

**THE WORLD BANK GROUP ARCHIVES**

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

**Folder Title:** Agriculture [AGR] - DR - Dissemination - Conference and Workshop - General - 1992 - Chronological Record - Volume 1

**Folder ID:** 1188367

**Series:** Chronological files

**Dates:** 05/18/1992 - 05/22/1992

**Fonds:** Records of the Agriculture and Rural Development Sector

**ISAD Reference Code:** WB IBRD/IDA AGR-01

**Digitized:** 01/21/2022

To cite materials from this archival folder, please follow the following format:  
[Descriptive name of item], [Folder Title], Folder ID [Folder ID], ISAD(G) Reference Code [Reference Code], [Each Level Label as applicable], World Bank Group Archives, Washington, D.C., United States.

The records in this folder were created or received by The World Bank in the course of its business.

The records that were created by the staff of The World Bank are subject to the Bank's copyright.

Please refer to <http://www.worldbank.org/terms-of-use-earchives> for full copyright terms of use and disclaimers.



THE WORLD BANK

Washington, D.C.

© International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / International Development Association or

The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**



The World Bank Group  
**Archives**



**1188367**

R1996-012 Other #. 12 Box #110281B

Agriculture [AGR] - DR - Dissemination - Conference and Workshop -  
General - 1992 - Chronological Record - Volume 1

**DECLASSIFIED**  
WBG Archives

RETURN TO INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION  
SERVICES CENTER

**A  
G  
R**

**92  
01**

Dissemination - Conferences and  
Workshops - General

**D  
R**

150 Files

AGRA - DISSEMINATION AND  
TRAINING - CONFERENCES & WORK-  
SHOPS - GENERAL

# TROPICAL FORESTRY ACTION PLAN

SUMMARY REPORT ON  
THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE T.F.A.P. FORESTRY ADVISERS  
ON HARMONIZING  
INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

18-22 MAY 1992 DUBLIN-IRELAND

**TFAP FORESTRY ADVISERS GROUP  
FOURTEENTH MEETING  
DUBLIN, 18 - 22 MAY 1992**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Introduction
2. Report and follow-up on the 13th FA-Group Meeting and the 9th Steering Committee Meeting.
3. Report and discussion on the outcome of the 1st and 2nd Ad Hoc Group Meeting, the recent CFDT Meeting the "position of the FA-Group re the Consultative Forum"
4. Report and discussion on the outcome of the UNCED's final preparatory meetings for Rio
5. Report and discussion on the outcome of the Joint Evaluation of the FAO-TFAP Multi-Donor Trust Fund
6. Multi-Donor Trust Fund II
7. Satellite Meetings
  - 7.1. FA-Group Task Force and Study Team
  - 7.2. Communications Strategies
  - 7.3. Multi-Donor Trust Fund
8. Country Capacity for National Forestry Programmes
9. Progress Report on NFAPs and other TFAP CU activities
10. Presentation and discussion of NFAPs and regional issues
  - 10.1. Asia
  - 10.2. Latin America
  - 10.3. Africa
11. Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
12. Target 2000, ITTO and relation to TFAP
13. EEC forest activities
14. Report on National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs)
15. Presentation on the GEF
16. Public Meeting
17. Where do we go from here?



## LIST OF ANNEXES

1. Agenda
2. List of participants
3. TFAP Donor participation list
4. Report of Working Group 1: Task Force and Study Team
5. Report of Working Group 2: Communications Strategies
6. Report of Working Group 3: MDTF and CCPs
7. Country Capacity for National Forest Programmes; UNDP Presentation to TFAP Advisers Group
8. UNDP Project Brief on Country Capacity Projects

**TROPICAL FOREST ACTION PROGRAMME  
FORESTRY ADVISERS GROUP (TFAP-FA)  
FOURTEENTH MEETING, DUBLIN  
18-22 MAY, 1992**

**MINUTES**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The fourteenth meeting of the TFAP Forestry Advisers Group (FA-Group) was held in Dublin, Ireland, 18 - 22 May 1992. Twenty-nine representatives from donor countries, development banks, and international organizations together with 3 representatives from Asia and Latin America, discussed progress in the implementation and restructuring of the TFAP.

The agenda of the meeting is presented in Annex 1 and the list of participants, in Annex 2. The meeting included satellite sessions on: 1) Terms of Reference for the Task Force on TFAP; 2) Communication strategies, and 3) the Multi-Donor Trust Fund.

The meeting was opened by the Chairperson, Mr. Ralph Roberts who welcomed all participants. The proposed agenda was amended by the Steering Committee at a meeting the afternoon of the 17th of May and was adopted without changes. In his opening address, Mr. Paul Byrne, Secretary of the Irish Forestry Board, on behalf of the Minister for Energy, Mr. Robert Molloy, emphasized Ireland's increasing support for international measures against forest destruction, especially through the EEC, the ITTO, TFAP, and, recently, the International Convention on Climatic Change. He further explained that Ireland's forestry history was largely similar to that of present-day developing countries. Ireland's forests had virtually disappeared by 1900, and only from then on reforestation was gradually built up - initially with external assistance - to a plantation rate of over 20,000 ha/year. At present, forests cover around 7.7% of Ireland's land area and Irish forestry has now entered the phase of profitable and sustainable production. He stressed that developing countries might now benefit from Ireland's experience.

**2. REPORT AND FOLLOW-UP ON THE 13TH FA-GROUP MEETING IN ROME AND THE 9TH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN NEW YORK**

Mr. Ralph Roberts reported that after the 13th FA-Group Meeting in Rome in December 1991, the following meetings were held: two Ad Hoc Group meetings of the FAO Council, one CFDT meeting, and the 9th TFAP Steering Committee. All meetings in one way or another dealt with institutional arrangements concerning a consultative mechanism for TFAP.

The 9th TFAP Steering Committee was held in New York back-to-back with the 4th UNCED Prepcom meeting. Minutes have been sent separately to participants and are available from the Secretariat on request. Among the topics discussed were the following: 1) Follow-up work on institutional arrangements on TFAP reform, 2) Other aspects of donor coordination in forestry 3) The review of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), 4) the Options Paper on the CF (see item 3); and 5) TFAP's position at the 4th UNCED Prepcom and in the GEF. Mr Roberts highlighted the absence at this meeting of the FAO-TFAP Coordinator. As a result of point 2), a Task Force was proposed for which Terms of Reference were drafted (see item 7).

**3. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE 1ST AND 2ND AD HOC GROUP MEETING, THE RECENT CFDT MEETING IN ROME AND ON THE "POSITION OF THE FA-GROUP RE THE CONSULTATIVE FORUM"**

The first of the two Ad Hoc Group meetings of the FAO Council was held immediately before the FAO-CFDT Meeting in Rome, followed by a second meeting on 5 May 1992. At the second meeting, an Options Paper was



discussed in which five options for institutionalizing a consultative mechanism were presented. While most OECD countries preferred Option 5 (a new consultative mechanism), other countries preferred internalizing a Consultative Forum within the FAO structure. A Working Party was set up to work out these options. Mr. Roberts expressed his concern about this development which seemed to deviate from the consensus and momentum gained at the previous Geneva and Paris high-level meetings.

In his report of the FAO CFDT meeting in Rome in December 1991, Mr. Roberts highlighted 1) a paper on funding developments in developing countries, and 2) suggestions which were made by forestry advisers to revitalize the CFDT and make it more technically oriented. In this respect he mentioned the recent creation of the Foresters' Forum for Developing Countries, which hopefully would contribute to increased quality of the CFDT meetings. Mr. Röbbel representing FAO announced that the next CFDT meeting would probably be postponed to 1994. The next COFO meeting would take place in March 1993. Copies of Mr Roberts' report to CFDT on TFAP have been sent to TFAP Steering Committee members and are available on request.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted:

- The need and possibilities for transformation of the CFDT to a more technical forum was emphasized;
- The need for a "speedy resolution" concerning the Consultative Forum was discussed and recognized at the CFDT meeting, but the shape of this forum was not discussed;
- The lack of progress in institutional reform was commented upon, especially since total ODA on forestry has risen to appr. \$ 1,3 billion at present, and the UNCED Agenda 21 will require \$ 6 billion per year for the coming decennium.

#### **4. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE UNCED'S FINAL PREPARATORY MEETINGS FOR RIO**

Mr. Bernardo Zentilli reported progress on forestry discussions during the four preparatory meetings (PREPCOMs) for UNCED. As a result, two different sets of documents have been prepared for final negotiations in Rio: 1) A non-legally binding set of principles concerning all forests in the world, to be presented separate from the Earth Charter; and 2) Agenda 21, Chapter 11 which contains 4 major programmes on forests.

He further reported that the discussions had been characterised by:

- A unexpectedly high level of participation at political and global level from over 60 delegations, including many multilateral organisations, governments, and NGOs;
- An expansion of the approach to include all forests instead of only tropical forests;
- Strong support for meeting indigenous people's needs, participative programmes, attention for special groups like women, youth, etc.;
- Increased emphasis on interlinkages with other sectors;
- Very weak participation of technical experts in delegations;

The FA Group was further urged to look into the links to forestry emerging from the preparation of other conventions, namely the Conventions on Climatic Change and on Biodiversity. The issue of developing a Convention on Forests remains undecided. So far there is no official discussion to transform the Principle into a Convention although some countries would favour this evolution.

During subsequent discussions, the following points were raised:

- The importance of maximizing "visibility" of the forestry programmes was stressed. They might otherwise be by-passed by many uncoordinated initiatives which are the result of the present high public interest in forestry;
- These Programmes together with the TFAP operational principles and guidelines could form the basis of an up-dated doctrine for donor and recipient country cooperation;
- In order to provide decision-makers at the Rio conference with an order of magnitude of costs involved,



an estimate of funding requirements for combatting deforestation was made in Prepcom III; however, caution was urged not to use these figures as final estimates;

- Further informal negotiations on Agenda 21 will be held during the first days of the UNCED to finalize texts;
- Over 3000 NGOs have registered for participation in UNCED;
- Three members of the FA-Group would attend the UNCED;

## **5. REPORT AND DISCUSSION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE JOINT EVALUATION OF THE FAO-TFAP MULTI-DONOR TRUST FUND**

Mr. Egbert Pelinck reported the outcome of the joint evaluation of the FAO-TFAP Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) which was carried out in January 1992. The report has been sent to all interested OECD and G-77 countries. The mission consisted of representatives from developing countries (2), donor countries (2), and FAO (1). The evaluation process included extensive consultation with the members of the TFAP-CU and other actors inside and outside FAO and in developing as well as donor countries. FAO was complimented for maximizing interaction with all these groups.

The mission had noted that the six objectives which could be distilled from the nine project documents were quite ambitious in relation to the budget which was around \$ 2 million/yr, i.e. 0.2% of total ODA in forestry.

The mission found that the project had been successful in:

- Supporting individual NFAPs, and increasing forestry to a higher political level in the countries;
- Promoting TCDC, by exchange of information between National Coordinators;
- Development of Operational Principles and Guidelines for TFAP;
- Facilitating technical advice for NFAPs;
- Crucial staff support to the Regular Programme;
- Integrating MDTF activities in the FAO Field Programme;
- Flexible response to changes in the TFAP approach in developing countries.

Negative aspects of the project had been the following:

- The nine project documents underlying the project were not consistent and clear;
- The project's work programmes were more demand-driven than objective-driven, which resulted in questionable priority setting;
- Cohesion management of the TFAP-CU by the FAO Forestry Department was missing;
- The CU had taken insufficient steps to ensure donor coordination in the follow-up of Round Tables; especially reports of Round Tables III were seldom made available, so that donors were seldom confronted with their own promises;
- There was a lack of publicly available information on TFAP, and FAO had insufficiently used its potential for generating thematic support documents.

The mission recommended that all nine project documents should terminate on 30 September 1992, and that a new project based on one common document with a single set of objectives should start from then on. The future outlook for TFAP would be as follows:

- First priority will have to be given to NFAPs in developing countries;
- Donor organization will for the time being continue to be based on country-to-country funding mechanisms; Although several sector-based funds have been created recently, there is insufficient reason to expect them to replace bilateral support for launching action in forestry;
- As for multilateral channels, efforts should be made by donor agencies to prevent the development of multilateral mechanisms parallel to TFAP; the combining of the Master Plan and the TFAP approach at the Yogyakarta Regional Meeting was a successful example in this respect;



- FAO - which has indicated a budget for TFAP for the next biennium of appr. \$ 3 million under its Regular Programme - should concentrate on those areas where it has an exclusive mandate, such as: thematic analysis of global forestry issues, technical backstopping, liaison and information supply, and support to regionalization. The new MDTF would support this focus;
- The "country-driven" character of the process has been emphasized both by donor agencies and by developing countries;
- Country Capacity Projects should be agreed upon and launched as soon as possible since they are an increasingly important mechanism to maintain the momentum of TFAP in a country (see also item 8).

In the discussion on the evaluation, the following subjects were raised:

- The mission has recommended that in the follow-up MDTF, funds should be allocated per region, in order to separate field activities from global activities;
- When the Consultative Forum does come into being, its possible role in information distribution should be investigated;
- The MDTF's management has been implicated by the fact that it was "a field project based at Headquarters" and improvement in the follow-up proposal (see item 6) was recommended,
- The mission's recommendation to establish a formal Steering Committee in support of any new MDTF was welcomed.

## 6. MULTI-DONOR TRUST FUND II (MDTF II)

Mr. Hans Röbbel presented the draft project document on the MDTF II. Mr. Röbbel opened his presentation by stating that the proposed project is to address the six problem areas identified by the Joint Evaluation Mission (see also item 5):

- Insufficient country capacity to take the leadership in NFAPs,
- Lack of experience in the implementation of the revamped TFAP among tropical countries, donor and international agencies,
- Insufficient quality multi-disciplinary technical support and guidance to ensure the effectiveness of the revamped TFAP,
- Insufficient flexible funding support to remove critical bottlenecks in the TFAP process and in the planning and implementation of NFAPs,
- Insufficient information on key aspects of the TFAP process to all TFAP partners and requirement for an efficient monitoring system on overall TFAP progress,
- Insufficient levels and effectiveness of international support.

The "strategic design" of the project "is guided" by the recommendations of the Joint Evaluation Mission of the MDTF I:

- "Coherence with and reflecting the priorities and focus of the revamped TFAP and the comparative advantage of the FAO",
- "Achieving balance between FAO's potential roles in liaison, technical and operational support and realistic assessment of FAO's carrying capacities, and
- "Continued flexibility in the application of support to this project".

The project is designed as programme support to FAO's activities in relation to TFAP, i.e FAO's Regular Programme (RP). In addition to RP staff ad hoc inputs to TFAP, the allocation of RP financial resources for TFAP for the biennium 1992-93 is \$US 3,106,000.

In his presentation Mr. Röbbel stressed the importance of the two immediate objectives:

- Effective support to strengthen country capacity capability for the multi-disciplinary preparation, conduct and implementation of NFAPs, and

- Promote cooperation and consultations among all TFAP partners.

Activities and outputs for a 3 yr. MDTF II, considered as an integral part of TFAP, were outlined followed by the budget:

Year #1	-	\$ 2,495,492
Year #2	-	\$ 2,572,983
Year #3	-	\$ 2,839,122

---

Grand Total    \$ 7,907,597

Mr. Röbbel closed his presentation with the observation that initially it was anticipated that the contents of the new project would have been agreed upon, and approval have been obtained from donors, by September 1992. This is unlikely to happen for a number of reasons peculiar to the FAO bureaucracy. Mr. Röbbel expressed scepticism that it would be possible to create a common document with a single set of objectives agreeable to all donors (see also 5). Mr. Röbbel therefore suggested that a fifteen months interim funding should perhaps be considered by the donors. Assuming this to be a feasible solution the FAO has made a needs study on the basis of regions:

- o for Africa                      - approximately \$US 500,000
- o for Latin America       - approximately \$US 600,000
- o for Asia                        - approximately \$US 330,000
- o for Global activities - approximately \$US 900,000

Both the "3-year MDTF II proposal" and the "15 months bridging MDTF" were subjected to detailed discussions on policy and finances by the Forestry Advisors.

The question was raised, why the Regional Advisors are located in Rome and not at focal points in the regions they represent. The point was made that by doing so the Coordinating Unit would be deprived of half of its professional staff and replacement would be needed at the centre. This is under the present circumstances clearly impossible.

Interest in mounting a "15 month bridging period" proved to be such, that a special satellite meeting was organized to accommodate detailed discussions consisting of TFAP FA-Group members representing donors with particular interest in the MDTF.

## 7. SATELLITE MEETINGS

It evolved during the plenary session that three working groups were needed to deal effectively with some of the major issues tabled at the 14th meeting of the Forestry Advisors Group. These were:

1. The FA-Group Task Force and Study Team on New Approaches to Partnership Arrangements in Forest Development and Conservation;
2. Communication Strategies; and
3. Multi-Donor Trust Fund (see item 6).

These working groups sat during the first half of Tuesday and Wednesday morning, and presented their conclusions and recommendations in plenary sessions on Wednesday and Thursday afternoon. The output from these sessions can be found in appendices 4, 5 and 6.

### 7.1. The FA-Group Task Force and Study Team

Ralph Roberts, followed by Twig Johnson, introduced and discussed major aspects of the proposed study on new approaches to partnership arrangements in forest development and conservation. The discussion, which largely



centred on the need for the study and on what it is expected to accomplish, touched upon:

- The purpose and scope of the study,
- The terms of reference for the study,
- The composition and size of the study team,
- The method of the study's execution,
- Commitments of support, and
- The problem of to whom and when to report.

Subsequent discussions among the advisors demonstrated clearly the need for a comprehensive effort by a working group to reach agreement on all of the study aspects listed above..

The chairperson of the working group, Mr. Jean Clément, introduced the major points of the new draft outline of the terms of reference:

- A strong focus upon improvement of collaboration among all partners,
- Concentration of efforts at the national level,

Jean Clément's introduction was followed by a sometimes intense debate among the Advisors. Major questions that were raised and discussed in depth included:

- Is the primary focus of the study the future role of the Forestry Advisors Group - within the TFAP process or on a global scale ?
- Will the output of the study be complementary to the output of the Joint Evaluation Mission - i.e. present alternatives based on an in-depth analysis supported by time and budget information ?
- Will the study present a new and clearer vision of TFAP - a "new theology" - which will cause the bi-lateral agencies represented among the Advisors to continue or expand their support in the process of establishing sustainable forestry on a global scale ?
- More specifically, will the future of the Coordinating Unit, and viable alternatives to its continued existence, as expressed in several FA-Group papers and statements, be analyzed in the required detail ?
- Will the study examine past and future of the role of the FAO and other sponsors and develop new information on leadership and the Consultative Forum ?
- Should point 3.6 on Future Action, as expressed by the working group on "Principles and Sponsor-Partnership of TFAP" during the 13th TFAP FA-Group meeting in Rome not be used as a departure point for the study.

The discussion closed with a paragraph by paragraph editing of the 5th draft of the terms of reference. The resulting 6th draft was presented in plenary on Thursday afternoon.

After the above mentioned issues were visited once more, in particular with respect to expected outputs of the study. Expected outputs are summarized below:

#### At the National Level

- Definition of alternative mechanisms for cooperation in implementing CCPs and other activities linked to NFAPs.

#### At the International Level

- Definition of alternatives in institutional arrangements including the Consultative Forum and the TFAP Support Centre,
- An up-dated doctrine for cooperation in forestry based on TFAP operational principles and guidelines and Agenda 21 Forest Programmes, and
- An up-date on the role and mandate of the TFAP FA-Group,

The meeting adopted the 6th draft and moved to the selection of the task force whose principle task is to act as the steering committee of the study on behalf of the FA-Group. During the selection process members briefly discussed potential areas of conflict between management vs participation in the study. The composition of the study team, in particular with respect to representation from developing countries was discussed. No recommendations could be made since the availability of funds still remained to be settled.

The composition of the task force was decided to be:

- o Ralph Roberts
- o Caroline Sargent
- o Jean-Jacques Faure
- o Reidar Persson
- o Twig Johnson
- o Chip Rowe
- o Christian Mersmann
- o Tom Fox

Task force members will undertake on an individual basis to forward to Ralph Roberts, no later than the first week of June:

- An elaboration, with emphasis on expected outputs, of the 6th draft of the terms of reference,
- The composition of the study team and a list of candidates,
- A budget for the execution of the study in relation to expected output of the study and the composition/size of the study team,

Parallel to the elaboration of the terms of reference Caroline Sargent undertook to prepare a work plan and cost for management of the study by IIED.

Jean Clément informed the Advisers that he will be able to free himself from his normal duties to participate in the study team. Furthermore France is prepared to contribute an expert from an African developing country to the study team as well as office accommodation and support in Paris on an as needed basis.

## **7.2. Communications Strategies**

Mrs. Caroline Sargent recounted how the idea for a Group effort in communications was born during the 13th meeting in Rome this year. The original purpose was the production of an information document for UNCED on what TFAP was all about.

The discussions that followed Caroline's introduction of the topic showed a lively interest of the role of communications in the TFAP and it was decided to strike a working group on this topic. Annex 4 presents the result of the discussion which include a proposal for the preparation of a Communications Strategy.

## **7.3. Multi Donor Trust Fund and Country Capacity Projects**

The decision to strike a working group on the Multi Donor Trust Fund grew out of 1) the realization that a bridging period is needed to ensure continued operation of the Coordination Unit to prevent a serious hiatus in the TFAP operations and 2) the discussion on proposal for CCPs presented by UNDP (see item 8). The results of the working group were discussed in plenary and the final results are presented in annex 5.



## 8. COUNTRY CAPACITY FOR NATIONAL FORESTRY PROGRAMMES

Ralph Schmidt presented a UNDP proposal for a project facilitating the expansion of the capacity to manage national forestry programmes. This proposal had been solicited by the FA Group Steering Committee.

Principal elements of the capacity of a country to manage national forestry programmes include:

- The national government should be the driving force,
- The national government should ensure wide and continued participation - including community and public interest groups - in programming discussions,
- There should be meaningful involvement by many government sectors and society,
- Donors should participate in the design and execution of the national programme, and
- The national government should assure that donors' programmes are complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Ralph Schmidt pointed out that many donors participate on a bilateral basis in international forestry development. This necessitates coordination of their efforts by developing countries. The co-ordination of a national forestry programme which requires the cooperation of a number of ministries; participation by the private sector, people's groups and NGOs, and cooperation with bilateral donors and inter-governmental organizations is extremely complex. Most developing countries need international assistance to achieve this. There is a acute need in many coun for securing long-term support for forest programming.

Presently UNDP funds national forest management units through IPF <sup>1/</sup> resources in more than 20 countries. These programmes are developed individually within each country and have different approaches. A complementary alternative is a special fund administered by UNDP. Resident representatives, and governments through them, are made aware of funding that is available and for what purpose(s). Once agreement has been reached on how funds are to be utilized in the country programmes, they are transferred to the Resident representative and funds are administered under standard regulations.

UNDP could join with other donors in establishing a programme for "Support to Country Capacity for Forest Programmes". Ralph Schmidt advanced that \$US 20 million is a reasonable figure to start a global effort to facilitate coherent national programmes financed from other national and bi-lateral sources. The Support to Country Capacity is to provide the central identity without which it is difficult to achieve a strong, coherent international forestry programme.

Mr. Schmidt stressed the critical importance of establishing the Support Programme in the very near future. The international community has been waiting on a fully supported forestry programme since the June 1990 propos to revise the TFAP. It is not likely that any of the current activities directly or indirectly related to forestry - the Rio Conference including the forest principles discussion, the FAO AD-HOC process, the Developing Countries Forest Forum, the review of the MDTF for the TFAP CU, the Bio-Diversity and Climate Convention negotiations, and the review of the Global Environment Facility - will provide adequate support for comprehensive national forestry programmes in the near future.

Mr. Schmidt emphasized the fact that 75 developing nations have committed themselves to forest development guided by the operational principles of TFAP. These important forestry programmes should not be allowed to "whither for want of international support".

The discussion that followed revealed a great deal of interest among the Advisors in the potential benefits of the Support Programme to developing countries' national forestry programmes. At the same time many expressed a deep concern about the need for effective management of the programme to assure the use of funds for the purposes intended. Some of the major issues that were raised are the following:

---

<sup>1/</sup> Indicative Programme Funds



- What are the reasons for not using IPF;
- The proposal includes a sound justification of the need for the programme but lacks specifics on the management of the programme;
- The proposal does not include effective measures for monitoring;
- In some developing countries forestry may not be a priority and further analysis of countries' needs appears to be warranted;
- The suggestion was made that recipient country contributions in addition to UNDP funding and donor contribution should be used as a measure of the country's commitment to sustainable forest development;
- Some advisors questioned whether the programme meets the original intent of the Country Capacity Programmes,
- To ensure longevity the support for country capacity should eventually be incorporated in the IPF;
- The proposal needs to give priority and definition to the leadership role of other partner agencies.

## 10. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF NFAP AND REGIONAL ISSUES

### 10.1. Asia

Mrs. Aimi Lee Abdullah from Malaysia reported the results of the Workshop for the National Coordinators of the TFAP and MPFD in the Asia-Pacific Region which was held in Yogyakarta in February 1992, and at which 27 delegates from 14 countries participated. The workshop concluded that since there was no fundamental difference between the TFAP and the Master Plan approach, the two should not be duplicated in one country, and the individual countries should follow their own preference in applying either or other; the TFAP Operational Principles were endorsed as a common basis for both NFAPs and MPFDs; the important role of the Asian Development Bank in the region's forestry planning was recognized; it was further recognized that a continuous review of both approaches was needed; the concept of Country Capacity building was welcomed; the need for strengthening regional cooperation was recognized, taking into account existing structures and institutions, duplication of which should be avoided; and the need for improving equal access to donor funding in the region was identified.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were raised:

- The need for follow-up meetings was generally recognized, in order to share information, and, secondly, to organise common training programmes for forestry implementation in the region; however, no date was set as yet;
- The island nations of the region considered meeting separately in future to be better able to discuss their specific problems;
- The workshop conclusions largely reconfirmed the conclusions of the Joint Evaluation of the MDTF; the important role of the MDTF in organizing and contributing to this workshop was recognized;
- Transborder issues were discussed in the workshop as far as technical aspects were concerned, whereas political aspects were left to the UNCED in Rio.

### 10.2. Latin America

Mr. Juan José Salas, Regional Coordinator of the TFAP for Central America, presented the conclusions of the Second Meeting of National Coordinators from Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America and the Caribbean which was held in Bolivia in March 1992. In this meeting, the decision was taken to create the Latin American Group of National Coordinators for TFAP, with the following objectives: 1) to participate in the definition of global TFAP policies by representation of the region on the decision-making levels, in particular the FA-Group; 2) to strengthen cooperation in the region; and 3) to cooperate with the TFAP Coordinating Unit in information distribution and other activities of coordination and integration. An organisational structure was agreed upon, and it was decided that the Group would assemble at least once a year. The meeting recommended that the MDTF for TFAP would be equipped with mechanisms to fund the Group.

The meeting further expressed strong support for the TFAP Coordinating Unit, and recommended to regionalize the Unit and establish a branch in Colombia. The Operation Principles were considered especially useful for assisting countries where TFAP is in its initial stages or has to be revitalised. For these countries, the preparation of additional technical notes was recommended. It was recommended that the Operational Principles would be distributed at the highest level of government, and adapted to specific countries' needs where necessary. It was also recommended to strengthen the countries' capacities to prepare and implement NFAPs, to increase the forestry sector's political level, and to strengthen interlinkages with other sectors.

The following points were brought up in the discussion:

- ITTO is also considering setting up a regional office for Latin America;
- The CU is preparing a paper on financial flows which might substantiate the discussion on the adequacy or inadequacy of donor funding for TFAP;
- The FA-Group was invited to hold their next meeting in Costa Rica.

### 10.3. Africa

In the absence of Mr. Koné who was to speak on the Regional Coordinators Meeting in Africa, Mr. Jaime Aggrev-Orleans commented on the situation, saying that although many forestry projects are being implemented on a bilateral or multilateral basis, high-level decision-makers are still largely unaware of TFAP, let alone of the importance of regional coordination. He urged that the FA-Group take action to improve this so that the region would be able to better respond to and make use of global initiatives. He also pointed out that ITTO had made consistent efforts to place their projects under the TFAP umbrella. In the discussion that followed, the importance of improving country capacity was stressed, especially in view of the several large forestry development programmes which are currently being prepared in the region.

## 11. CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL FORESTRY RESEARCH (CIFOR)

Ian Bevege gave a brief review of the "Draft Strategic Plan for CIFOR" prepared for the mid-term meeting of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in Istanbul May 22-23, 1992.

The Draft Plan tabled by Ian Bevege includes information on the following major topics:

- Mission, Guiding Principles, Objectives and Milestones for CIFOR;
- Four Research Programs for CIFOR:
  - . Management and rehabilitation of degraded catchments for stabilised landuse;
  - . Management of tropical forests for sustainable production and conservation;
  - . Germplasm conservation, genetic improvement, for plantation establishment and management of natural forests;
  - . Utilisation and marketing of forest products.
- Two Support Programs for the above Research:
  - . Information and communication;
  - . Management and administration.
- The implementation of CIFOR's Research Strategy.

Because of time constraints Ian Bevege's presentation concentrated on the following activities related to converting the CIFOR strategy into action:

- Completion of the Establishment Agreement;
- Ratification of the constitution;



- Selection of members of the Board of Trustees;
- Recruiting and selection of a Director-General;
- Planning the mid 1992 Inaugural Board Meeting;
- Selection of a host country for CIFOR from among the following countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, India, and Sri Lanka;
- Selection of regional nodes;
- Completion of strategic plan for presentation during the CGIAR's International Centre's Week in 1992.

Ian Bevege also left for circulation information on the requirements for a Director General and the procedures involved in applying for the position.

## 12. TARGET 2000, ITTO AND RELATION TO TFAP

Mr. Bill Howard presented ITTO's "Target 2000" <sup>2/</sup> which had been adopted by the ITTO Council in December 1991. ITTO is in the process of producing criteria, indicators and guidelines for sustainable management to substantiate Target 2000. Member countries have been asked for progress reports on the measures they were taking to reach this goal, but response until now have been variable. The scope of the task and the resources required were further examined by an expert panel. A report with indicative figures has been produced, the structure of which showed great similarity with the TFAP approach. The FA-Group was asked how a closer cooperation between ITTO and TFAP could be realised in order to avoid overlap, and in order to secure funding for ITTO projects which might surpass the time horizon of the ITTA which would have to be renegotiated by 1994.

In subsequent discussion, Mr. Aggrey-Orleans added that a seminar at the University of Melbourne was held in February 1992 to study incentives for forest management through trade measures. At the last Council session in May 1992, resolutions were adopted to refine the policies and criteria for sustainable management, and also, to recognize TFAP as the main mechanism for implementing Agenda 21 for forestry. He stressed the important role of the FA-Group to encourage coordination of ITTO activities within the TFAP process and to point out constraints. The preparatory committee for the renegotiations for ITTA will meet on 11-13 and 23-24 November 1992, while the regular Council session will be held from 16-22 November.

It was further observed that in several donor countries, the Ministry of Economic Affairs is involved in ITTO while TFAP is taken care of by development agencies where foresters have an influence; it was therefore important to encourage consistency not only at international level but also at individual donor country level. In particular, it should be encouraged that the forestry advisers at the ITTO Technical Review Panel act in consistency with the TFAP process. Also developing countries should see that their NFAPs are used as a framework for ITTO activities.

It was concluded that a working group consisting of Messrs. Aggrey-Orleans, Clément, Howard, and Kotari would prepare a proposal for action to improve ITTO and TFAP links. This will be discussed at the next FA-Group Meeting.

## 13. EEC FOREST ACTIVITIES

Mr. Willem Kriek presented the organisational structure of the European Economic Commission relevant to forestry cooperation. He explained that the EEC has basically four budget channels for forestry projects the most important of which are the Lomé and the ALA budgets. These link to four Directorates. Spending on forestry had been little in the past (2 million ECU in 1991 for the forestry sector in DG VIII). At the request of the European Parliament, the Commission had recently decided to allocate an extra 50 million ECU for tropical forestry, to be committed

---

<sup>2/</sup> "Target 2000": The resolution that timber will only be produced from sustainably managed forest resources from the year 2000 onwards.



within the current year. It has been decided that this sum will be jointly managed by DG I and DG VIII, with a consultative role of DG XI. However, since the regulations for each budget line are different and procedures are often lengthy, rapid commitment poses problems. It has been proposed to spend 19.15 million ECU of this sum on the GEF, and another part on the pilot project in Brazil, and other projects. Also DG XII (research) claims part of the budget. The danger exists, however, that forestry projects presently in pipeline to the ALA or Lomé programme are now pushed into this extra budget.

In the discussion that followed, the importance of capacity building in recipient countries was stressed. It was suggested that EEC would invest in CCPs, if necessary through UNDP or other multilateral arrangements.

It was further brought forward by the FA-Group that:

- Whereas the EEC in the past had not sufficiently utilized forestry expertise available in member countries to ensure quality of projects, a group of forestry advisers had recently been formed to address this issue;
- Some EEC Directorates as well as the European Parliament were observed to redouble initiatives already taken elsewhere, e.g. studies for the preparation of guidelines on forest management, etc.; the above mentioned group could be useful to avoid this duplication.

#### 14. REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION PLANS (NEAPs)

Prof. Frank L. Convery of the University of Dublin and the Club of Dublin explained the situation around the NEAPs with special reference to Africa. He emphasized that NEAPs provided a broad national policy framework and a range of instruments for environmental action, that they were process-oriented, cross-sectoral as much as possible, involved substantial public participation, and required at least three years of work. About 20 African countries are now preparing NEAPs. Political support at the highest level is a *sine qua non*. The Africa Environment Division (AFTEN) of the World Bank has played a key role, but also other international agencies had been involved. The "Club of Dublin" had been set up in December 1990 as a network to facilitate trans-country communication and learning, through semi-annual meetings, newsletters and thematic support to NEAPs. As a conclusion, Mr. Convery urged integration of NFAPs and NEAPs since both related to the same structural issues underlying forestry and environmental problems.

In the discussion that followed, it was brought forward that:

- The increasing number of initiatives - TFAP, NEAP, GEF, etc. poses problems of coordination and capacity deployment in some countries;
- Putting NFAPs under an NEAP umbrella and then focusing NEAPs on institutional development would bring NFAPs further away from implementation, which is already lagging behind;
- Foresters are generally not well represented in the NEAP process;
- Country capacity building would be the only way to overcome these problems, and should therefore be emphasized by both EAP and TFAP.

#### 15. PRESENTATION ON THE GEF

Mr. Ralph Schmidt introduced a video presentation on Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and presented the latest developments. He reported that at the Third meeting of GEF Participants in April 1992, it had been decided to continue the GEF after the present pilot phase. The existing four areas of coverage (Climate Change, Biodiversity, International Waters, and Ozone) and the three funding mechanisms (Core Fund, Co-financing arrangements, and funding under the Montreal Protocol on the Ozone Layer) would be expanded. Projects addressing land degradation and deforestation also become eligible for funding, and more room will be given to nationally or regionally oriented projects. A small grants fund for NGO projects will be established with UNDP. The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) will be strengthened. The GEF may also become a mechanism to channel implementation

of global conventions agreed upon at UNCED or elsewhere. A total of \$ 1.2 billion has been pledged to date (\$ 860 million in the Core Fund and \$ 350 through co-financing arrangements); out of this, a total of \$ 584 million has been programmed in three tranches. A two-tier governance structure had been proposed in order to meet criticism from developing countries that GEF is too much donor-dominated.

In the ensuing discussion, the following points were raised:

- TFAP can learn from the excellent public promotion of GEF;
- The increased attention for national activities in GEF is important, since these include many forestry activities;
- The 2nd tranche projects of GEF did not mention TFAP at all; this has been rectified in the 3rd tranche;
- GEF could also implement global activities under the Agenda 21;
- It is important that CCPs are in place in developing countries to make the best use of the increased opportunities for forestry.
- Quality assurance of GEF projects should be improved;
- Since no projects are as yet operational, some advisers were sceptic about the effectiveness of the facility as an additional funding mechanism for forestry.

## 16. PUBLIC MEETING

A public meeting was held at the Royal Hospital Museum in Kilmainham at which the TFAP was discussed with an audience of over 100 persons. Mrs. Aimi Lee Abdullah presented the on-going exercise in Malaysia and regional efforts as reflected in the Yogyakarta meeting. Matt Heering and Ralph Roberts together with Raymond Keogh represented the FA-Group. A lively debate on TFAP followed, which concentrated on:

- The effectiveness of TFAP in the light of continuing deforestation;
- Conservation and biodiversity issues;
- The position of indigenous people, especially the Penan in Sarawak;
- The role of multinational cooperation and the World Bank in rainforest removal.

## 17. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

The Chairperson observed that the Working Group established by the FAO Ad Hoc Group for preparation of the Consultative Forum might invite him to participate. In case his other duties might prevent him from attending, he will request a member of the Steering Committee to replace him.

Mr. Roberts had earlier expressed his interest to retire as a Chairperson of the FA-Group after the forthcoming 15th meeting. He requested the Group to give thought to the nomination of a successor.

The invitation of the Government of Costa Rica to host the next FA-Group meeting was gratefully accepted. The meeting will be held from 30 November to 4 December 1992. Ralph Schmidt of UNDP will exercise liaison between the hosts and the FA-Group. Possibilities for meeting with members of the Secretariat of the National Coordinators for Latin America will be investigated by Caroline Sargent.

Finally, the Chairperson conveyed the Group's thanks to the Irish Forestry Board who hosted this meeting in a warm and relaxed atmosphere.

**ANNEX 1**

**AGENDA**



**AGENDA**  
**TFAP FORESTRY ADVISERS GROUP**  
**FOURTEENTH MEETING**  
**DUBLIN, 18-22 MAY 1992**

**Monday May 18, 1992**

09h00 - 09h30 Registration

**Plenary Session:**

09h30 - 09h35 Opening by the Chairperson (Ralph Roberts).

09h35 - 09h50 Welcoming Address: Paul Byrne, Secretary Irish Forestry Board.

09h50 - 10h05 Report and follow-up on the 13th FA-Group Meeting in Rome and 9th Steering Committee Meeting held in New York (Ralph Roberts).

10h05 - 10h30 Report and discussion on the Outcome of the 1st & 2nd AD HOC Group Meeting, the recent CFDT meeting in Rome and on the "Position of the FA-Group re the Consultative Forum" (Ralph Roberts).

10h30 - 10h45 Coffee Break

10h45 - 11h45 Report and discussion on the Outcome of the UNCED's Final Preparatory meetings for Rio (Zentilli).

11h45 - 13h00 Report and discussion on the Outcome of the Joint Evaluation of the FAO-TFAP Multi-Donor Trust Fund (Egbert Pelinck).

13h00 - 14h30 Lunch Break

Introduction to, and discussion in plenary of, Satellite Meeting Topics:

14h30 - 15h30 FA-Group Task Force on New Approaches to Partnership Arrangements in Forest Development and Conservation (Ralph Roberts and Twig Johnson):

- purpose and scope,
- terms of reference,
- composition of the study team,
- method of the study's execution,
- commitments of support,
- reporting; to whom and when.

15h30 - 16h00 Proposed terms of reference for the Communications Working Group (Caroline Sargent).

16h00 - 17h00 Presentation and discussion on proposed renewal of FAO-MDTF for TFAP-CU (Hans Röbbel).

16h30 - 16h45 Tea Break

17h00 - 17h15 Satellite Meetings organization: chairman, rapporteur and modus operandi.

17h15 - 18h00 Satellite Meetings in Session.

18h00 - 20h00 Reception at the Court Hotel (IDI).

\*\*\*\*\*

**Tuesday May 19, 1992**

09h00 - 10h45 Satellite Meetings in Session

10h45 - 11h00 Coffee Break

11h00 - 12h00 Presentation and discussion on "Project Proposal of a Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Country Capacity Projects" (Ralph Schmidt).

12h00 - 13h00 Progress Report on NFAPs and other TFAP CU Activities (Matt Heering).

13h00 - 14h30 Lunch Break

14h30 - 15h30 Presentation and Discussion of NFAP and Regional Issues:

- o Americas - (Regional Coordinator)
- o Asia - (Regional Coordinator)

16h30 - 16h45 Tea Break

16h45 - 18h00 Presentation and Discussion of Regional Issues continued.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Wednesday May 20, 1992**

09h00 - 10h45 Satellite Meetings Draft Final Reports/Statements.

10h45 - 11h00 Coffee Break

11h00 - 11h45 Target 2000, ITTO and relation to TFAP (Bill Howard).  
 EEC Forest Activities (Wim Kriek).

11h45 - 12h15 Presentation on the GEF (Ralph Schmidt).

12h15 - 13h00 Report by the Club of Dublin on EAPs (Professor Convery).

13h00 - 14h30 Lunch Break



14h30 - 16h30 Presentation and Discussion in plenary of  
Satellite Meeting Reports:

Working Group 1 - FA-Group Task Force on New  
Approaches to Partnership Arrangements in Forest  
Development, and

Working Group 2 - Communications.

16h30 - 16h45 Tea Break

16h45 - 18h00 Presentation and Discussion of Satellite Meetings  
Reports continued.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Thursday May 21, 1992**

09h00 - 13h00 Public Meeting at the Royal Hospital in  
Kilmainham (Raymond Keogh).  
(12h30) (Press Interview).

13h00 - 14h30 Lunch Break

14h30 - 16h30 Finalization in plenary of TFAP FA-Group  
Statements re:

- o FA-Group Task Force
- o Communications
- o Regionalization

16h30 - 16h45 Tea Break

16h45 - 18h00 Conclusion of the Meeting (Ralph Roberts):

Where do we go from here:

- o Consultative Forum
- o UNCED, FAO's TFAP CU, etc.
- o potential hosts of future meetings
- o organizing committee for future  
meetings in developing countries
- o time and place for next steering  
committee meeting and FA-Group  
meeting.

**Friday May 22, 1992**

09h00 - 13h00 Forestry Tour at Avondale, organized by our hosts  
(optional)

\*\*\*\*\*

ANNEX 2

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



Mrs. Aimi Lee Abdullah  
Ministry of Primary Industries  
6 - 8th Flrs. Menara Dayabumi  
Jalan Sultan  
Hishamuddin  
50654 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia

Tel: 03 2747511  
Fax: 03 2745014

Pedro Martinez Garrido  
Chief, Coordination and Relations  
ICONA  
Ministerio de Agricultura  
Gran Via San Francisco 2  
28005 Madrid  
Spain

Tel: 34 1 265 0012  
Fax: 34 1 265 8379

Bill Howard  
Senior Forestry Adviser  
Overseas Development Administration  
94 Victoria Street  
London SW1E 5DH  
United Kingdom

Tel: 44 71 917 0274  
Fax: 44 71 917 0679

Willem Kriek  
EEC DG VIII/A/1  
Rue de la Loi 200  
1049 Brussels  
Belgium

Tel: 2 2992514  
Fax: 2 2992907

Mr. D. I. Bevege  
Principal Adviser ACIAR  
GPO Box 1571  
3rd Floor Drake Centre  
10 Moore Street  
Canberra  
ACT 2601  
Australia

Tel: 61 62 488 588  
Fax: 61 62 573 051

David Gow  
Programme Coordinator World Resources  
Institute  
1709 New York Avenue, NW  
7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
U.S.A.

Tel: 202 662 2578  
Fax: 202 638 0036

Werner Hunziker  
Forestry Adviser  
Department of External Affairs  
Swiss Development Cooperation  
Eigerstrasse 73  
3003 Bern

Tel: 41 31 61 31 96  
Fax: 41 31 45 57 21

Dr. Christian Mersmann  
Forest Resources Management and  
Conservation of Nature  
(GTZ) GMBH  
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-2  
Postfach 5180  
D-6236 Eschborn bei Frankfurt/Main

Tel: 49 6196 794102  
Fax: 49 6196 797419

Jean Clément  
Chargé des relations internationales  
Office national des forêts  
2 avenue de Saint-Mandé  
75570 Paris Cedex 12  
France

Tel: 33 1 4019 5849  
Fax: 33 1 4346 1920

Robert Hallett  
Industrial Development Officer  
Agro-based Industries  
Industrial Operations/Technology  
UNIDO  
D-1308 P.O. Box 300  
A-1400 Vienna  
Austria

Tel: 43 1 21 131/5265  
Fax: 43 1 23 2156

Twig Johnson  
Director  
Environment and Natural Resources  
OS Agency for International Development  
R & D Bureau, Room 509, SA 18  
Washington D.C. 20523  
U.S.A.

Tel: 703 875 4106  
Fax: 703 875 4639

Søren Moestrup  
Danida Forest Seed Centre  
Krogerupvej 3A  
3050 Humleback  
Denmark

Tel: 45 42190500  
Fax: 45 49 160258

Jean Jacques Faure  
Chargé de mission "Forêts"  
Ministère de la Coopération et du  
Développement  
20 Rue Monsieur  
75007 Paris  
France

Tel: 33 1 4783 1184  
Fax: 33 1 4783 1378

Matt Hoering  
Coordinator TFAP  
Forestry Department FAO  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome  
Italy

Tel: 39 6 5797 3589  
Fax: 39 6 512 5137

Raymond Keogh  
International Development Ireland Ltd  
Wilton Park House  
Wilton Place  
Dublin 2

Tel: 353 1 687555  
Fax: 353 1 601733

Tapani Oksanen  
Forestry Adviser  
FINNIDA  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Mannerheimintie 15A  
00260 Helsinki  
Finland

Tel: 358 0 1341 6435  
Fax: 358 0 1341 6428

William Cordero Gamboa  
Diputado Asamblea Legislativa de Costa  
Rica  
Presidente Comisión de Asuntos  
Agropecuarios y Recursos Naturales

Tel: 33 52 72/23 00 44 (ext 286)

Katsuhiko Kotari  
Special Assistant to the President  
JICA  
Mitsui Building 46 Floor  
2-1-1 Nishi-Shinjuku Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo  
Japan

Tel: 81 3 3346 5311  
Fax: 81 3 3346 5446

J.E.K. Aggrey-Orleans  
Assistant Director ITTO  
International Organisations Centre  
5th Floor  
Pacifico - Yokohama  
1 - 1 - Minato - Mirai  
Nishi-Ku  
Yokohama 220  
Japan

Tel: 81 45 671 7045  
Fax: 81 45 223 1111

Cathrien de Pater  
Ministry of Agriculture  
NBLF-IKC  
3502 LA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

Tel: 31 30 85/2541/2417/911  
Fax: 31 30 891 864

Egbert Pelinck  
Forestry Adviser, Development  
Cooperation  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
P.O. Box 20061  
2500 EB The Hague  
The Netherlands

Tel: 31 70 348 4286/6486  
Fax: 31 70 348 4303

Reidar Persson  
Senior Environment & Forestry Adviser  
SIDA  
Birger Jarlgatan 61  
10525 Stockholm  
Sweden

Tel: 46 8 728 5556  
Fax: 46 8 612 0976

Pieter G. Prins R.P.F.  
Arbex  
P.O. Box 5500  
3439 McBean Street  
Richmond  
Ontario K0A 2Z0

Tel: 613 838 2047  
Fax: 613 838 5419

Ralph W. Roberts  
Director, Forestry and Conservation Sector  
Canadian International Development  
Agency (CIDA)  
200 Promenade du Portage  
Hull, Québec  
Canada K1A 0G4

Tel: 819 997 6586  
Fax: 819 953 4676

Hans W. O. Röbbel  
Assistant to Assistant Director-General  
Forestry Department  
FAO

Tel:  
Fax:

R. D. H. Rowe  
Forestry Adviser  
The World Bank  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington DC 20433  
U.S.A.

Tel: 202 473 8972  
Fax: 202 676 0007

Caroline Sargent  
Director, Forestry and Land-Use  
Programme  
IIED  
3 Endsleigh Street  
London WC1 H0DD  
United Kingdom

Tel: 44 71 388 2117  
Fax: 44 71 388 2826

Ralph Schmidt  
Senior Technical Adviser  
UNDP  
Room DCI-2024  
1, UN Plaza  
New York, NY10017  
U.S.A.

Tel: 212 906 5088 (off.)  
Fax: 212 906 5365

Martin Walter  
Ministry for Economic Cooperation  
D-W-5300 Bonn  
Germany

Tel: 228 535226  
Fax: 228 535204

Helmut Watzlawick  
Programme Co-ordinator  
Employment and Development Department  
ILO  
4, Route des Morillons  
CH-1211 Geneva 22  
Switzerland

Tel: 41 22 799 7467  
Fax: 41 22 799 8685

Hiroyuki Yamamoto  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Japan

Tel: 03 3581 5794  
Fax: 03 3581 9470

Bernardo Zentilli  
Senior Programme Officer  
UNCED  
B.P. 80  
160 Route de Florissant  
CH 1231 Conches

Tel: 41 22 789 1676  
Fax: 41 22 789 3536  
41 22 346 6815 (direct)

Mr. José Luis Salas Zuniga  
Secretario General América Latina  
y el Caribe - PAFT  
Apartado 1338 - 1002  
San José  
Costa Rica

Tel: (506) 25 05 09/34 65 04  
Fax: (506) 34 06 51



**ANNEX 3**

**DONOR PARTICIPATION LIST**

# TFAP DONOR PARTICIPATION LIST

## Notes:

1. This list concerns donor assistance or interest in NFAP preparation exercises. It does not reflect donor involvement in project implementation.
2. The list was updated at the TFAP Forestry Advisers Group Meeting in Dublin, May 1992.
3. The CARICOM TFAP comprises the following countries: Antigua/Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Christopher/Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, and Trinidad & Tobago.

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
<b>AFRICA</b>			
ANGOLA	UNDP/FAO ITALY	FRANCE NORAD	SIDA USAID NETHERLANDS
BURKINA FASO	GERMANY	CIDA UNDP FAO FRANCE GERMANY IIED SWITZERLAND NETHERLANDS WRI	IDRC ITALY SIDA KFW UNSO WB USAID EEC DANIDA
BURUNDI	UNDP/FAO	WB FRANCE	SDC ODA ILO
CAMEROON	UNDP/FAO	AFDB CIDA GERMANY FRANCE JAPAN IIED IUCN IUFRO UNESCO NETHERLANDS ODA WFP WB WWF	CHINA ITTO USSR USAID UNSO CARE EEC ITTO

Page 2

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
CAPE VERDE	FAO/BELGIUM	FRANCE NETHERLANDS	GERMANY SWITZERLAND UNEP ITALY
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	WB	FRANCE UNDP	CIDA EEC IIED USAID IUCN GERMANY
CHAD		FRANCE	CARE IUCN SWITZERLAND NETHERLANDS
CONGO	FRANCE	AFDB EEC FAO GERMANY IUCN UNESCO WB ITTO	NEW ZEALAND USAID
IVORY COAST	FAO/WBCP	CIDA FRANCE UNDP WB	GERMANY ILO ITTO UNSO KFW IUCN ITALY EEC FRANCE USAID
EQUATORIAL GUINEA	WB/FAO	EEC FRANCE IUCN	
ETHIOPIA	WB/UNDP/FAO	GERMANY AFDB CIDA ILO ITALY IUCN IUFRO SIDA WFP EEC	NETHERLANDS DANIDA USAID KFW FRANCE UNSO CARE SWITZERLAND



Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
GABON	FRANCE	UNDP ITTO WB	UNSO GERMANY EEC IUCN
GAMBIA	GERMANY	CIDA FRANCE GERMANY	USAID EEC
GHANA	WB/FAO	ODA ODA DANIDA CIDA	IUCN GERMANY IIED ITTO KFW NETHERLANDS UNSO USAID WRI
GUINEA	FRANCE	CIDA FAO GERMANY EEC USAID UNDP	IUCN SWITZERLAND KFW
GUINEA-BISSAU	WB/EEC	UNDP FRANCE	UNSO KFW GERMANY NETHERLANDS SIDA WWF USAID IUCN
KENYA	FINNIDA	WB ODA	SIDA NETHERLANDS CIDA CARE DANIDA UNEP UNSO USAID IUCN GERMANY ITALY ITTO

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
LESOTHO	UNDP/FAO	AFDB UNEP IFAD USAID ILO ODA SIDA	FINNIDA GERMANY ITALY NETHERLANDS KFW WB CARE EEC IIED
LIBERIA			ITTO JAPAN ODA IUCN
MADAGASCAR	UNDP/FAO	AFDB FRANCE GERMANY UNDP ILO SWITZERLAND USAID USSR WB	KFW ODA WFP EEC CIDA UNESCO WRI IUCN ITALY IIED
MALAWI	WB/ODA?	CIDA WFP UNDP	EEC IUCN USAID NETHERLANDS FINNIDA
MALI	FRANCE	AFDB CIDA FAO GERMANY ILO IDRC NETHERLANDS SWITZERLAND USAID UNDP WFP WB	IIED UNSO CARE EEC IUCN ITALY

Page 5			
Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
MAURITANIA	UNDP/FAO	AFDB CLUB DU SAHEL FRANCE DANIDA WB IUCN UNEP USAID	GERMANY SWITZERLAND KFW WFP NETHERLANDS UNSO
MAURITIUS			
MOZAMBIQUE		FRANCE	AIDAB CIDA CARE SWITZERLAND SIDA FINNIDA USAID NETHERLANDS ITALY
NIGER		FRANCE GERMANY SWITZERLAND NETHERLANDS	CIDA CARE SIDA DANIDA IUCN GERMANY ITALY
NIGERIA	WB	ODA JAPAN UNDP WWF EEC	ILO UNEP CIDA UNSO USAID WRI GERMANY ITTO
RWANDA	CANADA/ACCT	FRANCE SWITZERLAND	CARE GERMANY WRI NETHERLANDS
SENEGAL	UNDP/FAO	CIDA FRANCE GERMANY JAPAN NETHERLANDS USAID WB WWF	FINNIDA IIED ILO ITALY SIDA EEC UNSO

Page 6			
Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
SIERRA LEONE	UNDP/FAO	GERMANY IUFRO	WB USAID KFW CARE
SOMALIA	UNDP/FAO	AFDB GERMANY IUFRO ODA UNSO	DANIDA FRANCE USAID WB WFP UNSO CARE EEC FINNIDA ITALY
SUDAN	WB	FAO USAID ODA CIDA GERMANY NETHERLANDS	CARE UNSO IDB IIED ILO FINNIDA
TANZANIA	FINNIDA	AFDB DANIDA ITALY FAO GERMANY IIED ILO IUCN JAPAN NETHERLANDS NORAD ODA SIDA UNDP UNEP WB	EEC USAID SWITZERLAND UNSO
TOGO	UNDP/FAO	FRANCE	CARE UNSO USAID KFW ITTO WB WFP EEC UNEP IUCN GERMANY



Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
UGANDA		CIDA DANIDA NETHERLANDS	CARE SIDA USAID UNEP ILO WRI FINNIDA IUCN IIED
ZAIRE	CIDA	AFDB FAO FRANCE GERMANY EEC UNDP WB IUCN	IDRC USAID WRI KFW ITTO
ZAMBIA	FINNIDA	WB PDA UNEP	SIDA NORAD NETHERLANDS KFW EEC FRG UNDP CIDA USAID IUCN
ZIMBABWE	WB	AFDB CIDA ODA USAID IIED CARE DANIDA	SIDA NORAD WRI IUCN GERMANY ITALY FINNIDA NETHERLANDS ITTO

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
<u>ASIA-PACIFIC</u>			
BANGLADESH	ADB/UNDP		FRANCE IUCN GERMANY NETHERLANDS JAPAN DANIDA SIDA CIDA FINNIDA AUSTRALIA USAID WRI ITALY SWITZERLAND
BIHUTAN	ADB	DANIDA FAO WWF ODA SWITZERLAND UNDP WFP WB	GERMANY IDRC NETHERLANDS FINNIDA FRANCE AUSTRALIA
FIJI	UNDP/FAO	ADB AUSTRALIA CDC ODA GERMANY ILO JAPAN NEW ZEALAND	USAID IDRC KFW FRANCE EEC CIDA ITTO
INDIA	NATIONAL	UNDP FAO CIDA SIDA ODA NETHERLANDS WB	AIDAB FRANCE JAPAN SWITZERLAND USAID UNEP DANIDA GERMANY ITTO

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
INDONESIA	NATIONAL	ADB CIDA FAO FINNIDA IDRC IIED ILO IUCN JAPAN ODA UNDP USAID WB	AUSTRALIA ITTO KFW FRANCE WRI GERMANY ITALY NETHERLANDS
LAOS	UNDP/FAO	ADB AUSTRALIA FRANCE IUCN SIDA WB NETHERLANDS	ILO USSR USDA-FS
MALAYSIA	NATIONAL	ODA WB	CIDA FRANCE JAPAN GERMANY ITTO
MYANMAR	ADB/FINNIDA	CIDA FAO DANIDA JAPAN NORAD ODA SWITZERLAND UNDP USAID WB IDRC	CARE EEC IUCN KFW ITTO IIED NETHERLANDS
PAKISTAN	ADB	FAO GERMANY ILO NORAD NETHERLANDS SWITZERLAND UNDP USAID WB WFP	IDRC IIED KFW CIDA ODA AUSTRALIA IUCN

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	WB	ADB AUSTRALIA FAO GERMANY IIED IUCN JAPAN NEW ZEALAND UNDP FRANCE	IDRC ITTO WRI KFW USAID EEC
PHILIPPINES	ADB/FINNIDA	USAID IIED IUCN JAPAN UNDP	IDRC KFW AUSTRALIA FRANCE CIDA CARE ITTO GERMANY ITALY NETHERLANDS
SOLOMON ISLANDS	ODA	ADN AUSTRALIA ILO NEW ZEALAND	GERMANY ITTO UNEP IIED
SRI LANKA	FINNIDA	CIDA ODA IUCN WB	NETHERLANDS CARE JAPAN SDC SIDA USAID
THAILAND	UNDP/FINNIDA	ITTO DANIDA FAO FRANCE GERMANY JAPAN	AUSTRALIA WRI ODA IUCN CIDA CARE USAID IIED NETHERLANDS
VANUATU		AIDAB	FRANCE UNEP



Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
VIETNAM	UNDP/ITALY/FAO	IIED IDCN SIDA USSR WB WFP FRANCE NETHERLANDS	ADB AUSTRALIA SWITZERLAND IDRC GERMANY NEW ZEALAND FINNIDA
<u>LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN</u>			
ARGENTINA	NATIONAL/ ITALY/FAO	CIDA FAO IDB UNDP JAPAN	ITALY SPAIN USSR GERMANY IIED
BELIZE	ODA	CIDA FAO UNDP USAID	CARE
BOLIVIA	NETHERLANDS/ SWITZERLAND/ FAO	BELGIUM GERMANY IDB ODA SPAIN SWITZERLAND UNEP	ITALY ITTO KFW CIDA FRANCE ITALY JAPAN CARE DANIDA EEC USAID WRI IUCN
CHILE	NETHERLANDS/FAO		GERMANY IDB SIDA WB FINNIDA WRI USAID ITALY

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
COLOMBIA	NETHERLANDS/ FAO	CIDA FAO FRANCE GERMANY IDB SPAIN UNDP WB	EEC ITTO WRI KFW USAID
COSTA RICA	NETHERLANDS	SIDA FAO IDB JAPAN ODA GERMANY UNDP USAID ITALY IIED	CIDA EEC FINNIDA SWITZERLAND IUCN WB
CUBA	NATIONAL	FAO UNDP USSR	ODA FRANCE WB ITALY
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	UNDP/FAO	CIDA GERMANY USAID IDB ISRAEL	ITALY WRI EEC
ECUADOR	NETHERLANDS/ FAO	FAO IIED IUCN GERMANY USAID ODA SWITZERLAND UNDP WRI IDB WWF	ITTO JAPAN CARE CIDA EEC ITALY KFW SPAIN
EL SALVADOR	FAO		CIDA IDB WB USAID NETHERLANDS

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
GUATEMALA	USAID	NETHERLANDS IIED UNDP WRI IDB CATIE SPAIN WWF GERMANY	FINNIDA KFW CARE CIDA IUCN ITALY ITTO
GUYANA	CIDA	FAO IDB ODA UNDP WB	KFW UNEP EEC USAID GERMANY NETHERLANDS ITTO
HAITI	UNDP/FAO	CIDA FAO FRANCE ILO UNDP USAID WB	SWITZERLAND KFW CARE NETHERLANDS
HONDURAS	UNDP/FAO	CIDA UNDP FAO GERMANY JAPAN ODA SPAIN USAID NETHERLANDS	IDRC ITTO KFW CARE SWITZERLAND EEC ITALY FINNIDA
JAMAICA	UNDP/FAO	CIDA ODA UNEP IDB NETHERLANDS	CDB IDB IFAD WB USAID
MEXICO	FAO	FINNIDA GERMANY IDB ODA SPAIN UNDP USAID USDA-FS WB	JAPAN UNEP WRI ITTO

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
NICARAGUA	SIDA/ NETHERLANDS/FAO	NORAD UNDP FINNIDA	IUCN DANIDA ITALY SWITZERLAND CIDA UNEP CARE FRANCE USAID GERMANY
PANAMA	UNDP/FAO	IDB JAPAN ODA USAID IUCN	ITTO FINNIDA GERMANY BITS-SWEDEN
PARAGUAY	GERMANY	UNDP	IDB JAPAN WB UNEP
PERU	CIDA/UNDP/ SWITZERLAND	FAO FRANCE GERMANY IDB IDRC IUCN JAPAN SPAIN NETHERLANDS UNEP USAID WFP	ITALY ITTO FINNIDA KFW CARE EEC WRI
SURINAM	FAO	NETHERLANDS	IIED IDB WB ITTO
CARICOM	FAO/ODA	GERMANY EEC CDB USDA-FSP/TFP IUFRO	IIED ITTO? WB OAS IUCN IDB
URUGUAY	FAO		JAPAN WB

Country or Sub-region	Lead agency	Participating agencies	Interested agencies
VENEZUELA	NATIONAL	FAO USDA-FS UNDP	CIDA UNEP GERMANY
CENTRAL AMERICA AMAZONIA		NETHERLANDS	ITTO NETHERLANDS ITTO



**ANNEX 4**

**REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 1**

**TASK FORCE AND STUDY TEAM**

**KNOW THYSELF:TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR STUDY OF COOPERATION IN FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT**

**KILLINEY BAY  
MAY 20, 1992  
(SIXTH DRAFT)**

**PURPOSE:** To improve cooperation among national governments, international agencies, donors, and the private sector, including NGOs, in their endeavours to achieve sustainable forestry development at the national level.

**RATIONALE:** Previous and current attempts to achieve this purpose have fallen short of expectations, while conditions have changed since the initiation of TFAP seven years ago. However, the urgent need for effective cooperation, both international and national, is ever more paramount: developing country needs and the accelerating rate of natural resource depletion and degradation require a fresh look at existing relationships and programs, and new possibilities.

The FA-Group considers participation by people and institutions from the developing countries of critical importance in suggesting improved ways and means to harmonize donor assistance to promote and establish sustainable forestry. Such participation will guide this study.

**PROPOSAL:** The Forestry Advisors Group will commission a study which will cover the following issues and questions:

1. Analyze the TFAP, take into account the outcome of UNCED and the work of related forestry programs under ITTO (Target 2000), World Bank, UNDP, and UNEP (GEF and National Environmental Action Plans - NEAPs), the G-7 Initiative, and other forestry related activities which are suited to collaborative arrangements among partners, and identify areas of complementarity and possible areas of duplication.
2. Examine in detail the institutional arrangements for collaboration within and between the programs and activities referred to above, with a focus on each of the three levels: national, regional and international.
3. Recommend how collaboration at the three levels can be improved, and how financial and technical resources of governmental and non-governmental organizations at these levels can be harnessed to achieve effective promotion of sustainable forestry at the national level.
4. Propose an appropriate role, modus operandi, and membership composition for the FA-Group, in particular the extent to which the group -- without losing its flexibility -- can serve as a forum for promoting this improved collaboration at the three levels within the context of post-UNCED forest principles.

**PROCESS:** The client for this study is the FA Group and, by extension, the community of international agencies, national governments, and the private sector, including NGOs, interested in sustainable management and conservation of forest lands and resources. The group will use the study to redefine its own role and function in the promotion of sustainable forestry on a global scale; and individual members will use it to strengthen the forestry programs of their own institutions.

In addition, the group will appoint a task force, drawn from sponsors of the study, to finalize the terms of reference, select the study team, monitor progress, and provide regular advice and guidance to the team. The study will be conducted by three to four consultants familiar with forest issues and existing programs, including the TFAP.

The team will need approximately six months to complete their tasks – specified as follows:

1. Establish a work plan and assign responsibilities.
2. Review the recent literature and documentation on relevant planning exercises.
3. Seek ideas and perspectives from all relevant parties and individuals.
4. Prepare a first draft of report for review by the FA Group task force, incorporate their comments, suggestions, and recommendations into a final report for presentation to next meeting of the FA-Group in December 1992.

**FUNDING:** The budget for this exercise should cover approximately twelve person months (3x4 months), related secretarial support, travel for both the team and the advisory committee, plus necessary administrative costs. Costs will be approximately \$US150,000 - \$US200,000. The study would be funded by FA Group members who could either provide their contribution directly, in the form of a consultant or airplane tickets, and/or grant funds to a central coordinating contractor.

### **EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

During final discussion at the 14th meeting the Group listed the following expected outputs:

#### At the National Level

- Definition of alternative mechanisms for cooperation in implementing CCPs and other activities linked to NFAPs.

#### At the International Level

- Definition of alternatives in institutional arrangements including the Consultative Forum and the TFAP Support Centre,
- An up-dated doctrine for cooperation in forestry based on TFAP operational principles and guidelines and Agenda 21 Forest Programmes, and
- An up-date on the role and mandate of the TFAP FA-Group,



**ANNEX 5**

**REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2**

**COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGIES**

## TFAP AND COMMUNICATIONS

### COMMON STRATEGY

#### PURPOSE:

Develop an effective strategy to communicate relevant TFAP information amongst the different levels of international donor and recipient communities and end users.

#### RATIONALE:

Lack of adequate information transfer is as detrimental to project execution as the lack of a food supply system is to a field army. As with a food supply system, information must come on-stream WHERE and WHEN it is needed. However, information transfer in forestry as experienced in the TFAP process often does not adequately reach the three levels where action and support is essential:

- Government and other agencies which are responsible for and contribute to, policy, planning and implementation;
- the public;
- operators at the field level.

Information flows, to and from these entities, must be catered for in an integrated manner. The 'bad press' which TFAP has received is partly a consequence of inadequate communications. This has contributed to a weakening of confidence in the process at Government level, especially amongst donors. Early expectations of TFAP have not been realised. This has further exacerbated the problem with the result that participants involved in the execution of TFAP have had to expend limited energy and resources on ad hoc information and political tasks which detract from the final goal : action at the field level.

The communication strategies adopted by the GEF and ITTO are good examples of effective approaches to articulating their aims, objectives and implementation progress. This has minimised criticism of, and enhanced outside support for, the two entities; two positive elements not currently enjoyed by TFAP.

It is opportune to examine how TFAP communicates information at internal and external levels with the ultimate objective of redressing forestry problems in the developing countries. It is necessary to consider how to direct relevant information so that it will reach the right audience and have the intended impact. The desired impact has to be clear, tangible and capable of being monitored. It is also necessary to identify what should be communicated to achieve this goal and which audience to aim at. In terms of TFAP, the audience is composed of ALL those who have an influence, either directly or indirectly on the forest. The audience is a heterogeneous body and it is impossible to address all these on one level; the information needed for each stratum is different and the mode of communication has to be different too.

The information being divulged must be of a consistently high standard to inspire confidence amongst end users. Strategic documentation must conform to the operational principles and guidelines. All other materials should be clearly sourced.

For a TFAP communications system to work, the following elements are necessary (see also the Figure):

- clear definition of goals, objectives and approach (strategy);
- implementation of strategy through a coordination network (Coordination Units at global, regional and national levels);
- independent assessment (at the political, NGO and other levels);
- definition of information sources and end users;
- definition of the modes of information transfer;
- a plan of action to ensure smooth execution of information transfer.



A cursory glance at the Figure demonstrates the very wide range of information to be communicated and, equally, the very different levels of end users to be catered for. Considering the variety of organisations and agencies involved in the process it is essential that they all be guided by a clear common strategy.

#### **PROPOSAL:**

The Forestry Advisers Group recommend that the Coordinating Unit commission a study to draw up a strategy for communications amongst the international donor and recipient communities and end users. The strategy will be developed from an historical and actual review of the TFAP process and it will define priorities for the speedy implementation of information transfer to overcome identified 'bottle-necks'.

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

1. Review recent documentation on TFAP related activities and issues including the process by which information has been transferred at the international and national level.
2. Conduct a communications needs analysis and identify key clients for communications purposes.
3. Conduct a survey of forest resources development communications products and systems which could support or guide communications for TFAP at the national and international level.
  - 3.1 survey communications products, materials and systems available in selected international agencies;
  - 3.2 survey communications products and initiatives within TFAP which could contribute most effectively to divulging TFAP accomplishments and objectives.

4. Draft a communications strategy and action plan for the TFAP
  - 4.1 develop a strategy and action plan which fill priority communications needs identified during the needs analysis;
  - 4.2 develop an action plan including activities for the short, medium and long term; resources required to implement the activities; and an overall budget for implementing the action plan;
  - 4.3 develop a draft version of the strategy and action plan for comments by TFAP staff and participants and a final version incorporating these comments.

**RESOURCES NEEDED:**

To compile an effective strategy the FAG considers that a sum of at least US\$ 25,000 should be made available by donors and that the study should be completed within a period of two months or less. It should be carried out as soon as possible.

# Strategy

## Information

**Source**

**Coordination**

**Mode**

**Users**

**New  
Information**

Field Data

Research

Analysis

Review

Evaluation

**Existing  
Information**

**TFAP**

Global Levels

Regional Levels

National Levels

Monitoring  
Information

Newsletters

Case Studies

Overviews

Plans

Project Documents

Extension

Audio-Visual

Press/TV/Radio  
Releases

RT's

Regional Meetings

Decision Makers

Planners (TFAP)

Implementers

Management

Observers  
(Feedback)

Public

Press



**ANNEX 6**

**REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 3**

**MULTI-DONOR TRUST FUND  
AND  
COUNTRY CAPACITY PROJECTS**

**FORESTRY ADVISERS GROUP ON FUTURE DONOR SUPPORT TO FAO  
MULTI DONOR TRUST FUND AND UNDP PROPOSAL FOR SUPPORT TO  
COUNTRY CAPACITY PROJECTS**

The Forestry Advisers Group considered two proposals for donor support to TFAP, the extension of the FAO Multi-donor Trust Fund in support of TFAP and an UNDP Programme in support of Country Capacity Projects.

**1. EXTENSION OF THE FAO MDTF IN SUPPORT OF TFAP**

**1.1 BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION PRESENTED BY THE EVALUATION MISSION**

The present MDTF was established to strengthen the role of the FAO-TFAP Coordination Unit in 6 specific fields. A joint evaluation took place from 8 - 28 January 1992. Despite a number of shortcomings of the project, the evaluation concluded that the following achievements of the MDTF and the potential of FAO's CU justified continuing support:

- (a) facilitating and providing high quality technical advice and information on various aspects of general TFAP formulation and implementation;
- (b) technical backstopping and short-term support to NFAP formulation and implementation;
- (c) promoting donor support and donor coordination through the organisation of round tables and other mechanisms;
- (d) promoting technical cooperation among developing countries through the organisation of regional meetings, regional documentation centres, etc.

However, the mission identified some important gaps in the pace of progress for important activities of global nature, such as the preparation of guidelines and studies on new substantive issues as well as information activities.

The Mission stressed the need for continued strengthening of FAO's role in contributing to TFAP with regard to its conceptual, strategic and technical aspects, as a channel for information, and liaison. These were the areas where FAO had a comparative advantage, and follow-up assistance through a new multi-donor trust fund project should therefore focus on these aspects. The mission considered the pros and cons of whether the current project should be extended further or a new project should be initiated immediately following the current project period. The mission concluded in favour of the latter, especially for the reason to ensure that the new project would be more sharply focussed on the recommended aspects and not merely represent a follow-up phase of the current project per se. Also, it was submitted that the new project, in scope and targets of activities, should be based on realistic estimates of FAO's carrying capacity which was not necessarily the case in the design of the current project. Yet, there was a need for built-in flexibility which had proved particularly useful during the implementation of the current project. A new three year MDTF project for approximately US\$ 7 million in total was proposed, which should start immediately upon termination of the current project in September 1992.

## 1.2 CONSIDERATIONS BY THE FORESTRY ADVISERS GROUP

Based on the findings of the Mission, but taking into account the following points:

- (a) The protracted discussion among TFAP parties regarding an institutional mechanism for TFAP, the outcome of which may have considerable implications on the functions of the TFAP Coordination Unit, continue and will only be concluded well after the termination date of the present project.
- (b) Also, in 1993 related assistance to the TFAP Coordinating Unit by the Italian Government (GCP/INT/540/ITA) will phase out and there are no concrete indications as yet whether follow-up assistance can be expected from Italy in support to TFAP.
- (c) The support for CCP through existing and future national and international projects.
- (d) Furthermore, FAO will prepare its PWB proposals for the biennium 1994/95 in late 1992/early 1993 which have direct connections with the qualitative and quantitative contents of the new MDTF project, since it provides complimentary programme support to FAO's TFAP activities.



The Forestry Advisers concluded it to be more prudent and yet more effective, if a bridging phase be considered by the donors for the duration of 15 months, i.e. for the period 1 October 1992 to 31 December 1992, which may for pragmatic and expeditious reasons be processed as an extension of the current MDTF project.

The substantive contents of such a 15 months bridging phase should be presented in the form of a comprehensive project framework, showing clearly the adjusted focus of project objectives, activities and outputs. The budget for donor input requirements should be determined by a clear output - input analysis, stating the complementary extra budgetary resources to FAO's own inputs (RP or any other available sources of funding), based on a detailed work programme of the TFAP Coordinating Unit for the period 1 October 1992 to 31 December 1993.

The MDTF should be designed so that all the funding available to the CU be maintained at current levels.

FAG encourages the CU staff to consider favourably extended their employment for the period of this bridging project to ensure continuity.

The FAG welcomed FAO's intention to fully integrate the functions of the CU within the activities of the regular programme. It will be critical that this process be completed by the end of the bridging period.

### 1.3 PROPOSED SCOPE FOR TFAP COORDINATING UNIT ACTIVITIES

#### **A. INTERNATIONAL**

International level including thematic analysis, information and liaison [allocated time and resources 65%].

#### **B. REGIONAL**

Regional level including cooperation and training [allocated time and resources 15%]

#### **C. NATIONAL**

Critical inputs in the process upon request from the country when NFAP is starting up, stalled or in difficulty [allocated time 20%].

## A. INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

### A.1. Revision of analytical and thematic guidelines (based on feedback from country experience).

- Updating operational principles.
- Preparation of technical notes attached to operational principles. (See C.1.).
- \* Conceptual guidelines for establishment and revision of NFAPs [framework and criteria].
- \* Guidelines for programme management at national level.

### A.2. Information Management

- General documentation reports etc particularly reports on round tables (RT III and IV).
- TFAPRIS Data base.
- TFAMIS establishment and development of the system and training in it.
- Analysis and interpretation of the data.
- TFAP UPDATE and TFAPULSE.
- Communication strategy implementation.

**Output:** Country specific documentation

- Basis for A.1.
- Information service for recipient countries donors and NGOs.

### A.3. Liaison

- Focal point for future activities in TFAP process, initial processing of requests, contacting donors to co-finance joint missions.
- Communications: mail fax answering request.
- Organisation and participation in international meetings FFDC, FAG, CFDT, CF and COFO.
- Presentation of TFAP in international fora.
- Public relations brochures folders etc.
- Assist participation of NFAP coordinators to FAG meetings.

**A.4. Training Workshops/Seminars**

- Promoting understanding and correct use of operational procedures.

**B. REGIONAL LEVEL**

**B.1. Regional cooperation meetings of NFAP coordinators.** (MTDF would pay 50% of national coordinators).

**B.2. Training Workshops**

- Operational principles.
- Promotion of technical workshops on:
  - \* project preparation working up project profiles
  - \* monitoring and evaluation techniques at the national level (TFAMIS);
  - \* participatory approaches.

**C. NATIONAL LEVEL**

**C.1. Critical inputs in the process upon request from the country when NFAP is starting up, stalled or in difficulty.**

**1.4 CO-FINANCING PROGRAMME FOR COUNTRY CAPACITY PROJECTS**

The Forestry Advisers welcomed the UNDP Country Capacity Programme Proposal. Several advisers strongly supported the idea. None were currently in a position to commit their agency to finance the joint programme, however they encouraged UNDP to further develop and submit the proposal to the appropriate donor representatives. Advisers agreed that as many donors as possible should participate in funding the programme.



The advisers felt that multilateral funding of Country Capacity Programmes (CCP) could make a positive contribution in many countries. Developing countries should have options for funding country capacity consistent with a country-driven TFAP process. Duplication where bilateral donors or development banks were already funding CCPs should be avoided. Programme design and implementation should seek to ensure complementarity and positive interaction with existing programmes.

It was felt that CCPs were consistent with the important role of UNDP in national capacity building. UNDP was urged to commit its available central funds to the extent of 15% of the total programme. The FAs agreed that TFAP partnership arrangements should characterize the management of the Programme.

UNDP was requested to strengthen the proposal in relation to the criteria for selecting countries, the means to maximize leveraging of additional funds for national forest programmes, and in developing a special management structure and country level procedures for the programme to ensure quality in execution.

Innovative methods for co-financing and bilateral participation should be developed. Assuming the programme could be satisfactorily strengthened in these areas, the advisers felt there would be good prospects for funding and implementation of the programme.

ANNEX 7

COUNTRY CAPACITY FOR NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES

UNDP Presentation to TFAP Advisers Group

## UNDP PROJECT BRIEF

Division Chief:	Luis Gomez Echeverri
Area Officer:	Ralph Schmidt
Resident Representative:	Various

### I. BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

Country:	INT	IPF:
Project Number and Title:	INT/92/000	Country Capacity for National Forest Programmes
Expected Duration:	1992	
Proposed Executing Agency:	National execution; OPS co-operation	
Government Implementing Agency:	Various	
Proposed UNDP Contribution:	\$1,000,000	Source of funds: SPR/DGIP/RBs
Government Cost Sharing:	Various	
Third-party Cost Sharing:	\$19,000,000	Source of funds: Bilateral
Total UNDP Budget:	\$20,000,000	

Approval Process: The project has been requested and will be presented to bilateral donors interested in developing country national forest programmes and TFAP. It will be discussed with Regional Bureaux in a PAC and then presented to the AC.

### II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Background: Poverty and environmental degradation are linked. Sixty percent of the developing world's poorest people live in highly vulnerable ecological areas and about one billion live in tropical forest areas. Short term survival strategies of these people conflict with environmental protection. The problem is how to combine the relief of poverty with the sustainable use of natural resources in the interests of future generations.

Tropical forests are extensive in almost all developing countries and intimately involved in the livelihoods of the people, especially the poorest people. Almost nowhere in the tropics are sustainable land use and natural resource management practiced within forest lands. Clearing and degrading the forest decreases their contribution to national and local economies and endangers the survival of present and future generations.

Protecting the forest environment protects the health and wellbeing of the poorest of the poor. For they depend disproportionately on natural resources in their untreated and unprocessed state - river and ground water without filtration and chemical treatment; the forests and woodlands for fuel, building materials and animal fodder; the soil devoid of chemical fertilizer for subsistence and cash crops.

There is an acute and mounting crisis of tropical deforestation; 20 million ha are destroyed every year. The causes vary, and different economic social and political pressures apply in different parts of the world. Poverty, population growth and public policies are all involved. The consequences include loss of soil and food productivity, fuelwood scarcity, destruction of wildlife habitat, loss of protein sources for rural populations, loss of medicinal plants and extinction of genetic resources. Unsustainable land use practices including lack of forest management lead to resource depletion and adverse socio-economic effects. Poverty, unemployment, migration and social instability may follow.

Tropical forests are the most important resource in the developing countries in regard to two major global environmental issues - biodiversity and global warming. These issues pose major threats to the future habitability of the planet. At no time have forests commanded a higher priority within the global agenda.

Few if any developing countries have a comprehensive and effective programme for wise use and conservation of forest resources. However more than 70 developing countries have launched national forest programmes within the TFAP framework. Many of these countries have made very substantial progress towards viable and effective national programmes. Based on these experiences, much has been learned on how to proceed. A multi-sectoral, widely participatory approach where government co-ordinates the effective co-operation of donors are key elements. National capacities need consistent and continuing support to achieve these ends.



UNDP and other international cooperation organizations have financed forest sector studies and programmes in many countries. Funding for national forest programmes currently proceeds on a ad hoc basis through many channels. Developing countries, donors and NGOs are requesting that UNDP strengthen its leadership role in comprehensive multi-donor forest sector programmes. A consistent and coherent programme to support the building of developing country capacity to manage national forest programmes is clearly needed and widely supported.

**B. Description of Project:** This project will support an interregional effort in developing countries which are managing on-going programmes within the framework of the Tropical Forests Action Programme (TFAP) to develop comprehensive programmes focused on the forest sector and involving all sectors important for forests. It will build on lessons UNDP has learned through its field work, including the \$ 50 million per year directed at forest related activities, namely: that tangible field results are best achieved when local communities are the main protagonists of activities; that building local capacities, in and out of government, is the most lasting result of any programme; and that comprehensive programmatic approaches, although complex and difficult, present the best opportunity for significant progress. A key characteristic of comprehensive sector programming is the shift from donor-driven to a country-led process. Commitment at the country level is indispensable.

A variety of local institutional arrangements may be appropriate to achieve country-specific objectives, depending on individual country circumstances. Some countries may wish to continue use of external expertise, others may place greater reliance on in-country expertise and institutions, depending on their individual capacities. In any case, it is important to establish at the country level a participatory planning and implementation process, and a multi-disciplinary multi-sectoral approach to forest issues. A mechanism is needed at the country level to reinforce and support such an approach. A national steering committee or other such arrangement including important ministries, international organizations and NGOs and CBOs (community based organizations) is often the appropriate mechanism. To be effective the committee would obviously have to be empowered with the political authority to ensure the necessary internal collaboration. Wherever an appropriate mechanism exists this should be built upon to the extent possible to avoid duplication. Countries should also designate a national steering committee chairperson as the principle contact person with whom interested parties would interact.

Some countries will need assistance in setting up and supporting their steering committees and in helping them monitor and assess their activities. This project would provide technical assistance for this, and in particular contribute to country capacity projects to strengthen human resources and institutions for forest sector programmes. Developing countries may need assistance to start such a process or to adjust an existing on-going process to coincide with new priorities. Particular assistance may be needed in conveying the key role of policy in determining the sustainability of forest resources, in giving attention to the importance of consultation and involvement of grassroots groups, the private sector and other interested parties, in the establishment of a national steering committee for the forest sector programming process, in assessing the country's capacity to embark upon such a programme and in proposing technical assistance where necessary.

A collaborative effort amongst all interested donors is required, and this project will support UNDP Resident Representative in this key role. These efforts on behalf of forests and people are closely related to overall organizational priorities of programme approach, country capacity building, poverty alleviation, environmental and natural resources management, participatory people centered development and national execution of programmes. It will also strengthen UNDP's lead role in developing collaboration between all organizations for more effective management of better financed international co-operation.

**B.1. Women and forestry:** In many developing country rural societies, women persevere in the traditional role of collecting and utilizing fuelwood and often carry the main work burden in agricultural activities. Thus, forest development has direct impact on the life and work of women, and women may view the role of forests and trees in the communities' life differently than men. Because of these roles women may realize more often than men the importance of forests in conserving and maintaining the natural environment. The inclusion of women's views and participation is of paramount importance in planning and implementing forest development and conservation.



The important role of women in forest development, and the impact of this development on the life and work of women, need substantially greater attention in the development of national forest programmes. Women's roles and views should be analyzed and included from the inception of the programming process. Specific attention should be given to training and other measures to incorporate fully local community women in the design and implementation of such activities as tree planting, cottage industry development and extension work. Where local women's NGOs exist, these should always be accorded a prominent role in national forest programming.

**B.2. NGOs:** There are five main groups of NGOs which have a direct interest in national forest programmes and the processes which lead to them: community and indigenous organisations; conservation and environmental organizations; forester and other professional organizations; trade and labour organizations of loggers, sawmillers, timber merchants, rubber tappers, rattan processors, etc. All of these have been involved in the development of national forest plans, but no programme has included all of these types of NGOs. Some countries have included and utilized NGOs in the national programming process very successfully and others much less so. Often the comments of conservation NGOs have been critical to the point where further contact with them has been avoided.

Criticisms of national forest programmes by local NGOs, sometimes well founded and justified, have been of two kinds: a) that important aspects of forest sector development have not been given sufficient attention, something which could have been avoided had they been involved in the process, and b) that they were not invited or requested to participate in national forest programme development work. The various types of NGOs will have a role in the implementation and execution of the national programme and should be involved as early as possible in the process, beginning with the preparation of preliminary studies and policy and planning work. Because many local NGOs are unlikely to have financial resources, support should be included in the programming process when warranted.

**C. Inputs:** UNDP will support national and possibly international experts in comprehensive and participatory forest sector programming. Training opportunities will be provided and support for documentation and organization of meetings. Support will focus on building national capacity to implement and monitor participatory, comprehensive forest sector programmes. Countries and Resident Representatives will define their own needs to support national capacity for forest sector programming.

**D. Financial Data:** (As an average in each of 40 countries)

	<u>US\$</u>	<u>£</u>
Personnel	250,000	
Training	100,000	
Equipment	75,000	
National consultations and travel	50,000	
Miscellaneous	25,000	
Total UNDP Budget (per country)	500,000	—
Total UNDP Budget	20,000,000	

**E. Target Group:** Primary beneficiaries are the hundreds of millions of mostly very poor people who live in and around the tropical forests. Production and access to fuelwood and soil and water conservation will incorporate, empower and benefit poor women. Capacity building, policy changes and technical co-operation will benefit rural people's efforts to maintain sustainable livelihoods. As tropical forests play major roles in economic development and water regulation, for example, management will benefit most inhabitants of developing countries. The contribution of sustainable management and protection of forests to biodiversity conservation and climatic stability benefit the entire planet.

**F. Government Commitment:** Governments must be committed to the importance and priority of comprehensive forest sector programming based on their own priorities and according to the principles guiding the programme. There must also be commitment to managing and harmonizing the actions of donors interested in the sector.



G. Executing Arrangements: The project will be nationally executed in each country with OPS. The funds will be authorized for management by Resident Representatives in nationally executed comprehensive forest sector programmes. Specialized agencies such as FAO and national and international NGOs such as IUCN will execute or be associated with programmes according to national priorities and decisions. Programming will usually focus on managing and dovetailing the activities of many interested donors and on managing the process of a widely participatory national discussion on the many complex issues related to sustainable management in the forest sector. Specific activities will vary in accord with the specific needs of the field office and government.

H. Other Related Past or Ongoing Projects: The TFAP was launched in 1985, sponsored by FAO, IBRD, WRI and UNDP. TFAP has helped to increase awareness of tropical forest issues and needs in both developing and industrialized countries. More than 80 developing countries and 40 aid agencies have participated. There is now wide agreement that TFAP has not met its original goals. Developing countries point out that too little additional concessionary financing has become available. Donors and many conservation NGOs question the quality of some of the plans and the absence of a long term strategy. UNDP, IBRD and FAO have co-operated for more than a year in managing a wide consultation to reform TFAP. There is a clear need to develop a mechanism for shared governance of a co-operative programme. Concerned Governments are still discussing how that mechanism should operate. The wide consultations on TFAP produced many useful conclusions and agreements on how to collaborate on comprehensive forest sector planning at the national level. The present project supports these approaches.

UNDP has funded sector studies or follow up TFAP projects in more than 20 countries. This project will provide special and additional support to all developing countries and UNDP field offices with a commitment to manage a more cross sectoral, participatory approach through relying on national capacity building.

I. Other Policy Issues: The design and implementation of a global forest programme is a major world issue and UN concern. Forests are a key issue on the UNCED Agenda, and developing countries are cognizant that they are of great concern for the global community. The development of a World Forest Convention has been endorsed by a G-7 summit meeting. The final PrepCom of UNCED has provided largely agreed upon texts for, "A non-legally binding authoritative statement of principles for a global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests", and "Combating deforestation: options for Agenda 21". The "Principles" document may become the basis for further international negotiations for a legal instrument on forests, although this is controversial. The TFAP programme is active, important and strongly supported in at least 70 developing countries. Donors have indicated their readiness to increase significantly their support for forest programmes. There is at this time in UNDP no other special or interregional support specifically for forests which constitute a key environment and development sector in developing countries.

As the international debate on a global forest programme progresses, all agree that capacity building in this field in developing countries is an urgent need which requires immediate and consistent support. Member nations have requested UNDP to take a lead in this and the UNCED has designated a lead role for UNDP in capacity building.

J. Conditions for Approval: Wide acceptance and support of the programme from developing countries, interested donors and TFAP co-sponsors. Approval by an inter-Bureaux PAC and the AC.



ANNEX 8

UNDP PROJECT BRIEF

## COUNTRY CAPACITY FOR NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES

### UNDP Presentation to TFAP Advisers Group

Dublin, Ireland, 20 May 1992

#### Background

Certain things have remained more or less constant in the rapidly shifting world forest scene. There is still an urgent need in the great majority of developing countries for serious expansion of the capacity to manage national forest programmes.

Consideration of the collaborative management of the TFAP has been subsumed into the complex and contentious global debate on the stewardship of forest resources. The UNCED PrepCom has been, by far, the most intense, visible and high-level international debate on forest resources ever conducted. (See final section for further discussions on UNCED.)

The forests of developing countries, in addition to their overwhelming national economic and environmental importance, are the key resources for global action on biodiversity and global warming. There is linkage to trade, debt and the consumption levels of energy and natural resources in industrialized countries. Progress on these issues is imperative, but negotiations will not be concluded quickly. Meanwhile deforestation and associated rural poverty have worsened.

For national forest programmes, most developing countries define funding as their most important need. International co-operation organizations agree that national capacity building is a key need. Total international funding for forests in developing countries has doubled in the past decade to more than \$1 billion. This financing proceeds on an ad-hoc basis through many independent channels. Donors, understandably, wish to maximize the effectiveness of the programmes they fund. Developing countries, understandably, wish to have a strong role in financing and programming decisions.

#### Managing National Forest Programmes

Somewhat surprisingly, given the many disputed issues within the UNCED debate on forests, there is considerable agreement on how matters should proceed in managing national forest programmes. Points of general consensus include:

- \* The national government should be the driving force;



- \* Government should manage a continuing process of wide participation in programming discussions, including community and public interest groups;
- \* Many sectors of government and society should be meaningfully involved;
- \* Donors should participate in the design and execution of the national programme, and a process managed by government should assure that donors' programmes are complementary and mutually reinforcing.

These are some of the principal elements of the capacity of a country to manage a national forests programme. (The capacity to implement the programme in the field is an equally important matter.)

These general attributes of national forest programmes leave several issues to be determined within each country.

- \* There may be a programme focused specifically on forests or a broader conservation, environment or sustainable development programme which may include forests as a component.
- \* A line Ministry or Planning Ministry or Commission may take the lead.
- \* There may be national and international steering committees or they may operate as one.
- \* Countries will have different strategies regarding the significance of donor and independent group participation.

The TFAP process, for all its problematic aspects, can be credited with building international consensus on the important areas of agreement mentioned above. High political level international discussions on forests will most probably continue in some way, and whatever their result there will be a need to support country capacity to manage national forest programmes.

Certain large countries with extensive forests, Brazil and Indonesia, for example, have the option of directly negotiating international co-operation within their programmes. This has been done in conjunction with TFAP or independently. However, considering the large number of countries who have embarked on NFAPs, a consistent, reliable system for supporting the national programming process is necessary for a vigorous and balanced global programme. Without such a system many national programme management units will atrophy at some point, and national programmes, forests and people will suffer accordingly.



## Supporting National Forest Programme Management Units

The TFAP Advisers are well acquainted with the Country Capacity Programme concept. Each country will have its own approach based on its particular situation. A coherent global programme will also be consistent with agreed principles such as those outlined above and principles and objectives for forestry agreed upon at the UNCED. Funds would support national managers, with international assistance when appropriate, to build and execute a national forests programme with wide national and international participation.

Meaningful participation will require well prepared and reported meetings. National managers will be supported in this task and in providing the support that people's and public interest groups will need to be truly involved. This summarizes the all important participatory aspect of country capacity for national forest programmes.

Other fundamental aspects of country capacity include policy analysis and political commitment (closely related to participation), generating and exchanging the information necessary to guide national decisions on forests, and developing the human resources to manage the programme. All are part of country capacity support. National programme managers also need the means to participate significantly in international forest programme events.

Within the context of a country driven process it may seem that national funds should support national programme management units. National commitment is undoubtedly indispensable, and could be expected to fund internal co-ordination. The fact that many donors participate on a bilateral basis in international forestry co-operation necessitates co-ordination of their efforts by developing countries. There is clear justification for donor support to national units which promote the complementarity and effectiveness of international contributions.

A national forest programme requiring the co-operation of several ministries, the participation of the private sector, people's groups and NGOs, as well as co-operation with bilateral donors and intergovernmental organizations is a very complex undertaking. Most developing countries will need international assistance to succeed in this crucial effort.

National forest programme management units are now functioning in scores of developing countries around the world. They may be funded by national budgets, bilateral donors, multilateral bank loans, FAO funds or UNDP IPF. Some countries have been unable to obtain any external funding. All of these funding sources are subject to termination due to events far beyond the forest sector. It is unlikely that UNDP would support long-term programme management units without a special source of funding. No funding



is guaranteed in perpetuity, but there is a clear and critical need in many countries for stable, long-term support for forest programming.

Developing countries may have preferences regarding international funding for national forest programme management units from bilateral, multilateral investment or multilateral technical co-operation sources. Within a country driven process all these options should be available to countries. If UNDP is requested to support a national programme management unit, FAO may be requested to provide technical assistance, according to government decision.

Through IPF resources UNDP continues to fund national forest programme management units in more than 20 countries. These programmes are developed individually within each country. There may be different approaches, delays or interruptions.

#### A Multilateral Fund for Country Capacity

An alternative which is complementary to IPF is a special fund administered by UNDP. Several such funds have been operated successfully within UNDP in the past few years to streamline and reinforce support in priority programme areas. Resident Representatives, and governments through them, are made aware of funding that is available and of the purposes for which it may be used. They submit detailed proposals on how to utilize these funds in country programmes. Once approved, transfer of funds to Resident Representatives is authorized and funds are administered under standard regulations. Special fund disbursements are often complemented by IPF or bilateral or multilateral bank co-financing. Special funds serve to stimulate and leverage other funds for the targeted programme area.

These centralized programmes are administered by the Office for Project Services with technical determination of funding allocations by the Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation. Regional Bureaux officers are involved for individual countries. These funds may be administered without provision of any additional headquarters staff or the special fund programme may call for a consultant management unit. Once funds are transferred to the field offices they are managed according to regular UNDP procedures.

The project document for such a programme will specify precise objectives and activities, and can clearly define the procedures and criteria for the utilization of funds within country programmes. Programmes may be evaluated and reviewed (by independent teams if appropriate) as often as necessary. There could be an advisory committee for such a programme.

Assuming general support for this approach, UNDP could join with other donors to establish a programme for Support to Country



Capacity for Forest Programmes. \$20 million per year is a reasonable figure to start a global effort in this regard, and UNDP would hope to mobilize this from donors interested in a co-ordinated international programme for forests. This could, for example, provide an average of \$500,000 per year to 40 countries with national forest programmes with significant international participation and funding that wish to access international programme support through multilateral channels. Countries with larger populations and forests should be able to access greater funds.

### Justification

As an example of comprehensive financing for a national programme, the Indonesia Forest Action Programme has recently mobilized and is programming several hundred million dollars of international funding. A multilateral fund serving many countries is an enabling mechanism for investment and bilateral participation in national forest programmes. It merely complements and facilitates the much greater international support necessary for the viability of these programmes. The proposed programme is not a funding mechanism for world forestry, but a facilitator for a coherent programme.

Another option is for bilateral donor programmes to provide directly all support to national forest programmes. As in the case of Indonesia, bilateral support has a very important, perhaps the principle, role in funding components of national programmes. Each bilateral donor can support programmes according to its own particular criteria. A bilateral strategy would not contribute as much as a multilateral programme to common approaches based on international consensus. Without some central identity it will be difficult to achieve a strong, coherent international forests programme, a goal which has general support across the globe.

There are several additional advantages to supporting country capacity through a special multilateral programme.

- \* Developing countries would have ready access to international support for national forest programme management units and would be able to choose whether to establish this through bilateral or multilateral, investment or technical assistance channels.
- \* The donor community would be taking clear and positive action to support TFAP and national forest programmes in developing countries.
- \* Criteria for utilization of the fund would establish clear and transparent operational principles for all international forest co-operation partners.



- \* The donor community would be joining together to co-operate on clearly identifiable and highly visible support for national forest programmes which has been repeatedly called for by the developing countries.
- \* Developing countries would be able to access funding much more quickly than by negotiating through UNDP IPF, multilateral bank, or bilateral funding channels. Support for national capacity would not fluctuate, alternatively building and reducing national programme management capability.
- \* Developing countries would consistently and steadily build capacity to manage national and international support for comprehensive forest programmes.
- \* All developing countries participating in TFAP would have equal access to support for building national capacity to manage comprehensive forest programmes and could access funds based on national priorities and according to agreed criteria.

### Timing

There are many activities related to forests occurring in the international arena: the Rio Conference including the Forest Principles discussion, the FAO ad-hoc Group process, the Developing Countries Forest Forum, the review of the multi-donor trust fund for the TFAP co-ordinating unit, the Biodiversity and Climate Conventions negotiations, and the review of the Global Environment Facility. The question of waiting for the outcome of all these naturally occurs.

Firstly, the international community has already been waiting on a fully supported forest programme since the June 1990 proposals to revise the TFAP. None of the negotiations mentioned above are likely to provide adequate support for comprehensive national programmes for forests in the near future.

The commitment of the 75 developing countries that are significantly engaged in TFAP should not be allowed to wither for want of international support.

Every passing day destroys forests, the livelihoods of the people who depend on them, and the viability and credibility of national and international programmes. The international community has a clear responsibility to get on with the job.



## Relationship with Other Programmes and Processes

### UNCED

Related to forests the final PrepCom has provided largely agreed upon texts for, "A non-legally binding authoritative statement of principles for a global consensus on the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests", and "Combating deforestation: options for Agenda 21". (Post PrepCom IV versions appended.) Documents very similar to these are likely to be the main forest related output of the Rio Conference.

The "Principles" document is wide ranging and general. It may (there is disagreement and controversy) become the basis for further international negotiations on a legal instrument on forests. If the UNCED gives any indication, these negotiations, if held, will proceed slowly. Any intergovernmental negotiating group for the legal instrument could function as a high level international group on forests. In all likelihood the international negotiation would discuss all forests and its membership would be open to all countries.

The Agenda 21 draft on forests is also a very general document. It's mention of TFAP, if finally approved, is a general one. It outlines a broad and comprehensive agenda including objectives and activities in four programme areas. Means of implementation are yet to be specifically negotiated. Agenda 21 will provide officially agreed upon objectives and activities for global forest programmes. It appears very unlikely that it will provide specific guidance on management and implementation procedures for 'FAF'.

Two important points for a country capacity building programme emerge from these documents on forests:

- \* resolution of final questions regarding a world forest forum or programme may take several to many years and;
- \* support to national capacity to manage forest programmes which include international funding does not conflict in any way with the "Principles" or "Agenda 21 - Forests". On the contrary, the support will complement the achievement of these objectives, maintaining vigorous national programmes with international participation until a generally supported, well financed international forest programme with clearly defined governance emerges.

Agenda 21 on International Institutional Arrangements, in its post PrepCom IV version, presents the following directives on UNDP. "UNDP would be one of the main financing and operational agencies in the implementation of Agenda 21, drawing on the expertise of the specialized agencies and other UN organizations and bodies involved in operational activities.



"Its role would include the following:

"(a) (Agreed) Acting as the lead agency in organizing UN system efforts towards capacity building at the local, national and regional levels; ...

"(d) Assisting recipient countries in the establishment and strengthening of national co-ordination mechanisms and networks related to activities for sustainable development; ..."

The proposal outlined here is thus completely in line with UNCED directives for UNDP. In that context, it is conceived as an integral and complementary part of UNDP's overall activities in support of building national capacity to manage sustainable development programmes.

#### Consultative Forum

The Consultative Forum process now seems closely linked with UNCED and is referred to above. The ad-hoc Group may clear the way for FAO participation in some kind of forum. The UNCED forest discussions may result in a group to discuss global forest agreements or policy. The possible elevation of the Forum to the UNCED (General Assembly) level or the inclusion of forests as one topic in a more general forum or commission only reinforces the need for an effective, sustained and unified international programme to support national programmes on forest resources.

If and when an International Forum on Forests is created, a unified fund would provide one clear focus for its policy analysis and advice.

#### TFAP Co-ordination Unit (CU) and FAO Role

At this writing there is some uncertainty as to the future of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund Project which has supported the CU. An evaluation mission has recommended its renewal. Be that as it may TFAP activities will surely continue as a high priority within FAO. Direct support for national activities can only complement and reinforce whatever centralized co-ordination activities are deemed necessary. At the national level governments would determine the role of FAO which has been substantial in UNDP funded programmes up to the present.

The report of the Joint Evaluation Mission on the Multi-Donor Trust Fund Project in Support of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan (with FAO's comments - April 1992) states the following:

"The mission considers that future support to TFAP as a whole should include the following components:



- a. provision of high quality technical advice and information on various aspects of general TFAP formulation and implementation;
- b. technical backstopping and short-term support to NFAP formulation and implementation;
- c. monitoring of progress made with the implementation of NFAPs and dissemination of such information to all concerned partners;
- d. training of forestry planners and others engaged in NFAPs in new and emerging issues affecting forestry in developing countries;
- e. financial support to approximately 40-50 countries to implement country capacity projects; and
- f. financial support for implementation of individual projects emanating from NFAP processes.

"In the mission's judgement, technical assistance would be needed to provide support to activities a. - c., and here FAO could continue to play an important part in providing such technical assistance, including through a possible follow-up project to the present MDTF project. For the training component (point d.), where FAO can also play a useful role, the recently started Italian Trust Fund is well designed. However, support to the execution of country capacity projects in 40-50 countries (point e.) would require a substantial amount of assistance, say at least US\$20 million per year, for which separate and innovative mechanisms might have to be found. The mission is of the opinion that there are good prospects for broad support for such an arrangement, provided that a programme approach is used in which the use of funds is basically determined by individual developing countries engaged in NFAPs. Some of the projects funded under this arrangement may be assigned for FAO execution ...

"... the mission recommends that as soon as possible, discussions should be initiated among donor organizations, including multilateral organizations regarding the ways and means for generating funds for facilitating and ensuring that country-driven processes materialize. Arguments for a programme in support of country-driven NFAP's, including 'minimum quantity' support to Country Capacity Projects have been given in para. 5.28 ...

"Comments (by FAO)

The recommendation is strongly supported. FAO continues to assist the tropical forest countries in the preparation of country capacity building projects, as a matter of priority, and invites the donors to increase their funding commitments for this purpose. The proposed follow-up phase to the present Multi-Donor TF combined with RP resources, will further increase FAO's effective support to country capacity project development. It is observed that the actual requirements of the tropical forest countries for country capacity building may well exceed the level estimated by the mission."

Forest Advisers (FA) Group

An overall study of TFAP contracted by the FA Group will undoubtedly provide useful conclusions for the design and execution of country capacity projects. However, action to support national capacity should not wait for the conclusion of such a study. The arguments presented in the "Justification" and "Timing" sections of this paper are germane here. They include the facts that all parties are agreed that support for national capacity for a country led process is an urgent need, that the momentum that has been created in developing countries should not be lost, and that the time has come to minimize rather than compound delays.

An international capacity programme will need to be flexible to address the needs and priorities of many countries and will be able to accommodate new ideas and approaches as they are developed through international consensus.