZ and FARM/Africa SOS Sahel were not been on board, PFM groups would have been fated for eventual failure. This is a paradox where community participation has gain recognition in the region, is introduced as a core process of the organisation, and where elements of community participation are in all job process deemed necessary and also there are forest extension and PFM officers at all levels and in contrast little attention is given to support old PFM groups.

The support and progress of PFM is stunted because OFWE has not recruited the required staff even as per its own structure and therefore seems over stretched by other utilisation activities which by itself emanates from policy priorities of OFWE. Currently, OFWE seems stretched between maximising revenue generation and minimising cost where costs for forest protection objectives considered as auxiliary cost. The idea of having a forest fund must be appreciated and regions should also share this experience with a clear policy guide on the management and investment priorities of the forest fund. The little support to PFM communities in Oromia could only be reasoned as the objective of maximising revenue has overruled technical and administrative support provision to PFM communities despite PFM is mainstreamed within the job process of forest management in OFWE.

This situation of failure to provide assistance to established community groups is not the case only for OFWE but is also the case in SNNPRS where this study team visited. In SNNPRS communities were complaining that requests made by forest cooperative has fallen on deaf ears for about three years. This lack of passionate support for community involvement in the forestry sector needs to be properly addressed through extensive and intensive awareness campaign at all levels including policy makers. Facilitating community participation in resources management is considered as a development strategy to bring growth and transformation and is part of the national agenda to get out of poverty and hence the forestry service and their technocrats need to develop confidence in the community's ability to sustainably manage the resources and govern issues affecting his life.

Any collective actions dealing with land and natural resources to be effective, it need to have a clearly defined right and responsibilities and these again needs to be legally recognised. This legal provisions need to provide, among other things, security and flexibility as the process itself is a participatory process. This means, for any collective action to be effective and sustainable, it must secure current and future benefits it intends to bring for the members of the group. If these benefits are not legally secured it is not possible to think of sustainable management in unsecured situation. Clear benefit sharing arrangements need to be agreed from the start and agreed rights and benefits should not be revoked at any cost or if need be this rights must be renegotiated and revised if it is a national interest. The practice in some of PFM sites is that some community institutions who were exercising some of their rights are now don't have the rights as simple as using fallen trees and allowing the use of construction wood for personal consumption by their members.

Such revocation of rights sometimes occurs because the forestry institution itself is so weak that it cannot abide to agreed principles and does not perform as transparent and efficient institution. In such cases the effort needs to be for the institution to look critically into its institutional norms and practice and try to rectify though a transparent and self criticizing process of learning by doing. If PFM agreements are revoked by the agreeing institution itself there is nothing as damaging as such cases for community based resources management which is a disempowering community from engaging as equal partners and has a spill over effect on other forestry developments and future collaboration. This situation must be assessed and corrected as soon as possible.

On the other hand, if organised communities are not empowered enough to fervently demand their rights from the concessioners/ forestry institutions it is something we all should consider that there is a problem. This situation where communities not requesting their rights can be equated as not abiding to agreed terms of obligations and this will eventually lead to the collapse of the PFM process as a whole. Therefore community institutions need to be made aware that the purpose of the current civil service reform programme is to bring efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency so as to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of public sector service delivery which in this case the forestry service must be effective in undertaking its responsibilities.

In general, forestry institutions should pay attention to balance revenue generation and conservation efforts and also consider investment made on community participation is granting the sustainable supply of forest products.

> **Action 3.2.3.** *'It is suggested in support of mainstreaming PFM, forestry institutions are able to provide the necessary technical and administrative support to community efforts having the necessary structure at the grass roots level'.*

3.2.4. Lack of proper job process and service provision assessment of sustainable forest management practice at federal and regional levels.

The need for mainstreaming of PNRM/PFM within the service provider/ government structure to scale-up the positive impacts observed from the pilot PFM programmes in the past 10 years or so is a natural step. According to the World Bank scaling-up is defined as to mean to efficiently increase the socioeconomic impact from a small to a large scale of coverage. The main activities of scaling up are also mainstreaming, institutionalising new practices, and introducing new way of working and approaches in the conventional way of doing things.

The current institutional development of the MOA indicates that strengthening sustainable natural resource development, conservation and utilization is taken up as one of the four lead pillars or sub sector indicator of the agricultural development targets in the Business Plan Reengineering (BPR) and the subsequent a balanced score card (BSC). This gives greater opportunity to translate policy provisions of community participation into the forest management practice. The mainstreaming ad institutionalisation of PFM as a management approach requires particularly analysing the process of change required in light of the business plan reengineering process the government has undertaken and revisiting the job process as experience is gained through continued implementation. The overall objective of the process is to increase effectiveness and efficiency, in the service provision, development and regulatory role of the government. The institutional arrangement for undertaking sustainable forest development, protection and utilisation responsibilities at federal and regional levels has some variations but the arrangement in Oromia region can be taken as an example. In Oromia, the institution responsible for implementing the regional forest policy and strategy has carried out a good self assessment, through reflection and analysis of the process and has resulted in recognising community participation as a core process within forest management practice of OFWE.

The recognition of community participation as a core process entails the identification and measuring of job process in the form of creating job descriptions for each job process owners and performers in the field of community participation. Currently it is only in Oromia that PFM can be said is mainstreamed to a certain degree where for example OFWE has one forestry extension and one PFM job performers at the three levels of operation, enterprise, branch and district levels (district is equivalent to forest priority area) and in addition may have forestry Development Agents (DAs) as required. In addition to these, all

job descriptions of job performers within the forest development and utilization processes have elements of community participation in their job process.

In addition to these job performers, OFWE has identified the need to have forestry development agents at grass roots level depending on the need for community participation and as these are graduates from forestry training institutions they might need to be supported with DAs from TVETC who are within the Bureau of Agriculture and also need to be linked with kebele level development managers. It would have been good if the forestry institutions had their own forestry DAs from TEVTC. The placement of DAs in the extension organisation is long been discussed on the way to organise the extension system. Some years back MOCTD and MOA had their own DAs in Agricultural and Coffee growing areas and the same should be emphasised to have DAs in predominantly forested woredas.

With the current understanding of PFM within OFWE it is planned to manage all natural forest areas of Oromia under joint forest management approach where rights and responsibilities are shared with local community. This is planned to be possible with the support of the three PFM programmes, GTZ AMBERO, EU supported Federal PFM Scaling up programme and the FARM-Africa/ SOS SSFM programme. The two EU supported programmes are operating in the four regions and this should be possible to manage relatively all the natural forests of Ethiopia through community participation. There are other projects such like NTFP-PFM-RD projects operating in SNNPRS and ORDA in Amhara region are complementing the scaling up effort. This plan of Oromia managing all natural forests using JFM can be said is part of the GTP that states "Forestry development, protection and utilization will be done with increased effectiveness by the participation of communities" and this can be said as perfectly translated in to regional plan and implementation approach.

> ***Action 3.2.4****: Therefore, it is suggested that it is urgent that PFM introduced in to the Job processes of the federal and respective regional authorities of the forestry sector, i.e. the Amhara Bureau of Agriculture, Amhara Forest Enterprise, Natural Resources Management Environment protection Authority of SNNPRS, Benshangul BoA*

3.2.5. Lack of technical and institutional guidance to PFM actors by the MOA and Regional Authorities

One of the challenges to the forestry service to mainstream PFM is that some of the regional states new to PFM has limited idea on how to proceed with the process. Some regions are expecting for the federal ministry to send PFM as a package so to officially implement PFM. The other aspect is that many actors claim to have PFM guidelines which are prepared over the years. There are variations among these guidelines and some are not concise enough for new practitioners to take it up and were not prepared with clear idea of the target audience particularly the grass root forestry job performers and forestry DAs. It is clear that the existing three or four PFM technical guidelines need to be harmonised in a way they are flexible to accommodate environmental, social, economic and institutional settings. The federal ministry through the scaling up PFM programme has a plan to lead the

harmonisation process where PFM actors will be contributors and the process need to be completed before field implementation of the new scaling up programme starts. At the policy and strategy level it is now clear that forest development, protection and utilisation activities must be done with the participation of the community and the PFM guidelines should explicitly clarify forest utilisation aspect of the participatory forest management implementation which currently is a challenging area for most community groups engaged in PFM plan implementation. This harmonisation should be of priority to all PFM actors and the PFM guidelines need to be sent to respective regions just like the Community-Based Watershed Development Guidelines part I and II are sent to the regions and gained strong regional support base.

The PFM guideline after endorsed by the federal MOA should be considered as PFM implementation standard and all PFM actors should drop their affiliated guidelines and use the harmonised guideline as an official tool. It should also be flexible and must have room for other PNRM practices such like Participatory Range Land Management in pastoral areas. Therefore, the guideline should consider social, economic, and resource base differences of different contexts and without having a harmonised technical guideline it is unrealistic to mainstream PFM into the management practice of the forestry sector and maximise conservation and economic impacts of PNRM.

The other aspect the harmonised technical guideline need to consider is the right sizing PFM process to the level that forestry extension performers can scale it up in terms of cost and time it requires to organise community groups in JFM/PFM/PNRM. The major issue in scaling up PFM is related to the cost implication and time it takes to finalise a PFM process and assist the community to become an active partner in resources management. The right sizing of the PFM process needs to be done without compromising important stages of the process but balancing out the quality and the time it takes and as reports indicate that the more time the PFM process took the better the collective action and understanding about the objectives of PFM and rights and responsibilities. Some critics say that PFM is expensive venture for the government forestry service to take it up and PFM actors need to address the issue and compile and communicate the evidence that shows the contrary.

The issues around harmonisation need to be addressed not only as sending it as approved technical guide but also PFM process need to be prepared as a package for extension service to adopt and the package need to include the average estimate of the budget required to establish one community group.

The engagement of training institutions such like Wondo Genet College of Forestry in meeting trained manpower need of the country is critical. The college is responsible for producing trained manpower for the forestry sector and we are told that the WGCF has already incorporated PFM into their curricula. Some regional governments has the plan to upgrade the educational level of DAs to first degree level and the Amhara region has planned to upgrade 70% of the DAs to first degree level in the coming 5 years. The development trend is to have DAs with first degree and it is a good start that OFWE's organizational structure has foresters assigned as DAs and this is similar with the plan in Amhara regional state.

The integration of PFM approach in WGCF curriculum is equipping the new graduates with community participation and this need to be followed with other training institutions producing Development Agents within the MOA and forestry agency. Currently most foresters and DAs are all new for PFM particularly in the new regions and therefore the focus should be to introduce the harmonised PFM approach in TEVTC curriculum.

> **Action 3.2.5**: *It is suggested to finalise the harmonisation process as soon as possible and provide technical and institutional support to regions to scale up PFM.*

3.3   Framing communication issues of mainstreaming PFM-

3.3.1. Lack of national consensus on the viability of the PNRM as a management strategy albeit all policy statements assert community participation.

The need for community participation for sustainable forest management has gained attention at federal and regional levels. In all policy provisions and strategic development plans community participation is sought after. Although all actors are willing to instil participatory approaches in their undertakings, the understanding and purpose of community participation in forestry is not clear whether it is pursued as a livelihood development strategy for rural community or as a cost reduction mechanism for forestry agencies. Most conventional forest management of the past were not considering the social aspect of forest management and therefore fail short of attaining their objectives. The problem here in our case is not only because of the lack of proper understanding of community participation but knowing the benefits of participation alone would not be enough unless the institution is committed and takes community participation in forest management as an integral approach of the forestry development effort. Here a clear strategy and objective for community participation should be developed by forestry institutions and ambiguities of mass mobilisation and participatory process must be cleared. The participatory processes sought after in forest management need to be understood as sharing rights, responsibilities and authorities of forest management and not just mobilising the community like the old food/cash for work, PSNP and tree planting campaigns. The popular notion of benefit sharing in the conventional forest management approach that thinks investment from forest revenue on infrastructure development projects as sharing benefits to community, where all citizens are entitled for development projects with or without participating in resources management, need to be critically reviewed and community's effort must appreciated by all involved in resources management and decision making. If clear and balanced view of community participation is not properly understood and communicated at all levels the potential of community participation in forest management either as livelihood development strategy or cost effectiveness would not be realised in the long run.

Although PFM projects have piloted PFM to the best standards, results and potential benefits of PFM are not properly communicated beyond limited number of forestry experts and it is not much known outside the forestry departments not to mention policy makers and other stakeholders to support PFM programmes. The issue here is how we can raise the awareness within the implementing institution that PFM is a workable forest management strategy that would benefit the rural livelihood and at the same time contribute to economic development.

On mainstreaming PFM, there are some lessons that PFM communication strategy should learn from the institutionalization process of the watershed development strategy to land management approach, that has been piloted through partnerships between the Government and WFP's MERET project (Managing Environment Resources to Enable Transition to more Sustainable Livelihoods), and Sustainable Land Management programme (SLM) of GTZ where guidelines on community-based participatory watershed developments were developed from pilot projects and are adopted in 2005 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MOARD) for scaling up best practices.

The firsts step to incorporate and adopt PFM as forest development strategy is to bring forestry issues as part of the sub-component of Rural Economic Development and Food Security (REDFS) programme. REDFS has three sub-components or pillars namely disaster risk management and food security; sustainable land management; and agricultural growth and PFM as a forest management strategy can be part of Sustainable Land Management subcomponent technical platform to increase the awareness on PFM and also to feed in policy making with pertinent evidence for issues requiring policy directives and guidance. The incorporation of PFM into the existing steering and technical platforms within MOA will raise the awareness on PFM and institute a strong political commitment to increase institutional capacity and improve environmental governance issues at different levels and as well gives momentum for PFM to be effectively institutionalised within the government structures.

Adopting PFM as a national strategy for forest development and utilisation, effective communication networks need to be developed in order to raise awareness the various contributions of PFM such like in food security, livelihood improvement, climate change mitigation, means of securing external funding from REED+, biodiversity and securing environmental benefits. Forestry institutions, Research and Education Institutions and CSOs should jointly work to bring the importance of forestry to the attention of higher officials to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Prime Minister. To gain high level support actors first and foremost compile existing evidence or generate convincing evidence of PFM's economic contribution and pave the ground through identifying opinion leaders and champions to channel the evidence and support to the higher officials.

The forestry institutions should also lobby MoFED on the national accounting system to consider ways of properly accounting the contribution of the forestry's share in the GDP. The economic contribution of the forestry sector as declared by MoFED in the national account is 6.4% in 1995 and 4.7% in 2005 but whereas one study indicates that the economic contribution of forestry including the watershed service is 27.5% in 1995 and

18.8 % in 2005. Therefore, compiling prudent evidence and presenting nicely packed information is critically important to gain the required support. Commissioning researches that will be undertaken by academic and research institutions and as well carrying out a national debate of PFM and other approaches of community mobilization will evidently raise the awareness level and help build strong joint government CSO collective action to increase the contribution of the forestry sector.

The other aspect is the use of media normally underestimated due to the financial implications but its role in raising the awareness on forestry issues and in particular community participation is significant. Using media like "walta information centre' which has a wide spectrum of audience from federal to regional levels is advisable.

Currently PFM is considered as an agenda of few forestry professionals and its role as a viable forest management strategy is not appreciated as result of low level of engagement by other actors.

> *Action 3.3.1: Therefore, it is suggested to reach national consensus on the importance of PNRM as a management strategy though national debate and other communication media.*

3.3.2. Lack of integration of approaches such like the PFM, biosphere and SLM approaches so to maximise impact and ensure addressing the three CBD objectives.

PFM implementation in Ethiopia started where the conventional protectionist forest management approach failed and deforestation and forest degradation has escalated. It is the problem of deforestation which led for the start up of PFM projects. The history of the GTZ Adaba Dodola IFMP project indicates that it was first designed as a conventional forestry project to be financially sustainable after the initial GTZ support. The commencement of the project took some years after the forest inventory done for the project design is no longer reflecting the forest condition and therefore the project was renegotiated to pilot community participation as a forest management strategy.

Community participation in forest management started in degraded dry montane forests of Addaba Dodola and Chilimo where deforestation is to its utmost level and PFM pilot projects concern was to halt the escalating deforestation. Considering the situation in which PFM started in Ethiopia, the pilot projects were not in a position of thinking integrating PFM into SLM and biosphere approaches where these approaches themselves were taking shape during the same time.

Some conservationists looking to PFM practice from a distance and perceiving the PFM approach being implemented as being biased towards forest utilization and undermine biodiversity. In actual case, studies indicate that PFM has contributed to improvement of forest cover and quality in all cases of PFM and rather some practitioners are commenting as being biased towards forest protection where fallen trees are decaying on the ground. Some academicians go further as saying that PFM is not addressing the three CBD

principles, Conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing but in practice these are the exact objectives of PFM practice in Ethiopia but the aspect of sustainable use is constrained by lack of capacity and reluctance of the forestry institution. There is one fact that some PFM actors who have the notion that integrating PFM and biosphere approach is challenging in that it might undermine the utilisation aspect and should not be implemented on all forests but on forests identified for biodiversity importance. All PFM actors agree that the integration of PFM and biosphere approach has a great potential for PNRM to gain political support and also help securing global finances and recognition.

The integration of the PFM approach into the watershed approach is another aspect which might have leverage for PNRM particularly on joining together for solving issues related to community institutions and natural resources management. The integration of PFM as a management approach as part of SLM approach of community based watershed management is not possible with the current size of 200 hectare of a watershed. The argument for smaller watershed is that in the 1980s it is found difficult to involve the community in larger watersheds with a top-down technically rigid approach. It is convincing that this technical familiarity of the rigid top-down approach has paved the way for participatory smaller watersheds developments but the rationale of adopting smaller watershed should be understood and wherever possible the SLM should consider PFM as part of the forest management in the landscape and a viable approach contributing for large-scale watershed developments. The watershed approach as an integrated and comprehensive approach of dominantly soil and water conservation and it would be effective when implemented on a large scale considering other resources like forests as part of the landscape. Integrating PFM into SLM approach needs a thorough analysis and visiting the size of a watershed as a working definition broadening the objectives of CBWD as a SLM approach including forest resources and wetlands. The GTZ SLM programme is struggling to integrate PFM into the SLM approach at least at a component level and creating proper understanding and complimentarily among the two will raise the awareness of rural community on natural resources management and also be leverage for natural resources cause.

The CBWD and PFM are both for the improvement of the rural livelihood through effective PNRM. Both have similar issues and can work together on areas such like legalisation of community institutions, benefit sharing arrangements from conservation efforts, and adopting participatory approaches to development. The integration of PFM into SLM needs a long way to go but working closely and collaborating on the common issues will give leverage to both sides.

> *Action 3.3.2: Therefore it is suggested to integrate principles of the biosphere approach into PFM approach wherever biodiversity importance is noted.*

4. DRAFT PFM POLICY SUPPORT STRATEGY

Advocacy Goal

The overall advocacy goal is to ensure sustainable management of natural resources through creating enabling policy environment and institutional setup

4.1. Advocacy Objectives

4.1.1 Advocacy Objectives: Legal, Policy and Governance Issues

4.1.1.1 To ensure proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels

4.1.1.2. To ensure legalization and empowerment of community associations

4.1.1.3.To ensure legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM

4.1.2 Advocacy Objectives: Institutional Issues

4.1.2.1.To collaborate with concerned actors to bring a lasting solution for efficient institutional arrangement for the natural resource sector at the federal and regional levels

4.1.2.2.To improve the current institutional arrangement to bring effective resource management at the federal level within the MOA

4.1.2.3. To ensure that forestry institutions are able to provide the necessary technical and administrative support to community efforts having the necessary structure at the grass roots level'

4.1.2.4.To ensure that PFM is introduced as a core process at federal and regional levels

4.1.2.5.To ensure that proper technical and institutional guidance is given to all actors by the MoA

4.1.3 Advocacy objectives: Communication and Awareness Issues

4.1.3.1.To reach national consensus on the importance of PNRM as a management strategy

4.1.3.2.To ensure that PFM actors integrate eco-region planning/Biosphere reserve approach into their PFM process

4.1.1 Advocacy Objectives: Legal, Policy and Governance Issues

4.1.1.1. Advocacy Objective: To ensure proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels

Success indicators:

- Amendment on the Federal Forest Proclamation with the insertion of community ownership as part of forest ownership types
- Community participation properly defined, understood and implemented by government actors
- PFM planning process properly included in the draft Forest implementation guideline
- Customary user rights of forest products recognized by the Forest Proclamation
- Customary user rights of forest products incorporated in the draft Forest Regulation as stipulated in the Environment Policy of Ethiopia

Target Audience:

- Council of Ministers
- State Minister of Agriculture [Natural Resources]
- NR Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture
- Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Affairs Standing Committee
- Agriculture Affairs Standing Committee

Methods and activities:

- Preparing and disseminating policy brief on community participation also including good practices from Oromia and SNNPR
- National debate on community participation as stipulated in the Proclamation and the GTP document
- Identify the provisions needed for amendment, prepare justification document for the Proclamation and Draft Regulation
- Holding meetings with MPs (NRMEPASC, AASC)
- Holding meetings with the State Minister

Timeframe: Ownership category: Long Term (LT), The rest: Short Term (ST)

Good practice to be cited: Oromia and SNNPR forest laws on community ownership

Potential partners: FfE, GTZ, EDRI, EIAR: Forestry Directorate, ORDA, NTFP-PFM

4.1.1.2 Advocacy objective: To ensure legalization and empowerment of community associations

Success indicators

- Associations have incorporated profit objectives or Cooperatives have incorporated conservation objectives
- Amendments on the Civil Code or the Charities Law to accommodate provisions that would enable profits to devolve to individual members in these community associations
- Needed technical support provided for community institutions
- Registration of community institutions and PFM byelaw

Target audience

- Prime Minister's office
- Ministry of Justice
- Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Affairs Standing Committee

Methods and Activities

- Case studies on community institution form PFM communities
- Hold meetings with MoJ officials
- Identify the provisions needed for amendment, prepare justification document for the Civil code and submit it to the Ministry of justice
- Building coalitions with like-minded groups such as water users associations, watershed users associations, forest user groups through establishing relationships with SLM Program and the NR Directorate
- Policy brief on communal land certification

Time frame:- ST

Good practice to be cited : None

Potential partners: RIPPLE, GTZ, SLM Project, ORDA, NTFP-PFM

4.1.1.3 Advocacy objective: To ensure legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM

Success indicators

- Proper actions taken on majority of cases
- Positive reports from PFM practitioner community associations
- Communal land certification adopted by government

Target audience

- Prosecutors, Police, Judges
- Zonal and Woreda administrative councils
- Legal Study, Drafting and Awareness Raising Department (LSDARD) at federal and regional level
- NREPASC

Methods and Activities

- Support trainings for the judiciary in partnership with Justice Professionals Training Center (JPTC)
- Commissioning a study on the status of legal enforcement and preparing a national validation workshop
- Sensitizing regulatory organs like MPs, administrators at all levels via documentary film production
- Experience sharing tour to Tigray to show the good practice on legal enforcement
- Profiling best practices from Tigray [on law enforcement] and SNNPR [on special court for environmental offenders] via video documentation and policy briefs
- Organize petitions by local communities when necessary

Time frame: ST

Good practices to be cited: Tigray [on law enforcement], SNNPR [on summary procedure and special court for environmental offenders]

Potential partners: LSDARD, JPTC, FfE, ISD, ORDA, NTFP-PFM

4.1.2 Advocacy Objectives Institutional Issues

4.1.2.1. Advocacy Objective: To collaborate with concerned actors to bring a lasting solution for efficient institutional arrangement for the natural resource sector at the federal and regional levels

Success indicators

- The establishment of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE) at the federal level also including the EPA bringing together mandates given to various federal and regional institutions like MoA, MoCT, IBC, EPA, etc
- The SNNPR good practice is replicated in the four regions and an institution that reduces duplication and promotes synergy is set up
- All regional forest enterprises will be mandated only on productive forests

Target audience:

- The Prime Minister's Office,
- Deputy PM,
- Regional presidents,
- NREPASC

Methods and Activities

- Profile the SNNPR good practice on institutional arrangement and the AFE's plantation-focused good practice on in an annual good practice forum
- Profile the SNNPR good practice on institutional arrangement and the AFE's plantation-focused good practice on in a documentary film
- Prepare and disseminate a policy brief justifying a consolidated institutional arrangement
- Hold meetings with the Deputy PM and other key officials
- Write a letter with justification statements to the PM
- Hold meetings with the regional presidents
- Write a letter with justification statements to the regional presidents

Time frame: Federal ministry: LT, Regional bureaus: ST

Good practice to be cited: SNNPR has set up an authority that is very comprehensive, Natural Resource Management and Environmental Protection Authority (NRMEPA)

Potential partners: FfE, NRMEPA of SNNPR, EARI-Forestry Directorate

4.1.2.2. Advocacy Objective: To improve the current institutional arrangement to bring effective resource management at the federal level within the MOA

Success indicators

- A vice directorate for forestry is set up at the Ministry of Agriculture

Target audience

State Minister of Agriculture (Natural Resources)

Methods and Activities

- Policy brief on the need, opportunities and challenges for a strong forestry institution
- Lobbying via holding a meeting with the State Minister
- Lobbying NRMEPASC members

Time frame: ST

Good practice to be cited: None

Potential partners: FfE, NRMEPA of SNNPR, EARI-Forestry Directorate

4.1.2.3. Advocacy Objective: To ensure that forestry institutions are able to provide the necessary technical and administrative support to community efforts having the necessary structure at the grass roots level'

Success indicators

- A forest regulatory organ [separate from OFWE] is set up or delegated in Oromiya Regional State (e.g., Oromiya EPA)
- A separate institution is mandated to look after the conservation areas, e.g., in Oromiya
- Agreed community rights are respected
- Technical and administrative support provided to community institutions

Target audience

- OFWE and NRMEPA of SNNPR
- Regional presidents and Vice presidents in the regions also in charge of agriculture
- MPs of the locality
- Participating local communities

Methods and Activities

- Awareness raising on basics of contractual obligations for local communities engaged in PFM
- Holding meetings with OFWE and NRMEPA officials on the institution of grievance procedure
- Holding meetings with MPs of the locality
- Organizing petitions by local communities to OFWE and NRMEPA
- Policy brief on institutional roles and responsibilities
- Personal dialogue and letter to with OFWE
- Sharing the SNNPR good institutional practice that mandates different institutions for conservation/regulation and marketing

Time frame: ST

Good practice to be cited: None

Potential partners: EPA, NREPASC , Regional BoA

4.1.2.4. Advocacy Objective: To ensure that PFM is introduced as a core process at federal and regional levels

Success indicators

- PFM is a core process at the federal and regional levels

Target audience

- Natural Resource Directorate
- State Minister of Agriculture (Natural Resources)
- Relevant regional institutions

Methods and Activities

- Profiling Oromia's OFWE experience during the Annual Good Practice Forum and the documentary film
- Lobbying officials at the MoA and the regional BoAs

Time frame

- ST

Good practice to be cited: OFWE has proactively introduced PFM as a core process

Potential partners: GTZ, OFWE

4.1.2.5. To ensure that extension agents are assigned at DA level for the forestry sector

Success indicators

- TVET graduates are assigned as forestry extension agents

Target audience

- OFWE
- AFE
- NRMEPA of SNNPR
- Regional BoAs
- MoA: NR Directorate
- The Prime Minister's Office

Methods and Activities

- Case study on the need for forestry extension agents
- Conducting a national workshop

Time frame: ST

Good practice to be cited: None

Potential partners: OFWE, AFE, NRMEPA of SNNPR, MoA: NR Directorate

4.1.3   Advocacy objectives Communication and Awareness Issues

4.1.3.1. Advocacy Objective: To reach national consensus on the importance of PNRM as a management strategy

Success indicators

- Improved positive attitude and reception of PNRM at all levels
- Increased level of awareness at all levels
- PNRM is accepted as a guiding principle for natural resource management in Ethiopia

Target audience

- Natural Resource Directorate at the MoA,
- Regional BoAs,
- Academic and research institutions,
- General public,
- Deputy PM,
- Minister of Agriculture,
- State Minister of Agriculture (Natural Resources),
- EPA,
- Regional Presidents and Deputy Presidents,
- Donor's Group,
- MOFED

Methods and Activities

- National debate on PFM and other approaches
- Policy brief on the positive outcomes and challenges of PFM
- Commissioning researches on social, economic and environmental impacts of PNRM
- Partnership with other actors to launch a radio program
- Lobbying donors
- Using existing publications like Akirma to sensitize various actors
- Promotional materials such as posters, leaflets, and billboards in Addis and the regions on the benefits of PFM
- Identify members of the Professional Advisory Group of MoA and lobby

Time frame: ST

Good practice to be cited: None

Potential partners: FfE

4.1.3.2. Advocacy Objective: To ensure that PFM actors integrate eco-region planning/Biosphere reserve approach into their PFM process

Success indicators

- Improved positive attitude and reception of PNRM at all levels
- Increased level of awareness at all levels
- Opposition on PNRM is reduced
- Community management contributing to biodiversity conservation through adopting biosphere approach
- PNRM projects meet the three objectives of CBD (conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing)

Target audience

- AAU,
- ECFF,
- EWNRA,
- GTZ,
- ORDA,
- MoA
- OFWE,
- AFE,
- NRMEPA

Methods and Activities

- Organizing workshop on the potentials of integrating eco-region planning/Biosphere reserve approach into their PFM process
- Informal discussion forums on the challenges and opportunities of the integration

Time frame: ST

Good practice to be cited: None

Potential partners: ECFF, EWNRA,   GTZ, ORDA

4.2   Advocacy Tools

Lobbying

1. Writing letters
2. Holding meetings
3. Annual Good Practice Forum and Exhibition
4. Amendments to Forest Proclamation
5. Amendments to the Civil Code
6. Organizing petitions

Networking

1. Building coalitions
2. Using existing networks and credible advocacy groups

Media

1. Documentary film
2. Radio Program
3. Use existing publications like *Akirma* and *Walia*

Public mobilization topics

1. Local awareness raising workshops
2. Incentive schemes
3. Petitions

EDUCATION AND AWARENESS

1. POLICY BRIEFS
2. TRAINING
3. Experience sharing visits
4. National Debate/Workshop
5. Promotional materials such as posters, leaflets, billboard
6. Action Research

PROPOSED POLICY BRIEF TOPICS
1. Community participation
2. Communal land certification
3. Legal enforcement
4. Institutional arrangement
5. The need, opportunities and challenges for a strong forestry institution
6. Status of [NR] legal enforcement in Ethiopia
7. The need for forestry extension agents
8. Inclusion of PNRM in the TVET Curricula
9. Harmonized and simplified PFM guidelines
10. PFM: successes, opportunities and challenges

DOCUMENTARY FILM CONTENT
1. SUCCESSES, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF PNRM
2. GOOD PRACTICES IN PNRM FROM VARIOUS REGIONS

LOCAL COMMUNITY AWARENESS TOPICS
1. BASICS ON CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT
2. DEFENDING COMMUNITY RIGHTS AS PNRM PRACTITIONERS

PROPOSED CASE STUDY TOPICS
1. COMMUNITY INSTITUTION FORM
2. STATUS OF [NR] LEGAL ENFORCEMENT IN ETHIOPIA
3. THE NEED FOR FORESTRY EXTENSION AGENTS
4. SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

COALITION BUILDING TARGETS
LIKE-MINDED GROUPS SUCH AS WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, WATERSHED USERS ASSOCIATIONS, FOREST USER GROUPS THROUGH ESTABLISHING RELATIONSHIPS WITH SLM PROGRAM AND THE NR DIRECTORATE

CURRENT GOOD PRACTICES
1. FOREST LAWS RECOGNIZING COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP: OROMIYA AND SNNPR
2. GOOD LAW ENFORCEMENT: TIGRAY
3. SPECIAL COURT FOR NR OFFENDERS: SNNPR
4. SUMMARY PROCEDURE FOR NR OFFENDERS: SNNPR
5. A MODEL NR INSTITUTIONAL SETUP (NRMEPA): SNNPR
6. PFM INTRODUCED AS A CORE PROCESS: OFWE

TOOLS FOR HORIZONTAL LEARNING
1. ANNUAL GOOD PRACTICE FORUM
2. EXHIBITION
3. EXPERIENCE SHARING VISITS

TOOLS FOR GENERAL PURPOSES
1. NETWORKING
2. RADIO PROGRAMS
3. PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS (POSTERS, LEAFLETS, BILLBOARD, ETC)
4. INCENTIVE SCHEMES
5. WEBSITE

SOME SUGGESTED USEFUL TOOLS
1. ESTABLISH A LOBBY GROUP TO UNDERTAKE THE LOBBYING EFFORTS
2. USE EXISTING NETWORKS
3. USE PROFESSIONAL ADVISORY GROUP AS AN ENTRY POINT
4. APPOINT AN ARTIST AS CONSERVATION AMBASSADOR TO ASSIST IN POSITIVE CAMPAIGNS
5. COMMISSION OPPONENTS TO UNDERTAKE RESEARCHES
6. IDENTIFY AND USE KEY FIGURES TO JOIN LOBBY GROUP
7. USE THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL AS A CHANNEL

LOBBY GROUP DRAFT COMPOSITION
1. CONSERVATION AMBASSADOR (ARTIST)
2. ACTIVE LOCAL COMMUNITY MEMBER (MAN AND WOMAN)
3. PROMINENT SENIOR FORESTER
4. PROMINENT ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATE
5. SOME KEY PUBLIC/POLITICAL FIGURES

Assumed Risks and Overcoming Strategies

1. Risk: Some objectives of the policy support strategy misunderstood by target audience [sometimes partners on some issues]
2. Solution: Rigorous lobbying
3. Risk: The program feels overstretched with addressing NRM issues
4. Solution: Share specific objectives of NRM issues to potential partners
5. Risk: Some of the issues might be misunderstood as against the provisions of the new Charities Law
6. Solution: Sharing tasks with other advocacy groups

Lobby targets

By thematic area

4.1.1.1: Council of Ministers, NREPASC, AASC, the State Minister

4.1.1.2: Prime Minister's Office, MoJ, NREPASC

4.1.1.3: Zonal and Woreda administrative councils, NREPASC

4.1.1.4: OFWE, NRMEPA, local MPs

4.1.2.1: Deputy PM, PM, Regional Presidents, NREPASC

4.1.2.2: State Minister, NREPASC

4.1.2.3: OFWE, Regional Presidents

4.1.2.4: State Minister (MoA) and regional BoAs

4.1.2.5: OFWE, AFE, NRMEPA, NR Directorate, the Prime Minister's Office

4.1.2.6: NR Directorate, MoA (in Charge of TVET Institutions)

4.1.3.1: NR Directorate, Regional BoAs, Donors, PAG

4.1.3.2 AAU, ECFF, EWNRA, GTZ, ORDA, MoA, OFWE, AFE, NRMEPA,

4.3   Prioritization of objectives

A joint exercise was undertaken among the consultants and FARM Africa/SOS PNRMU to prioritize the objectives in terms of level of urgent importance. The following ranking procedure was agreed upon by the joint group:

- Agree on a checklist
- Agree on the scoring method
- Give scores
- Rank the objectives
- Assess the final ranking to see if any reshuffling is necessary and
- Prioritize activities based on the above criteria

A draft checklist was presented by the consultants to compare the objectives, which was discussed thoroughly with FARM/SOS staff. Eventually, five criteria were selected and agreed upon by the consultants and Farm Africa staff to weight and compare the 12 objectives.

1. Support Community, People and power: whether meeting the objectives would empower the local communities through bringing about improvement in their lives, giving people a sense of their own power, and building lasting and strong organizations at the local level that will alter the power relations.

2. Has an impact on PNRM: does meeting the objective have any impacts on promoting PNRM?

3. Achievable and understandable: Is it a winnable issue under current circumstances? Is it easy to understand and communicate? Does it have clear targets and timeframe?

4. Avoiding risks of conflict: would addressing the issue unite the constituency community? Bring together the larger community? Create consensus among the various practitioner parties? Would it close and reduce any risk of rift with government? Would it reduce the gaps between practitioners and opponents?

5. Links local issues to macro policy and global context: would we address macro-policy issues by addressing the local issue? Does the issue have a national and international significance? Would it stir any national and global process?

The scoring method was agreed to be open with the participation of the consultants and the Farm Africa staff. Through discussions were undertaken on the scores of each objective relative to each criterion. Scores were then given between 1-5.

The key for scores was: 1:Very low; 2:Low; 3:Medium; 4:Good; and 5:Very good.

Table 1: Final score of the objectives

CHECKLIST FOR PRIORITIZING ISSUES/OBJECTIVES: Will the ISSUE	ADVOCACY OBJECTIVES (Scoring 1-5)											
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2
Support Community, People and power	5	5	5	3	3	4	2	4	3	3	5	3
Has an impact on PNRM	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	3	4	5	4
Be achievable and understandable	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	5
Avoid risk of conflict	5	4	2	5	4	4	3	4	4	3	5	4
Link local issues to macro policy and global context	4	2	4	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	3
Total Score	22	18	19	17	17	18	16	21	18	17	22	19

Table 2: Final rank of objectives

Advocacy Objectives	Rank
4.1.1.1. To ensure proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels	1
4.1.3.1 To reach national consensus on the importance of PNRM as a management strategy	1
4.1.2.4 To ensure that PFM is introduced as a core process at federal and regional levels	3
4.1.1.3 To ensure legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM	4
4.1.3.2 To ensure that PFM actors integrate eco-region planning/Biosphere reserve approach into their PFM process	4
4.1.1.2 To ensure legalization and empowerment of community associations	6
4.1.2.2To improve the current institutional arrangement to bring effective resource management at the federal level within the MOA	6
4.1.2.3 To ensure that forestry institutions are able to provide the necessary technical and administrative support to community efforts having the necessary structure at the grass roots level'	6
4.1.2.1To collaborate with concerned actors to bring a lasting solution for efficient institutional arrangement for the natural resource sector at the federal and regional levels	9
4.1.2.6 To ensure that proper technical and institutional guidance is given to all actors by the MoA	9

4.4. Roles and responsibilities of potential partners

The following were proposed as the major potential roles of partners:

1. Implementation of objectives or activities

        1A. Implementation with own cost

        1B. Implementation with some support

        1C. Implementation with full support

2. Political support

3. Technical support

4. Necessary ally: a partner whose support is politically very necessary.

Roles were then suggested for each partner to implement each objective.

Table 3: Potential roles for partners

I. Policy/Governance Issues: Advocacy Objectives	Partners	Potential roles & responsibilities
1.1 To ensure proper recognition of community participation by government at various levels	• FfE • GTZ • EDRI • EIAR: Forestry Directorate • ORDA • NTFP-PFM • FARM/SOS	1B, 3 1A 2 2 2 1A 1A, 3
1.2 To ensure legalization and empowerment of community associations	• RIPPLE • GTZ • SLM Project • ORDA • NTFP-PFM	2 1A, 3 1A, 3 4 1A
1.3 To ensure legal enforcement at Zonal and Woreda levels to halt deforestation and eventually support PFM	• LSDARD • JPTC • FfE • ISD • ORDA • NTFP-PFM • FARM/SOS	1C, 2 1C, 2 1A, 3 1A, 3 4 1A, 3 1A, 3

I. Policy/Governance Issues: Advocacy Objectives	Partners	Potential roles & responsibilities
II. Institutional Issues: Advocacy Objectives		
2.1 To collaborate with concerned actors to bring a lasting solution for efficient institutional arrangement for the natural resource sector at the federal and regional levels	• FfE • NRMEPA of SNNPR • EARI-Forestry Directorate • TVET institutions • ORDA • AFE • NRMEPA of SNNPR • GTZ • NTFP-PFM • JICA • FARM/SOS	3 4 4 4 4 1B 1B 1A, 3, 4 1A, 3, 4 4 1A, 3, 4
2.2 To improve the current institutional arrangement to bring effective resource management at the federal level within the MOA	• FfE • NRMEPA of SNNPR • EARI-Forestry Directorate • GTZ • FARM/SOS	3 4 4 3 3
2.3 To ensure that forestry enterprises /AFE, OFWE/ are giving equal emphasis for their development and utilisation efforts	• EPA • NREPASC • Regional BoA	3 4 3
2.4 To ensure that PFM is introduced as a core process at federal and regional levels	• GTZ • OFWE, AFE • Regional Boa • FARM/SOS • NTFP PFM • JICA PFM	1A, 3 1A, 3 1A, 3 1A, 3 1A, 3 1A, 3
2.5 To ensure that extension agents are assigned at DA level for the forestry sector	• OFWE • AFE • NRMEPA of SNNPR • MoA: NR Directorate	1A, 3 1A, 3 4 4
III. Communication and Awareness Issues: Advocacy Objectives		
3.1 To reach national consensus on the importance of PNRM as a management strategy	• FfE • FARM/SOS • GTZ • JICA • NTFP PFM • NREPASC	3 3 3 3 3 2, 4
3.2 To ensure that PFM actors integrate eco-region planning/Biosphere reserve approach into their PFM process	• ECFF • EWNRA • GTZ • ORDA • FARM/SOS	4 1A 1A 4 1A

5. ANNEXES

5.1. Methodology

The methodology used for this study is starts from properly understanding the TOR and then discussion with the two programme managers the SSLFMEP and BERSMP, and the policy advisor for SSLFMP. The literature review and focused discussion points were identified and discussed with the programme staff and tried to validate correct understanding of the assignment. The field travel plan of visiting the three regions out of the four programme areas was also agreed. The team has tried to extensively gather relevant information at all levels.

The following issues were identified as a guide for the literature review and discussion points with stakeholders and agreed with the client as an important area of gathering information.

1. POLICY, PROCLAMATION, REGULATION AND STRATEGY RELATED ISSUES
   a) What are the key policy issues in Mainstreaming PNRM into Policy strategies, proclamations, directives and guidelines?
   b) Explore objective of having a supportive policy in practical terms is to safe guard community rights and to ensure participation that will benefit the community.
      a. What is the policy gaps/issues felt in PNRM?/ trying to Identify opportunities and constraints
         i. What policy opportunities/what provisions exist for community participation in the policy, strategy, proclamation, and regulation
         ii. What the challenging/ constraining /restricting /policy provisions or which need common understanding in the current practice of PNRM?
      b. What are the policy statements safeguarding /securing community rights?
         i. What are legal opportunities/constraints/level of legal recognition of community institution and their actions- (recognition by court at all level, provisions/recognitions of community institutions' actions/roles in forest policy, proclamation, regulation and strategies, and other related laws)
            • What is legal recognition mean? What does it entail?
         ii. Legal forms of community institutions – kebele level forest cooperatives, purpose of cooperatives from cooperative side, and exploring practical experience of other forms of community institutions, how are by-laws developed, what are the challenges in enforcing these by-laws, is there a procedure for the registration of by-laws?
         iii. Preparedness of the cooperative promotion commission to organize and support forest cooperatives, in relation to the new draft forest

regulation, Do the commission need to issue directives regarding forest cooperatives

c. Sectoral policy integration and implementation as in the case with other policy implementation, agricultural development, land administration etc.

2 WHAT ARE THE KEY ISSUES IN MAINSTREAMING/SCALING UP PNRM IN TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

a) What are the key implementation issues in Mainstreaming PNRM into NRM plans and budget process

    a. Identify opportunities and constraints in policy implementation

    b. Deforestation and degradation implications in relation to PNRM and in particular with REDD

        i. Weak law enforcement by the zonal legal bodies and local level administration (Court, Prosecutor, and the Police Office)- what are the issues, why is the law not implemented?

        ii. To what extent does the Ethiopian justice system secure environmental justice and what are the constraints/challenges of the civil and Criminal codes in enforcing forest laws

    c. Awareness raising related issues of REDD, PFM and sustainability issues, Eco-region Planning, signing agreement on Emission Reduction Purchase Agreements etc..

        i. What are the opposing views/critics of the current PNRM practice?

            • What is the concern and interest of the critics on PNRM?

            • Were PFM/Participatory approaches advocated as the sole solution to all problems or as one effective approach that needs to be taken seriously and complimented by other actions

        ii. What are possible modes of addressing the concerns of the critics at the policy/ legal level? What are the possible ways of addressing the concerns of critics within forest related activities?

        iii. Share experience /Distil lessons and fed into appropriate existing networks concerning sustainable development, sustainable land management and landscape level NRM programmes

        iv. Sustainability issues, understanding environmental sustainability in light of community rights and benefits in general

        v. Linking with other cross sectorial /supportive activities like National tree planting campaign, Environment education programmes, school environment committees

b) Mainstreaming NRM into government structure, the forestry institutions, Agriculture, Health, judiciary

a. Capacity related constraints of community institutions operation (livelihood options, financial, technical, etc..)

b. Institutional set-up and capacity – Institutional linkages, planning process, human and financial resources

    i. What are the opportunities and constraints in operational linkages between federal and regional authorities

    ii. What are the opportunities and constraints in operational linkages between major regional actors, Agriculture Bureau/Forest Enterprises, Land Administration, Judiciary system,

    iii. What are human resources capacity gaps to implement PNRM at different levels and organisation of the extension system/and to use DAs at kebele level in Amhara and Oromia regions

c. Capacity building initiatives/ linking with training institutions WGCF, MWU, Bahiradr University

b. How is the current planning process with in the major government actors and What are the opportunities and constraints in Integrating planning tools (PFM planning process, Eco-region Planning etc..) into government planning process

c. What is the linkage between different initiatives like the Ethiopia's National REDD Strategy development and practical Bale REDD initiative and how to mainstream i? What other initiatives exist that complement each other

d. Financial Capacity related issues, how is the budgeting process, capital budget allocation/ proposal development, securing external funding opportunities,

    i. Simplifying PFM process/to the level of government institutional, human and financial capacity

    ii. What do government institutions /forestry departments/ need to embrace and own PNRM approaches and initiatives? How do we match their priority with PNRM and what are their priorities?

e. Who are/explore other supportive partners, NGOs, involved in PNRM

f. Identify target audience, supporters, tools of communication and success indicators for effective communication.

The team has tried to gather the concerns and feelings of stakeholders on the above issues although there were some limitations of resource and time from the respondents' side.

The study team has discussed with different actors including:

- FARM/SOS programme staff up to site level- Addis Ababa, Amhara (Bahirdar), Oromia (Addis Ababa), and SNNPRS(Bonga) (FARM/SOS Staff and partners)

- Forestry institutions at Federal, Regional, and Zonal level, Forest enterprise staff at the two regions, Technical and planning/budget preparation departments (implementing partners)

- Other implementing Actors/NGOs, GTZ AMBRO, NTFP-PFM-RD project, NABU- GTZ, SLM

- Sectoral government institutions
  - Judiciary system –prosecutors and legal bureaux at regional level and zonal level
  - Research and Training institutions Addis Ababa university, WGCF, Scientists and individuals,
  - Finance/ Planning and Economic Development (Ministry of Finance/ Federal and regional)
  - Cooperative Promotion Commission (CPO regional/federal)
  - Local administration at zonal and woreda level (Administration)

The above institutions and individuals are consulted on the above issues relevant to their area of operations.

5.2. References

Abebe Haile Gebremariam, Christopher Davey, Dena Freeman, and Nico van Wageningen, (2009), *Mid-Term Review of Bale Mountain Eco-region Sustainable Management Programme*, Full Report, FARM-Afrca/SOS Sahel, BERSMP

Abebe Mulatu (201 0) *Sustainable land management and the policy and regulatory framework*, A Report Presented to Ambero-Gitec, November 2010, Addis Ababa, (unpublished)

ABoARD (2010) *Five Year Strategic Plan GTP* (2003 -2007 EC) Draft Amhara Regional State (Unpublished)

Aklilu Ameha, (2010), *Performance of old PFM sites in Adaba-Dodola, Chilmo, Borana and Bonga sites*, Draft Report, BERSMP, FARM-Africa

Berhanu Adenew, Demese Chanyalew, and John Mellor, (2010) *Ethiopia's Agriculture Sector Policy and Investment Framework: Ten Year Road Map* (2010-2020), Draft Main Report, July 5, 2010, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia,

BERSMP (2009) *Semester II, 2009 Report: Bale Eco-Region Sustainable Management Programme*, FARM-Africa SOS Sahel, Addis Ababa (Unpublished)

Demamu Mesfin, Degnet Abebaw, Mengistie Kindu, Mulugeta Lemenih, (2009), *Benefit Sharing Mechanisms for the Bale Eco-Region Sustainable Management*, Draft Report, BERSMP, FARM-Africa,

EPE (1997) *Environmental Policy*, Environmental Protection authority, In collaboration with the, Ministry of Economic Development and Cooperation, EFDR, Addis Ababa,

FAO (2009), State of the World's Forests 2009 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome

MoFED (2010) *Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP),* 2010/11-2014/15, Draft, September 2010, Addis Ababa

MNREP (1994) *National Conservation Strategy*, Volume I, National Conservation Strategy Secretariat, Ministry of Natural Resources Development and Environmental Protection, Addis Ababa**,**

OFWE (2010) *BPR Study, (Summary),* January 2010, Addis Ababa (Unpublished)

Sisay Nune, Menale Kassie and Eric Mungatana (2010), *Forestry Resources Accounting: The experience of Ethiopia*, Draft, Center for Environmental Economics and policy in Africa (CEEPA) (Unpublished)

Tsegaye Tadesse (2010) *Pursuing REDD+ through PFM: Early Experiences from the Bale Mountain's REDD Project in Ethiopia*, PERSPECTIVES SERIES 2010, (113-125), UNEP Risø Centre, Systems Analysis Division, Risø National Laboratory for Sustainable Energy, Technical University of Denmark

Teklaregay Jirane., Tsegaye Tadesse and Zelalem Temesgen. (2008) *PFM in Oromia and SNNP regions of Ethiopia: A review of experience, constraints and implications for forest policy: Policies to Increase Forest Cover in Ethiopia.* Proceedings of a policy workshop organised by Environmental Economics Policy Forum for Ethiopia, Ethiopian Development Research Institute. Global Hotel, Addis Ababa

Hobly, Mary (1996), *Institutional change within the forestry sector: Centralized decentralization, ODI* Working Paper 92, Overseas Development Institute, London

5.3. People contacted

Date	Institution/responsibility	Name
25/11/2010	FARM-Africa SOS Sahel	Ato Tsegaye Tadesse
25/11/2010	FARM-Africa SOS Sahel	Ato Tekelearegay Jirane
25/11/2010	FARM-Africa SOS Sahel	Mr. Ben Irwin
25/11/2010	FARM-Africa SOS Sahel, SSLFMEP, Oromia	Ato Alemayehu
29/11/2011	Wondogenet Forestry College	Dr Melaku Bekele
29/11/2011	Wondogenet Forestry College	Dr Tsegaye Bekele
29/11/2011	Wondogenet Forestry College	Ato Matewos Ersado
29/11/2011 30/11/2011	Natural Resources, Development and Conservation Process Owner, and Deputy General Manager - SNNPR	Ato Mohammed Nur Faris
29/11/2011 30/11/30	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Authority – Team Leader,	W/zo Amelework Dubale
29/11/2011	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Authority	Ato Siraji Bekele
30/11/2011	Cooperatives Development Process Owner, Marketing and Cooperatives Process	Ato Anesa Melko Hebero
30/11/2011	Marketing and Cooperatives Bureau Officer	Ato Berhanu Asfaw
30/11/2011	Justice Bureau, legal drafting and awareness process owner, SNNPR	Ato Tefera wardelo
30/11/2011	Deputy Bureau head, BoFED, Plan preparation, M&E main process owner	Ato Aklilu T/silasie
3/12/2011	NABU, communication officer, Bonga	Ato Wondu W/Senbet
3/12/2011	FARM-Africa, SSLFMEP, SNNPRS	Ato Solomon Hailu
3/12/2011	FARM-Africa, SSLFMEP, SNNPRS	W/ro Luwiza W/Gebriel
3/11/2011	FARM-Africa, SSLFMEP, SNNPRS	Ato Alemu
3/11/2011	Agama PFM community , members and executive committee members, Bonga	6 Female and 18 male members
3/11/2011	PFM Officer, Bonga	Ato Yahiya Adem
4/11/2011	NTFP –PFM-RD , Policy Advisor	Ato Abbebe Haile
5/12/2011	NTFP-PFM-RD Project Coordinator, Mizan	Ato Emiyayehu Ejig Semahu
5/12/2011	NTFP-RD Project Coordinator, Mizan	Ato Abebe Haile
6/12/2011	Jimma zone, ARDD, Forest and Environmental Protection core process owner	Ato Misrak Tafese
8/12/2011	AFE, General Manager	Ato Feleke

Date	Institution/responsibility	Name
8/12/2011	Deputy Head of Department, Forest	Ato Solomon Ayele
8/12/2011	ORDA, Policy Advisor, -GAA	Dr Yeshanew Ashagere
9/12/2011	Planning Department of Bureau of	Ato Lemma Mekonnen
9/12/2011	Biodiversity Programme Manager, ORDA	Ato Getachew Tamiru
9/12/2011	Project Officer, ORDA	Ato Getu
9/12/2011	Cooperative Promotion Process owner, Amahara Region	Ato Mengistu Gidey
9/12/2011	FARM-Africa, SSLFMEP, Amhara Region Coordinator, Bahir Dar	Ato Abraham
9/12/2011	Natural Resources Development Conservation	Ato Aytenew Endeshaw
9/12/2011	Amhara Region SLM, Deputy Manager GTZ	Dr Zerfu Hailu
9/12/2011	Amhara Region SLM, Legal Advisor, GTZ	Ato leake Libanos
12/12/2011	Associations and Charities Agency, Information analysis Officer	Ato Endeshaw Regassa
12/12/2011	Small and Medium Scale Enterprise Registration, Development and support process performer, MOTUD Development	Ato Awel Adem
21/12/2011	GTZ-Ambero- PFM officer	Ato Ziyinu Lemma
21/12/2011	GTZ –Ambero PFM Project Coordinator	Ms Beate
22/12/2011	OFWE, Development, Deputy Director	Ato Ararsa
22/12/2011	OFWE, Forest Development and Utilisation Directorate process owner	Ato Diro bulbula
22/12/2011	OFWE, Community Participation core process owner	Ato Dereje
22/12/2011	Forestry Advisor SLM, GTZ	Ato Kiflu Segu
22/12/2011	Policy Advisor SLM, GTZ	Ato Amare Worku
22/12/2011	Deputy Director SLM, GTZ	Dr Tesfaye Meberhatu
23/12/2011	SLM Coordinator, MOARD,	Ato Daniel Danano
27/12/2011	MOA, Natural Resources Development and Conservation Directorate	Ato Husen Kebede
27/12/2011	MOA, Natural Resources Development and Conservation Directorate, Forestry expert	Ato Tefera Tadesse
27/12/2011	Environment	Dr Tadesse W/mariam Golle
28/12/2011	Addis Ababa University	Professor Ensermu Kelbessa

5.4. Terms of Reference

To **support Policy Strategy development** for FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel Ethiopia Participaroty Natural Resource Management (PNRM) Programmes;

Bale EcoRegion Sustainable Management Programme (BERSMP)

Strengthening Sustainable Livelihoods and Forest Management in Ethiopia (SSLFM)

Background

FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel Ethiopia's two PNRM programmes BERSMP / SSLFMP both aim to secure the sustainable management of Ethiopia's forests and reduce environmental degradation. To this end, both programmes work closely with government partners to establish and/or improve federal and regional forest policy, regulations and practices. The key aim of this work is to explicitly incorporate PFM approaches and formally recognize forest use rights of local communities into forest policy and regulations, and to promote the sustainable management of forest resources in practice.

 In addition, both programmes aim to work with and develop the capacities of Woreda and Kebelle Government and Community level institutions. BERSMP and SSLFM develop skills and expertise in sustainable forest management through the training and implementation of Participatory Forest Management, institutional capacity building and experience sharing. In this way it is envisaged that all stakeholders at the level of local government and within local communities will be empowered and enabled to promote and achieve sustainable forest management, and improve forest based livelihoods to alleviate poverty.

A key focus of the BERSMP / SSLFM programme in terms of Forest Policy (and linked policies) is to undertake advocacy and lobbying activities to influence policy and decision makers at various levels. Again the aim is to mainstream PFM in the regional and federal forest polces. To this effect, examples of activities undertaken to date include a range of policy discussion forums, and study tours, were members of federal parliament have been invited to visit the PFM programme sites in Oromia and SNNPR. These types of activities have positively impacted on the scaling up of PFM in new regions such as Benishagul Gumuz and Amhara regions (both Regions requesting FARM SOS to come to the Region and start PFM activities). Further advocacy actions of the programme have supported the federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to develop forest regulations for the new forest proclamation no.542 of 2007. The regulation, which was developed by range of key stakeholders, NGOs and higher educational institutions, is anticipated to be endorsed by the Council of Ministers in the near future. FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel trusts that the regulation will ultimately address the key gaps in understanding and implementation of the forest proclamation.

In consideration that the above mentioned actions, forest policy advocacy work is currently being done by FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel (often in partnership with other organizations). However one recommendation of the BERSMP MTR (2009) was to formalize and strategies

this work. The MTR noted that, although BERSMP is strong on short-term advocacy actions to address specific issues related to forest regulations, institutions, etc., there is no strategy or guidance to provide a sustained policy support strategy to influence national / regional development plans and policies. It was therefore recommended that FARM-Africa/SOS Sahel develop a Policy Support Strategy. FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel therefore is looking for an experienced Consultant to develop a comprehensive PNRM Policy Advocacy Strategy.

FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel's guiding principles and policies underline the importance of, and need for, policy support for community based natural resource management (CbNRM). Both organizations specify that policy support to government, to promote community participation for improved natural resource management, based on evidence based best practice, is very important.

Policy support in the context of CbNRM can be broadly defined as;

a deliberate process of assisting those who make policy decisions to achieve positive changes for better natural resource management through community centered approaches based on evidence, experience and knowledge of working directly with relevant government institutions and communities.

Evidence-based policy support is important in bringing about appropriate changes in policy and practice, helping to develop sustainable solutions for the proper management of natural resources by ensuring that national and regional policies support CbNRM.

General Aims and Objectives

The aim of this Consultancy Work is to:

- Develop a Policy Support Strategy to provide sustained policy support to influence national / regional development (NRM) policies, plans and practices.

- Identify key policy issues and gaps with reference to forest management and community based natural resources management.

- Design the appropriate strategies to support the adoption of PFM and CbNRM in to Federal and Regional Forest Policies

- Undertake gap analysis in sectoral policies and make explicit recommendations on how to address identified gaps

Specific Objectives of the Consultancy are to:
- Review the current status of policy lobby and advocacy initiatives, the procedures followed and tools used by FARM-Africa and SOS Sahel Ethiopia in Ethiopia in forestry and CbNRM

- Identify key policy lobbying and advocacy approaches and methodologies required to help government mainstream PFM / CbNRM throughout Ethiopia;

- Identify policy lobbying and advocacy related activities geared towards disseminating experiences and promoting debate within Ethiopia on PFM and CbNRM issues.

- Identify the gaps in related government forest policy and environmental law with regards to PFM and CbNRM, and make recommendations to address gaps

- Identify the roles of different actors in the policy strategy, and recommend with which strategic alliances may be formed.

Specific Tasks
- Together with FARM/SOS PNRM unit Policy Advisor, produce a Policy Support Strategy for the BERSMP / SSLFM progammes
- Review key NRM policy documents and proclamations at Federal and Regional levels
- Undertake discussions with key policy stakeholders and FARM/SOS staff members to assess their understanding and needs to formulate the policy strategy

2. Methodology
Undertake a Federal / Regional Policy analysis

The work will involve

- research and discussions with staff in the different project sites, focus group discussion of key policy institutions and stakeholders involved in similar actions,
- Document reviews including various policy strategy documents, relevant proclamations, studies on Ethiopia's relevant policies etc.
- facilitation of a policy workshop, with key staff / stakeholders
- the production of a the written Policy Support Strategy document.

Reference Documents
- Key project documents, reports prepared by the FARM Africa/SOS Sahel,
- Various sectorial policy documents, proclamations, regulations, etc…
- Relevant strategic policy guidelines, manuals and reference material based on countries with similar context

3. Expected Outputs
- Develop a Policy Support Strategy reflecting evidence based advocacy policy strategies and tools
- Identify the latest practices in policy support including monitoring and evaluating policy advocacy. Analyze current FARM-Africa/SOS Sahel and other organizations

experiences and propose relevant up-to-date ideas recognizing the unique nature of policy support work as compared to other forms of development efforts.
- Recommendation of how the BERSMP / SSLFM could improve monitoring progress in achieving policy influence outputs and impacts.
- Produce FARM-Africa / SOS Sahel Ethiopia Policy Support Strategy

4. Deliverables_Policy Support Strategy

In line with the above mentioned key and specific areas of review the Policy Support Strategy document shall incorporate findings and recommendations to achieve policy objectives.

The Policy Support Strategy will contain the following:

- An overview of the current policy framework (Federal and Regional (x4)) relevant to natural resources and community participation and identification of gaps
- Distinctive features and guiding principles of policy support for community based natural resource management / PFM
- Lists of what needs to be changed/addressed with regard to previous policy support strategies that are being followed considering FARM-Africa/SOS Sahel mandate and the new legislation on charity organizations.
- Practical recommendations on how to design and implement Policy support initiatives to generate credible, useful, and timely evidence for policy advocacy and decision-making affecting PFM / CbNRM.
- Short-term, mid-term and long-term policy support strategies including meaningful and interpretative monitoring / impact indicators
- Recommendations on utilization of community participation approaches in policy advocacy actions;
- Examples of checklists, interview and observation plans, etc. that can be used to evaluate BERSMP / SSLFM's policy advocacy initiatives.

Working modality and Timeframe

The consultancy work will be carried out as soon as possible in Aug/Sept 2010. This includes travel, discussion with staff and stakeholders, conducting workshop and document writing. The exact timetable will be worked out in consultation with the PFMU. The final document is expected to be delivered within 2 weeks of the conclusion of the field work. The consultant is expected to provide a Policy Support Strategy document of high quality with supporting evidences in due time.

A first draft of the document should be completed by the end of Aug/Sept 2010. The final draft of the document should be finalized after incorporating comments forwarded by the FARM/SOS by the end of Sept 2010. The consultant will also make a presentation at FARM-Africa Country Office to share the conclusions and recommendations with relevant senior staff.

Consultant Specification - Qualifications. Knowledge and Experience Required
Education: Advanced university degree in social sciences or a related technical field.
Formal training in policy related field is essential.
Work experience and Qualifications: A minimum of 10 years professional work experience
in policy support initiatives, with at least 3-4 years in evaluating policy advocacy work;
experience in planning and implementing policy support affecting communities in the
context of NRM; a proven experience in developing policy guidelines and toolkits.

Application
Individuals interested in conducting this work should send their CV and a concise technical
and financial proposal to FARM-Africa Country Office or e-mail to the Project Manager
BERSMP tsegayet@farmafrica-eth.org and or to Project Coordinator SSLFMP
beni@farmafrica-eth.org

Please send your applications (technical and financial proposals) before October 15, 2010.