

Evaluation

Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources

COUNTRY REPORTS

Parts: 1. Kenya, 3. Tanzania, 4. Zambia



Evaluation report 2010:5/II

(1. Kenya, 3. Tanzania, 4. Zambia)

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

- REPORT 2010:5/II Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources. Country and Regional Reports (Parts 1 Kenya, 2 Mozambique (Eng, Por), 3 Tanzania, 4 Zambia, 5 Lao Peoples Democratic Republic, 6 Vietnam, 7 Western Balkans, 8 Central America)
ISBN: 978-951-724-878-5 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-879-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2010:5/I Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources
ISBN: 978-951-724-876-1 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-877-8 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2010:4 Sustainability in Poverty Reduction: Synthesis
ISBN: 978-951-724-874-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-875-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2010:3 The Finnish Development Cooperation in the Water Sector
ISBN: 978-951-724-848-8 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-849-5 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2010:2 Development Cooperation with Ethiopia 2000–2008
ISBN: 978-951-724-839-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-840-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2010:1 The Transition Towards a New Partnership with Egypt
ISBN: 978-951-724-837-2 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-838-9 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:9 Meta-Analysis of Development Evaluations in 2007 and 2008
ISBN: 978-951-724-809-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-810-5 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:8 Natural Disasters, Climate Change and Poverty
ISBN: 978-951-724-807-5 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-808-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:7 The North-South-South Higher Education Network Programme
ISBN: 978-951-724-790-0 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-791-7 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:6 DEMO Finland Development Programme
ISBN: 978-951-724-784 9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-785 0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:5 Finnish Aid in Western Kenya; Impact and Lessons Learned
ISBN: 978-951-724-783-2 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-786-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:4 Meta-analysis of Development Cooperation on HIV /AIDS
ISBN: 978-951-724-769-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-770 2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:3 Support to Development Research
ISBN: 978-951-724-755-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-756 6 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:2 Agriculture and Rural Development. A Preliminary Study
ISBN: 978-951-724-746 7-(printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-747 4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2009:1 Finland ´s Development Cooperation in Central Asia and South Caucasus
ISBN: 978-951-724-728 3-(printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-729 0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:7 Kosovo Country Programme
ISBN: 978-951-724-716-0 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-717-7 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:6 The Cross-cutting Themes in the Finnish Development Cooperation
ISBN: 978-951-224-714-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-224-715-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:5 Finnish NGO Foundations
ISBN: 978-951-724-709-2 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-710-8 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:4 FIDIDA: An Examlle of Outsourced Service 2004–2008
ISBN: 978-951-724-690-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-691-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:3 Evolving New Partnerships between Finland and Namibia
ISBN: 978-951-724-701-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-702-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618

Evaluation

**Finnish Support to Forestry and
Biological Resources**

Country Reports

Parts: 1. Kenya, 3. Tanzania, 4. Zambia

**Evaluation report 2010:5/II
(1. Kenya, 3. Tanzania, 4. Zambia)**

This report can be accessed at [http:// formin.finland.fi](http://formin.finland.fi)
and hard copies can be requested from EVA-11@formin.fi

or

Development Evaluation (EVA-11)
The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
P. O. Box 512
FI-00023 GOVERNMENT
Finland

ISBN 978-951-724-878-5 (printed)

ISBN 978-951-724-879-2 (pdf)

ISSN 1235-7618

Cover photo: Antti Erkkilä

Cover design: Anni Palotie

Layout: Taittopalvelu Yliveto Oy

Printing house: Kopijyvä Oy

Anyone reproducing the content or part of the content of the report should acknowledge the source. Proposed reference: Forbes A & Karani I 2010 *Evaluation of Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources. Country Reports: Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia*. Evaluation report 2010:5/II Parts 1, 3, 4. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Kopijyvä Oy, Jyväskylä, 70 p. ISBN 978-951-724-878-5 (printed).

Evaluation

Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources

Country Reports Part 1. Kenya

Alex Forbes

Evaluation report 2010:5/II (1. Kenya)

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

This evaluation was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland to LTS International Ltd. The Consultants bear the sole responsibility for the contents of the report. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	vii
SUMMARY.....	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Brief Overview of Forestry Sector.....	3
1.2 Overview of the History of Finnish Support in Kenya.....	4
2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR.....	5
3 ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	7
4 CONCLUSIONS.....	13
REFERENCES.....	15
ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED.....	16
ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....	17
TABLES	
Table 1 Forestry interventions in Kenya 2007–2014.....	5

ACRONYMS

ASAL	Arid and Semi Arid Lands
CFA	Community Forest Associations
DSA	Daily Subsistence Allowance
EQ	Evaluation Question
ERSWEC	Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation
EUR	Euro
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FCC	Forest Conservation Committee
GoK	Government of Kenya
ha	Hectares
HAC	Harmonisation and Coordination Committee
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute
KFS	Kenya Forestry Service
KSH	Kenya Shillings
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MFW	Ministry of Forests and Wildlife
MMMB	Miti Mingi Maisha Bora (Support to the Forest Sector Reform in Kenya)
MSPNDV2030	Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030
NARC	National Rainbow Coalition
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
PIN	Project Identification Note
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
SME	Small/Medium Enterprise
SNT	Strategy for National Transformation
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank

SUMMARY

The country synthesis draws on a desk study of country and project documents and meetings with key individuals in Kenya and Finland that took place in April and June 2010 respectively. Key stakeholders met in Kenya include staff of the Kenya Forest Service (KFS), the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MFW), the Ministry of State of Planning and National Development (MSPNDV2030), the Ambassador and staff of the Embassy of Finland, donor representatives and civil society organisations.

The long history of Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) support in Kenya was suspended in 1998 due to the Government not endorsing a new Forestry Policy. It resumed in 2004 following a change in Government. The Miti Mingi Maisha Bora (MMMB) project was developed during 2006 and the inception phase started in July 2007 and ended in December 2009. The MMMB Implementation Phase commenced in September 2009 and will last for five years. The project is centered on supporting the forest sector reform in Kenya and is one of the MFA largest single country interventions and makes the MFA a significant partner to the Kenya Forest Service.

The main findings from the country assessment are:

- ❖ The MMMB is an ambitious programme that carries forward the main objectives of the MFA Guidelines on Forestry (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009c) and the MFA Development Assistance Policy (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007), and is well integrated within the needs and priorities of the Kenyan forestry sector and main national development priorities. The MMMB has one of the largest MFA financial allocations (EUR 18,644,990) for a country intervention and is potentially a “flag ship” intervention for MFA should it be successful.
- ❖ However, the main project risks are associated with political commitment to effect reforms in the sector, namely the lifting of the logging ban and endorsement of guidelines and procedures for charcoal production and trade and for other woody and non-woody commodities.
- ❖ The Kenya Forest Service is a semi-autonomous parastatal agency with an independent Board established in February 2007, following the endorsement of the new Forest Act (Government of Kenya 2005). It has made significant progress in strengthening its institutional capacity with support from USAID and the MMMB. The latter played an important role in strengthening internal governance and management systems including the design and application of a financial management system which is now in use by KFS.
- ❖ The effective engagement of the Embassy of Finland in leading the Forest Sub-Committee of the Government of Kenya (GoK)/Partner Harmonisation and Coordination Committee on Environment has played an important role towards a successful design and implementation of the MMMB Inception Phases. The Government led MMMB project has also been effectively complemented

with support to local NGOs engaged in the forestry sector using the Embassy Local Development Fund.

- ❖ Whilst the MMMB can have a positive impact towards sustainable development and poverty reduction in the medium to long-term, there is need to maintain focus in the short-term on continued institutional capacity building of KFS so as to ensure institutional sustainability.
- ❖ The Finnish led Technical Assistance team provides inputs in a range of technical areas that draw on Finnish added value in the areas of forest plantations, inventories, SMEs and farm-based forestry among others. It was every effective during the Inception Phase and the new team for the Implementation Phase is in the process of finalising workplans and best work practices.
- ❖ Support to the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MFW) and KFS through different aid modalities while under one intervention offers a case study for similar projects and serves to reinforce the mutually supportive nature of two separate components with one addressing regulatory requirements and National Forest Plan elaboration, and KFS addressing forest sector implementation and management.
- ❖ Cross-cutting issues (gender, equity, HIV/AIDS) were partially addressed during the Inception Phase and in the design of the Implementation Phase, but lacked clear direction on the “what” and “how”. For instance, indicators of change reflecting gender, equity and HIV/AIDS were not found in the logical framework at the level of objectives and results and therefore there were no corresponding activities and financial allocations. A study has been commissioned on gender and social equity to provide this input.

1 INTRODUCTION

Kenya's Vision 2030 aims to transform the country into a middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens. It is based on three pillars – economic, social and political and draws on the achievements obtained during the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERSWEC) – 2004–2007. The ERSWEC, Kenya's equivalent to the PRSP, incorporated key targets and indicators of the MDGs. By the end of the ERSWEC, poverty levels had declined from 56% in 2003 to 46% in 2006, and annual growth rate was 7.2% in 2007. The subsequent five year economic plan – Strategy for National Transformation (SNT) 2008–2012: Accelerating Equitable Economic and Social Development for a Prosperous Kenya – highlights the importance of safeguarding five critical “water towers” comprising of the main natural and plantation forest zones in Kenya in recognition of the ecological social and economic services that the forests provide.

1.1 Brief Overview of Forestry Sector

Kenya's woody resources include 120,000 ha of state forest plantation estates, comprising of *Cupressus lusitanica* and *Pinus*, of which an estimated 100,000 ha is stocked. State indigenous forests are gazetted reserves which cover approximately 1.2 million ha of variable quality. These forests contain 50% of Kenya's tree species, 40% of larger mammal species and 30% of bird species. These forests play an important role in five main water catchments (FAO 2007). Farm based forests and private forest constitute another growing category in Kenya. Although no Government figure is available, KFS's data suggests that 690,000–800,000 ha of land is planted with Eucalyptus trees in Western Kenya alone. Lastly Local Authority land, or trust land, also supports forest zones. The Forest Act 2005 recognises and promotes these areas as productive forest areas on which community and micro-enterprises can be supported. Official statistics put forest cover at 1.7% of Kenya. However, this estimate is considered misleading since it does not take into account existing forests found on private and trust land. Annual per capita wood consumption is estimated at 1m³ and considering that Kenya had a population of approximately 38 million in 2009, there is therefore tremendous pressure on the land and forest resources.

Kenya's forestry resources are of immense importance for the environmental and ecosystem services they provide, for their contribution to economic development, and their contribution to rural livelihoods. Their water catchment function is critical to secure water supplies for human consumption and hydro-electric generation. Indigenous forests support high biodiversity and wildlife resources which are critical for the tourism sector. Wood resources provide a number of products including timber, poles, fuel and non-timber products including resins, honey and medicinal plants. Ninety percent of all wood harvested is used for wood fuel. The charcoal industry is estimated to have potential earnings of approximately 4–5 billion Ksh per annum.

Annual revenue from state plantations is currently estimated at approximately Ksh 460 million per annum, with a potential to increase to Ksh 2–2.5 billion per annum with the lifting of the logging ban and with well-regulated forest management (Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife & Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009a).

The institutional and legal framework of the Kenyan forest sector has undergone a number of government led reforms. The Forest Act (GoK 2005) established the Kenya Forest Service in February 2007 which is a semi-autonomous institution governed by an independent board. KFS aims to become a financially viable institution that sustainably manages Kenya's forest resources for the benefit of the State and Kenyans. The Forest Act also sets up a framework for participatory forest management by creating Community Forest Associations (CFAs) adjacent to government forest reserves. The Act also allows for the development of management agreements, concessions and partnerships between KFS and the private sector regarding the long-term management of forest plantations.

Participatory forest management (PFM) is yet to effectively take off in Kenya. The Forests Act of 2005 gives some indications on PFM aspirations but offers different interpretations on the role, function and application of PFM between KFS and civil society institutions. PFM plans were developed in 2007 with support from UNDP, PFM Guidelines and a PFM Manual were prepared by the then Forest Department in collaboration with civil society. Pilot sites were established in the Mt. Kenya area and nine management plans were elaborated and endorsed. However, several PFM issues remain unresolved which include policy position on suitability of PFM for different forest types (plantations, indigenous forests), land tenure arrangements (state forest reserves, trust land) and policy position on how benefits/costs are shared between different parties.

1.2 Overview of the History of Finnish Support in Kenya

Finnish development assistance to Kenya started in the late 1960's and a formal framework for bilateral assistance was agreed upon later in the 1980s, when Kenya became a "Target Country" for Finland. The main sectors of Finnish assistance at the time included water, health, forestry, livestock production and cooperatives.

Historical efforts in the forestry sector included Forest Industrial Training Centre (1979–1989), Bura Fuelwood Plantation Project (1986–1993), Nakuru and Nyandarua Intensified Forestry Extension ("Miti Mingi") Project (1990–1995), and Kenya Forestry Master Plan Project (1991–1995). The Kenya-Finland Forestry Programme (1996–1998) provided institutional strengthening, farm forestry and conservation, and management of indigenous forests. The programme was suspended in 1998 due to absence of parliamentary approval of the new Forestry Policy, institutional problems within the Forest Department and diverging views on project procurement (Ministry of Forest and Wildlife 2009a).

In 2004, following the change in Government and a request from the new NARC government, MFA agreed with the Government of Kenya on the resumption of bilateral cooperation. It was decided that the three main cooperation sectors would be good governance, forestry and energy. The current MFA development policy programme for Kenya largely reflects the emphasis of the new MFA Development Policy Programme (2007). The challenge is to take into account the new needs and priorities that have emerged during the political crisis, as well as to further deepen the focus of the programme in the agreed cooperation sectors, which are good governance, forestry and integration of Millennium Development Goals (MDG) into the Kenyan Government's Vision 2030. The MFA programme for Kenya concentrates on reducing poverty as a cross-cutting theme. During the period 2008 to 2011 Kenya will receive EUR 63.40 million from Finland in development aid.

2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR

The portfolio of MFA supported forestry and biological resources interventions in Kenya during the period 2000 to 2014 are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 Forestry interventions in Kenya 2007–2014.

Title and Timeframe	MFA Code	Duration	MFA Spent
Miti Mingi Maisha Bora – Support to the Forest Sector Reform in Kenya - Inception Phase		July 2007 – December 2008	Total: EUR 2,408,021: MFA EUR 1,907,491 & GoK EUR 500,521
Miti Mingi Maisha Bora – Support to the Forest Sector Reform in Kenya – Implementation Phase		September 2009 – August 2014	Total: EUR 22,707,993: MFA EUR 18,644,990 & GoK EUR 4,063,003

Source: Ruotsalainen 2010.

In addition, the mission was informed of six NGO projects related to the forestry and biological resources sectors through the Embassy of Finland's Local Development Fund.

The Miti Mingi Maisha Bora (MMMB) project is one of MFA's largest single country interventions, and makes it one of the largest partners to the KFS. The project was designed during 2005 and a two stage approach was taken. The first ap-

proach involved the implementation of an inception phase in order to support ongoing institutional reform processes within the KFS and the piloting of institutional reform and decentralised processes whilst the second approach involved the development of a more extensive implementation intervention.

The MMMB is implemented by the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MFW), the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and the Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) in collaboration with civil society organisations and other Government of Kenya institutions.

Inception Phase: MMMB (July 2007 – December 2008)

Overall Objective: Increased contribution of forests to economic recovery and poverty alleviation on environmentally and socially sustainable basis.

Purpose: Efficient and accountable Forest Service established and improved human and technical capacity as well as mechanisms to collaborate with other government sectors, civil society and the private sector.

Programme Components:

- i) Support to the Institutional Reform of the Forest Sector;
- ii) Strengthen the Forest Information Systems;
- iii) ASAL Participatory Forest Management and Poverty Reduction.

Implementation Phase: MMMB (September 2009 – August 2014)

Overall Objective: A reduction in poverty through ensuring that the forest sector contributes effectively and sustainably to improving the lives of the poor, restoring the environment, and aiding the economic recovery and growth of Kenya within the context of Vision 2030.

Purpose: Improved forest and woodland management and utilisation practises, and a transformation of policy and institutional arrangements to serve the needs of communities, the private sector, civil society and the government.

Programme Components:

- i) Support to forest sector policy, regulation and coordination processes.
- ii) Support to implementation of KFS institutional change processes.
- iii) Support to management and utilisation of gazetted forest reserves.
- iv) Improved livelihoods in ASALs through sustainable production and trade in bio-energy and other forest products.

Programme Components 2, 3 and 4 are led by the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) while Component 1 is led by the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife (MFW). The Technical Assistance component which supports all programme components is provided by NIRAS of Finland and comprises of four long-term technical advisors and short-term consultants.

3 ASSESSMENT OF INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The assessment of the MFA country/regional forestry and biological interventions in Kenya consisted of a two step process: 1) an assessment of each project against evaluation questions TORs based on the review of project and country reports and documentation; 2) in-country assessment involving discussions with beneficiaries and key stakeholders, and acquisition of additional documentation. The report was also informed by discussions between the evaluation team and MFA Headquarters staff. This report is the combined outcome of both steps.

Evaluation Question 1

Did the respective budget appropriations, overall policy measures, sector policies and their implementation plans adequately reflect the development agenda in general, and in particular the major goal of poverty reduction?

The interventions are well grounded within both Kenya's long (Vision 2030) and medium-term economic development plans (Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 2009) and the priorities of the Kenya Forest Service. The formulation of the MMB Implementation Phase benefited from Inception Phase outputs which ensured that the experience and current priorities of Government and KFS were captured in the Implementation Project document.

The Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 (MSP-NDV2030) coordinates the national and district planning process. It also receives support from MFA for the MDG programme implemented by MSPNDV2030. The MDG programme aims to mainstream all MDGs into national and district development plans. District Development Plans have been prepared for 148 Districts and environmental issues have been mainstreamed in them. They aim to support the coordinated implementation of the five year national development plan at district level. Forestry priorities appear in District plans where forestry staff have participated in the formulation of district environment and development plans. Overall, the MSP-NDV2030 supports integrated multi-sectoral programmes at local level and welcomes the new approach taken by KFS. They emphasised the need for KFS to become commercially orientated and to support job creation, safeguard of existing forests and to support reforestation.

The Government of Kenya is committed to safeguard the five main "water towers" – Mt. Kenya, Aberdares, the Mau Escarpment, Mt. Elgon and the Chyulu Hills. All five are also the main natural forest zones of Kenya. MMB support to KFS is therefore timely to ensure that KFS is an effective institution in meeting national development commitments.

The project design has followed a participatory and consultative process involving KFS, Ministry and civil society which has ensured that the intervention is well grounded within key poverty reduction strategies and biodiversity conservation priorities. The MMMB supported KFS to prepare a Project Identification Note (PIN) to support the preparation of a REDD Plan for Kenya.

The Implementation Phase takes into account baseline data acquired during the Inception Phase and by the KFS. For instance the experience and information from three Forest Conservation Committees (FCC) established during the Inception Phase as well as the consultant report on recommendations for facilitation of SME development in sawmilling have informed the implementation phase design (Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife 2009b). Some preliminary work was undertaken to inform on gender and social equity issues but were found to be insufficiently addressed in MMMB activities and monitoring indicators. This is currently being readdressed through a study which should lead to adjustments in the logical framework, workplan and budget.

Evaluation Question 2

Are the interventions responding to the priorities and strategic objectives of the cooperating party, are they additional or complementary to those done by others, or are they completely detached and stand-alone – in other words, what is the particular Finnish value-added in terms of quality and quantity or presence or absence of benefits, and in terms of sustainability of the benefits and in terms of filling a gap in the development endeavour of the partner country?

It is evident from KFS, MFW and civil society institutions that the design and elaboration of the MMMB programme actively engaged these institutions and that there is a strong sense of ownership from the KFS and MFW in the MMMB intervention. This is also positively commented on by the MFA commissioned appraisal of the MMMB project document.

A concern is that the MMMB Implementation Phase programme is overly ambitious within the given timeframe. Whilst it is recognised that the Inception Phase was very successful in completing nearly all its activities and largely achieve its intended outputs, there is concern that the number and nature of the intervention activities led by MFW and KFS will be a challenge for these institutions to effectively internalise and execute. The risk becomes that the TA team will be called on to engage in implementation rather than maintain emphasis on providing advisory support.

Expectations by KFS and Government are high for the MMMB to respond to forestry needs as they arise. For instance, the Government has prepared a multi-donor project proposal for safeguarding the Mau Escarpment forests. KFS is expecting that the Government of Finland, as lead partner in the forestry sector, will commit funds to the Mau programme. The expectation from KFS is that additional MFA funds will be made available while the Embassy of Finland reserves the right to review MMMB allocations prior to considering additional funds. Similarly, the Government of Kenya through KFS has prepared a proposal to the WB Forest Carbon Partnership Facility for elaborating a REDD Readiness Plan.

Finland is also the lead donor in the forestry sector and heads the sub-committee on forestry of the Kenya GoK/Development Partners Harmonisation and Coordination Committee (HAC). The development partners positively commented that the design and progress of the Inception and Implementation Phases were regularly communicated and discussed at sub-committee meetings. Members also positively commented on the role of the Embassy of Finland in actively steering the committee. For example arranging for KFS Board members to meet committee members and on other occasions invite resource persons engaged in forest sector initiatives to update members.

The Finnish consultancy company providing the TA component has fronted a TA team of four which provide a range of technical inputs relevant to the MMMB components. The project benefits from the continuity of two members of the TA team specialising in information management systems and SME/PFM. The change in the TA team appears to have affected momentum where a settling in period at the beginning of the Implementation Phase has occurred.

Evaluation Question 3

How have the three dimensions of sustainability been addressed in the intervention documents, and were the aim modalities and instruments conducive to optimal materialisation of the objectives of the aid intervention?

The MMMB project fully addresses the environmental element of sustainability. Its aim is to ensure that the forest sector contributes effectively and sustainably to restoring the environment. The adoption of an ecosystem approach to forest management by KFS and the MMMB support is sound in terms of working towards environmental sustainability.

Social sustainability is largely addressed through an intention to empower communities and civil society to engage as partners in, and beneficiaries from, sustainable forest management. The establishment of Forest Conservation Committees and commitment to engage in participatory forest management should foster social sustainability. A prerequisite will be for KFS and the MFW to fully adopt policy and guidelines that enable PFM and community engagement, and, importantly, for KFS to instil a work ethic that actually demonstrates progress towards community empowerment. The forthcoming gender and social equity studies will play an important role in guiding the formulation of specific actions, allocation of resources and monitoring indicators to ensure that gender and social equity are incorporated in the MMMB work plan.

In terms of economic sustainability, the MMMB is supporting MFW to engage in analysing and communicating the economic benefits of the forest sector to the national economy, and through the forthcoming National Forest Plan to strengthen the role of the forest sector in Kenya's development.

However, economic sustainability will be largely influenced by the lifting of the logging ban, application of true market prices and production costs for stumpage sales,

and an open and transparent trade in wood and non-wood commodities (e.g. charcoal, resins, etc.). As identified in the risk analysis of the MMMB and re-emphasised by the Embassy of Finland the MMMB intervention would be seriously jeopardised if these reforms are not undertaken by the second year as it will be hard to justify MFA and Finnish tax-payers effectively subsidising wood supply in Kenya.

The MMMB implementation modality is fairly complex in light of the different institutions involved in the project. MFA funds for Component 2, 3 and 4 are managed and accounted for by KFS whilst operational funds for Component 1 have been subject to debate between Government and the Embassy of Finland. The Project Document (Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife & Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009) states that the funds for MFW will be under the responsibility of the international consulting firm selected to provide the Technical Assistance to MMMB. However, at the start of the Implementation Phase this has now been changed to the recruitment of a Fund Management Agent to manage and account for Component 1 funds, contracted by the Embassy of Finland.

The approach of channelling funds directly to components led by KFS and putting in place a separate arrangement for MFW is sound and reflects their respective mandates and work plans under the MMMB. It also places confidence in the KFS financial and management capacities established during the Inception Phase and serves to carry forward institutional capacity building. The use of a Fund Management Agent for the MFW led Component 1 will likely incur a substantial overhead cost but could ensure timely disbursements and reporting if adopted.

Evaluation Question 4

What are the major discernible changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended, direct or indirect) and are these changes likely to be sustainable, and to what extent these sustainable changes may be attributed to the Finnish aid interventions or to interventions in which Finnish aid have been a significant contributing factor?

MMMB's most significant achievements to date, largely accrued during the Inception Phase, have centred on supporting the ongoing institutional reform and capacity building of KFS and the MFW. The MMMB support has been complementary and builds on earlier institutional capacity building support provided to the Forest Department / KFS by USAID. The transition appears to have been very effective according to both parties. The strengthening of the KFS Board, human resource systems (pension, service charter), establishment of information management systems, guidelines and manual on forest inventory techniques, and preliminary ASAL PFM planning are all attributable to the MMMB inception phase.

Evaluation Question 5

Have the financial and human resources, as well as the modalities of management and administration of aid been enabling or hindering the achievement of the set objectives in the form of outputs, outcomes, results or effects?

A key achievement of the Inception Phase was the establishment of an information management system in KFS which also included an improved financial management system. This has strengthened KFS capacity to manage and report on funds and a prerequisite for securing and effectively managing financial resources including those generated from its activities and those of partner institutions supporting the institution. This was positively commented on by donor partners in the sector.

The Inception Phase completed a large number of activities and deliverables, largely centred on strengthening the institutional and human resource capacities of KFS. Overall these have been positive and effective, and wide ranging within the institution from Board level down to junior field staff. However, there remains the need for KFS to complete the recruitment of field staff (e.g. rangers) since a majority remain on temporary staff terms as ex-Forest Department staff.

The Inception Phase and the Implementation Phase start-up (first six months) has successfully contributed towards setting clear roles and mandates between KFS and MFW, where the latter has responsibility for leading on regulatory reforms required to support the implementation of the Forest Act and leading on the coordination and mainstreaming of forestry in national development priorities.

Evaluation Question 6

What are the discernible factors, such as exit strategies, local budgetary appropriations, capacity development of local counterpart organisations or personnel, which can be considered necessary for the sustainability of results and continuance of benefits after the closure of a development intervention?

The Appraisal team positively commented on the level of engagement by MFW and the KFS in the project design and during the MMMB inception period. This should provide confidence that KFS will be fully engaged in the programme implementation and secure sustainability of key programme components. However, the ability for KFS to become a financially viable institution is an underlying requirement for sustainability of all programme components. Sustained revenue streams from permits and concessions from state plantations, charcoal and other areas are yet in place due to the continued logging ban and need to endorse charcoal production and trade guidelines and permit procedures.

The ongoing institutional reform process within KFS and the support provided by MMMB in particular in the Inception period and now continuing during the Implementation stage is indeed critical towards securing sustainability of results. The putting in place of financial management systems, capacity building to the Board, senior and mid-level management is well received and is improving institutional delivery. Continued progress and achievements in institutional capacity building is essential for sustainability, and should not be reduced in the short-term in order to accommodate start up activities in Component 3 and 4.

The Government of Kenya and the KFS is providing 21% counterpart funding to the MMMB through in-kind support (salaries, etc.) but also budget allocations towards

running costs (e.g. DSA for staff and fuel). The availability and timely mobilisation of these funds over the course of the project will be essential for the effective delivery of the programme.

Evaluation Question 7

What has been the role of considering the cross-cutting issues of Finnish development policy in terms of contributing to the sustainability of development results and poverty reduction; has there been any particular value-added in the promotion of environmentally sustainable development?

The appraisal of the MMMB Implementation Phase design was found to address cross-cutting issues of gender & social equity, HIV/AIDS and indigenous peoples in a fairly general level in the background and analysis but insufficiently acted on in the implementation and monitoring plans for MMMB. It should be noted that the MMMB design process did benefit from the outcomes of Local Development Fund grants to civil society institutions engaged in indigenous peoples (i.e. the Ogiek of the Mau escarpment) and wider civil society engagement. As a result of the Appraisal recommendations, the MMMB programme is currently organising a gender and social equity consultancy to support the integration of required activities in the project's action and monitoring plans.

In light of the above and since MMMB Implementation only recently commenced, there is no specific evidence of change related to gender, equity and HIV/AIDS.

Evaluation Question 8

Are there any concrete identifiable examples of interventions, which may be classified to be environmentally, economically and socially sustainable, which have led to poverty reduction or alleviation of consequences of poverty?

It is too early in the MMMB intervention timeline to demonstrate contribution to poverty reduction or alleviation of consequences of poverty.

Evaluation Question 9

Have interventions which support economic development or private sector, been able to contribute towards sustainable economic results, let alone, raising people from poverty?

The Inception Phase was not designed to deliver economic development results during the 18 month period. Since the MMMB had only been operational for eight months at the time of this review no results at this level were reported.

Evaluation Question 10

How is the society touched upon by the development interventions taken into account in the strategic and project/programme plans, and what have been the major modalities for the society to influence and affect the development interventions and the decision-making on them?

The MMMB Inception Phase supported the establishment of Forest Conservation Committees (FCC) through the preparation of guidelines and protocols, and sup-

ported the process of forming of the committees. This experience combined with engagement with the Kenya Forest Working Group (a Kenyan network of NGOs) and private sector representatives contributed to ensure that the formulation of the MMMB Implementation Phase enabled members of society to inform and influence the design of the programme. However, it is appreciated that in the first instance MMMB aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of KFS and MFW to more effectively engage and lead the forestry sector. Consequently, it will only be towards the end of the MMMB Implementation Phase that progress and evidence of society engaging and benefiting from the intervention will be verified.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Drawing from the above information and analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- ❖ The MMMB is an ambitious programme that carries forward the main objectives of the MFA Guidelines on Forestry (MFA 2009) and the MFA Development Assistance Policy (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007), and is well integrated within the needs and priorities of the Kenyan forestry sector and main national development priorities. The MMMB has one of the largest MFA financial allocations (EUR 18,644,990) for a country intervention and is potentially a “flag ship” intervention for MFA should it be successful.
- ❖ However, the main project risks are associated with political commitment to effect reforms in the sector, namely the lifting of the logging ban and endorsement of guidelines and procedures for charcoal production and trade and for other woody and non-woody commodities.
- ❖ The Kenya Forest Service is a semi-autonomous parastatal agency with an independent Board established in February 2007, following the endorsement of the new Forest Act (GoK 2005). It has made significant progress in strengthening its institutional capacity with support from USAID and MMMB. The latter played an important role in strengthening internal governance and management systems including a financial management system which is now in use by KFS.
- ❖ The effective engagement of the Embassy of Finland in leading the Forest Subcommittee of the GoK/Partner Harmonisation and Coordination Committee on Environment has played an important role towards a successful design and implementation of the MMMB Inception and Implementation Phases. The Government led MMMB project has also been effectively complemented with support to local NGOs engaged in the forestry sector using the Embassy Local Development Fund.
- ❖ Whilst the MMMB can have a positive impact towards sustainable development and poverty reduction in the medium to long-term, there is need to maintain focus in the short-term on continued institutional capacity building of KFS so as to ensure institutional sustainability.

- ❖ The Finnish led Technical Assistance team provides inputs in a range of technical areas that draw on Finnish added value in the areas of forest plantations, inventories, SMEs and farm-based forestry among others. It was very effective during the Inception Phase and the new team for the Implementation Phase is in the process of finalising workplans and best work practices.
- ❖ Support to the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife and KFS through different aid modalities while under one intervention offers a case study for similar projects and serves to reinforce the mutually support nature of two separate components with one address regulatory requirements and National Forest Plan elaboration, and KFS addressing forest sector implementation and management.
- ❖ Cross-cutting issues (gender, equity, HIV/AIDS) were partially addressed during the Inception Phase and in the design of the Implementation Phase, but lacked clear direction on the “what” and “how”. For instance, indicators of change reflecting gender, equity and HIV/AIDS were not found in the logical framework at the level of objectives and results and therefore no corresponding activities and financial allocations. A study has been commissioned on gender and social equity to provide this input.

REFERENCES

FAO 2007 *Kenya Forest Report*. FAO Rome.

Government of Kenya 2005 *Forests Act* 2005 Government Printers Office, Nairobi.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Development Policy Programme 2007, Towards a Sustainable and Just Humanity Policy*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 38 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Forest Sector*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 18 p.

Ministry of Forest and Wildlife & Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Miti Mingi Maisha Bora Project. Programme Document for Implementation Phase (2009–2014). Support to Forest sector Reform in Kenya*. Ministry of Forest and Wildlife & Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Nairobi.

Ministry of Forest and Wildlife 2009a *The Implementation Phase Programme Document Prepared for the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland*. Appraisal Report. Support to Forest sector Reform in Kenya, Nairobi.

Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife 2009b *Miti Mingi Maisha Bora*. Project Completion Report for the period July 2007 to June 2009. *Support to Forest sector Reform in Kenya*, Nairobi.

Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 2006 *Kenya's Vision 2030*. Nairobi.

Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 2009 *Strategy for National Transformation (SNT) 2008–2012*. Nairobi.

Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Preliminary Evaluation Study Forestry Sector*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki [Published as Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Forestry Sector: Preliminary Study*. Evaluation report 2010:5/III. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Kopijyvä Oy, Jyväskylä, 145 p. ISBN 978-951-724-880-8 (printed)].

ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Embassy of Finland in Kenya

HE Ambassador Heli Sirve

Ms. Theresa Zitting, Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission

Mr. Julius Kamau, Forestry Programme Officer

Mr. Jussi Laurikainen, Governance Programme Officer

Kenya Forest Service

Mr. Emilio N. Mugo, Senior Deputy Director

Mr. Alfred N. Gichu, Senior Assistant Director, Climate Change Response Programme

Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife

Mr. Gideon N. Gathaara, Conservation Secretary

Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030

Mr. G.M. Mailu, National Project Coordinator, MDGs

Mr. Joseph Mukui, Director, Rural Development

Dr. Samson Wasao, Manager, Poverty & Environment Initiative

Miti Mingi Miasha Bora project

Mr. Harri Seppänen, Chief Technical Advisor

Mr. Juha Kiuru, Forest Enterprise Advisor

Mr. Jonathan Davies, Forest Resources Advisor

USAID

Dr. Robert Buzzard, Env/NRM Team Leader

Kenya Forest Working Group

Mr. Rudolf Makhanu, Coordinator

East Africa Wildlife Society

Michael Karanja, Deputy Director

ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

LTS International 2003 *Evaluation of the Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation*. Evaluation report 2003:2 part 1 & 2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Haka-paino Oy, Helsinki, 122 p. (part 1), 180 p. (part 2). ISBN 951.724-407-X (part 1); ISBN 951-724-416-9 (part 2).

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Development Policy Programme 2007, Towards a Sustainable and Just Humanity Policy*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 38 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Evaluation Guidelines of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Haka-paino Oy, Helsinki. ISBN 978-951-724-624-8.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Environment*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 26 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010 *Partner Countries and Regions*. <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?nodeid=15378&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Evaluation

**Finnish Support to Forestry and
Biological Resources**

**Country Reports
Part 3. Tanzania**

Evaluation report 2010:5/II (3.Tanzania)

Evaluation

Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources

Country Reports Part 3. Tanzania

Irene Karani

Evaluation report 2010:5/II (3. Tanzania)

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

This evaluation was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland to LTS International Ltd. The Consultants bear the sole responsibility for the contents of the report. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	vii
SUMMARY.....	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1 Country Development Needs and Priorities.....	3
1.2 Overview of Forestry Sector.....	3
1.3 Overview of the History of Finnish Support in Tanzania.....	4
1.4 Finland's Involvement in Forestry.....	4
2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR.....	5
3 ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	8
4 CONCLUSIONS.....	22
REFERENCES.....	24
ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED.....	26
ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....	27
TABLES	
Table 3 Forestry and biological interventions in Tanzania 2003–2010.....	5
Table 4 Overview of community Based forest management on mainland Tanzania as at 2006.....	16

ACRONYMS

CCM	Chama cha Mapinduzi
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DP	Development Partner
EQ	Evaluation Question
EUR	Euro
FBD	Forestry and Beekeeping Division
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FOPIS	Forest Policy Implementation Support Project
FITI	Forestry Industry Training Institute
FTI	Forestry Training Institute
FY	Financial Year
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoT	Government of Tanzania
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
JAST	Joint Assistance Strategy of Tanzania
JFA	Joint Financing Agreement
JFM	Joint Forest Management
JPFM	Joint Participatory Forest Management Programme
LGCDG	Local Government Capital Development Grant
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MM	Mama Misitu Advocacy Campaign Project
MNRT	Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
MP	Member of Parliament
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NAFOBEDA	National Forestry and Beekeeping Database
NAFORMA	National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
NFA-CUSP	National Forest Programme – Coordination Support
NFA-ISP	National Forest Programme – Implementation Support
NFBKP	National Forest and Beekeeping Programme
NFP	National Forest Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (also known as Mkukuta)
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PFRA	Participatory Forest Resource Assessment
PMO-RALG	Prime Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation

REDD+	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation +
SACCOS	Savings and Credit Cooperative Society
SME	Small/Medium Enterprise
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
TA	Technical Assistance
TASAF	Tanzania Social Action Fund
TFCMP	Tanzania Forestry and Conservation Management Project
TFS	Tanzania Forestry Service
TNRF	Tanzania Natural Resource Forum
TZS	Tanzania Shillings
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
USD	US Dollar
VLFR	village land forest reserves

SUMMARY

This report is a synthesis of the findings of a desk study and field visit to Tanzania that took place in April and June 2010 respectively. In addition key stakeholders in Finland including the MFA Headquarters were consulted. Stakeholders met in Tanzania included the Deputy Head of Mission and Counsellor Natural Resources in the Finnish Embassy, government officials from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), project team from the Forestry and Beekeeping Division (FBD) and Natural Forestry Resources Monitoring Assessment unit (NAFORMA), forestry officers at district level, civil society, communities and other development partners.

The interventions assessed were the Joint Participatory Forest Management Programme (JPFM), National Forest Programme-Coordination Support (NFP-CUSP), National Forest Programme – Implementation Support (NFP-ISP), National Forest and Beekeeping Programme (NFBKP), National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment programme (NAFORMA) and Mama Mimitu Advocacy Campaign Project (MM). The main findings were that:

- ❖ All interventions were in line with Tanzanian environment, forestry and land policies. They have also contributed to the United Nations Framework Convention for Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- ❖ Baselines were conducted for various interventions and currently the National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment programme (NAFORMA) is taking place. It will serve as a sound monitoring tool for biophysical, socio-economic and REDD+ information.
- ❖ Finnish value addition was seen in its support for NAFORMA and the potential of the system being a best practice in the region. In addition the encouragement of private-public partnerships with linkages to carbon credits was also seen as value addition.
- ❖ There is a lot of cooperation amongst donors through various forums but not all subscribe to the loose Sector Wide Approaches hence development partners are pursuing their own aid modalities.
- ❖ There has been increased participation and decentralisation in forest management through the Community based Forest Management systems and there is more demand for Participatory Forest Management (PFM) as a result of the Mama Mimitu campaign financed by Finland.
- ❖ There has been an increase in income in a few villages due to income generating activities or from fines paid under PFM but poverty reduction is still not yet evident at household level.
- ❖ Transparency, accountability and weak management capacities are still challenges being faced by MNRT, hence the current suspension of Finnish funding to the Ministry. In view of the current situation best practices from other developing countries can be used by MFA in order to assist Tanzania overcome some of the problems it is having with financing and managing the forestry sector.

- ❖ Integration of cross cutting issues is still a challenge for the interventions. However, the positive impact of energy saving stoves on women is being felt in some villages.
- ❖ There has been a steady increase of forestry contribution to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) from 2005. However it is difficult to measure the extent to which Finnish Aid has contributed to this growth.
- ❖ Monitoring of poverty alleviation attributed to investments in the forestry sector does not take place and there are no systems to capture this that have been put in place. However there is an opportunity under NAFORMA for this.

1 INTRODUCTION

Tanzania has experienced a high degree of political stability since independence in 1961. The ruling party, Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM) has dominated domestic politics since shortly after independence a situation which has not changed with the end of one-party rule and introduction of a democratic multi-party system in 1995.

Three multi-party elections have been contested since 1995; Benjamin Mkapa served two five year terms and in 2005 Jakaya Kikwete started a five year term in office after what the international community deemed were free and fair elections.

Tanzania is also a socially stable country and there is little history of civil unrest, apart from isolated incidents on Zanzibar.

The Tanzanian economy still depends heavily on agriculture, which accounts for about half of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and employs 85% of the workforce. Services (38% of GDP) and industry (18%) are still lagging behind- (Source: World Bank: World Development Indicators, 2007).

The growth of the economy as measured by GDP growth has remained steadily over 6% per annum since 2001 and in 2007 recorded an encouraging 7.3%. Sources: UN Statistics Division, National Account Aggregate Database; United Republic of Tanzania (URT): Speech by the Minister for Planning, Economy and Empowerment, Hon. Alhaj Dr. Juma Ngasongwa (MP) presenting to the National Assembly the Economic Survey for 2006 and medium term outlook for 2007/08-2009/10.

In the mid-1980s, Tanzania began introducing macroeconomic reform programmes favouring a greater role for market forces and closer integration into the global economy. The reforms, which entailed rationalization of government spending and more conservative fiscal policies, intensified in the mid-1990s. Progressive implementation of economic stabilization and structural reform programmes resulted in the privatization of many public institutions and the liberalization of the banking sector, which brought about substantial (and continuing) influx of Foreign Direct Investment

(FDI) in all sectors. These developments helped sustain macroeconomic stability that is the basis of the impressive growth performance over recent years.

But despite the macroeconomic progress, political stability, and impressive growth records, higher growth has yet to translate into significantly improved living standards and reductions in poverty, which remains prevalent especially among rural families that depend largely on agriculture for their livelihoods. In this context, industrialization has a critical role to play in helping Tanzania to raise growth rates (*source (<http://www.unido.org/index.php?id=6452,04/07/10>)*).

1.1 Country Development Needs and Priorities

Tanzania's population is estimated at 34 million people, with a population growth rate of 2.8%. The prevalence of income poverty is still high in Tanzania. According to the Household Budget Survey of 2000/01 the proportion of the population below the national food poverty line is 18.7 % and that below the national basic needs poverty line is 35.7 %. Poverty remains overwhelmingly in rural areas where about 87 % of the poor population lives. It is highest among households who depend on agriculture. As the population is growing, the absolute number of the poor raises concern. There is also a big disparity between urban and rural poverty for both food and basic needs poverty (National Bureau of Statistics Tanzania 2002).

Agriculture is the lead sector, accounting for 45 percent of GDP and about 60 percent of export earnings from 2003–2005. It also provides livelihoods to 82 percent of the population. The constraints to rural growth are largely related to those in the agricultural sector, broadly defined to include livestock and bee-keeping. The constraints include low productivity of land, labour and production inputs; underdeveloped irrigation potential; limited capital and access to financial services; inadequate agricultural technical support services; poor rural infrastructure hindering effective rural-urban linkages; infestations and outbreaks of crop; animal pests and diseases; erosion of natural resource base and environmental degradation. Others include gender relations, weak producers' organisations, poor coordination and limited technological capacity, depressed prices for primary commodities in global markets and insecurity with respect to property rights to land and its use as collateral for credit (Government of United Republic of Tanzania & Government of Finland 2006).

1.2 Overview of Forestry Sector

Tanzania has about 33.5 million hectares of forests and woodlands. About 13 million hectares of this total forest area have been gazetted as forest reserves. Over 80,000 hectares of the gazetted area is under plantation forestry and about 1.6 million hectares are under water catchment management. The forests offer habitat for wildlife, beekeeping, unique natural ecosystems, genetic resources and bio-energy which is the main sources of fuel for rural population and accounts for 92% of the total energy

consumption in the country. The sector's contribution to the GDP is between 2.3% and 10% of the country's registered exports (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2007a).

The present overarching framework for Tanzanian forestry is the NFBKP with sub-programmes such as PFM, NAFORMA, Forestry Training College, beekeeping, private forestry amongst others. The NFBKP programme's content has been planned together with the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) from 2004/2005 onwards.

Despite the importance and roles played by forest resources to the economy, there are a number of problems faced which hamper the development of the sector. The problems include: deforestation, inadequate forestry extension services, inefficiency in wood based industries and poor infrastructural facilities, fragmented administration at all levels between the centre and the local levels, lack of participation of various stakeholders in the management of the resources and poor resource databases, outdated and non existence of management plans for efficient resource use (MNRT 2007a). In addition, the implementation of NFBKP is still being carried out like a project instead of a strategic programme despite the merger of the NFBKP Coordination Unit and FBD planning unit 2 years ago.

1.3 Overview of the History of Finnish Support in Tanzania

Tanzania is the longest standing and historically most important partner in Finnish development co-operation. Co-operation between Finland and Tanzania started in the early 1960s as part of a Joint Nordic initiative, and Tanzania became the first bilateral development partner of Finland. Tanzania enjoyed a special status as the main development cooperation partner of Finland until the beginning of the 1990s. Historically, Tanzania has received the largest cumulative amount of Finland's bilateral development aid since 1970 to date. Finnish Aid has targeted directly productive sectors e.g. forestry, mining, electricity, construction, large scale infrastructure projects and natural conservation (<http://www.finland.or.tz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31653&contentlan=2&culture=en-US> (24/4/10)).

1.4 Finland's Involvement in Forestry

Finland has been supporting the Tanzanian National Forest Programme since 2001. The programme includes: support to Forestry Beekeeping Division (FBD), village forest programme, a forest inventory, private small and medium enterprises in the forest sector; good governance and initiatives related to bio-energy and climate change.

2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR

Table 3 gives a summary of interventions supported by Finland in Tanzania from 2003–2011.

Table 3 Forestry and biological interventions in Tanzania 2003–2010.

Title	MFA Code	Duration	MFA Budget
Forestry Sector			
NFP – Coordination Unit Support Project (NFP-CUSP)	28206402	2003–2006,	EUR 1, 044, 910
National Forest Programme Implementation Support (NFP-ISP) Preparatory Phase	28227501	2004–2007	EUR 597,500
Joint Participatory Forest Management		2005–2009	USD 1,9 Million
Support towards the funding of the National Forest and Beekeeping Programme (NFBKP)		2008–2011	EUR 13,700,262
Tanzania / National forest resources monitoring and environment assessment		2008–2011	EUR 1,929,593
Tanzania / Study on public private partnership in forestry sector		2009–2010	
Mama Misitu Advocacy Campaign		2008–2009	EUR 440,576
Biological Resources			
TANZANIA/Integrated rural development programme, phase III	28203707	2004–2006	EUR 506,262
TANZANIA/Integrated support to land use and environmental administration in the Zanzibar	28203803	2004–2006	EUR 639,487
TANZANIA/Forest sector support project, phase II	28206402	2004–2006	EUR 76,637
TANZANIA/Eastern Usambara natural forests conservation and management project, phase II	28219401	2005–2006	EUR 41,416

TANZANIA/Morogoro environment project	28224901	2004	EUR 15,500
TANZANIA/Local co-operation fund 2001-2003	28225201	2004–2008	EUR 191,322
TANZANIA/National forest programme	28227501	2004–2008	EUR 666,380
TANZANIA/Eastern Usambara forest conservation	28228401	2004–2006	EUR 238,320
TANZANIA/Community forestry development and training project, phase II	28228601		EUR 3,309,80
TANZANIA/Integrated support to land use and environmental administration	28229801	2004–2008	EUR 345,039,92
TANZANIA/Integrated support to land use and environmental administration, phase II	28229802		0
TANZANIA/Kiwenga environmental tourism project (KIWA)	28230501	2006–2008	EUR 35,100

Source: Ruotsalainen 2010; Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010.

The interventions that were assessed by this evaluation were:

NFP – Coordination Unit Support Project (NFP- CUSP)

Duration: 2003–2006

MFA Intervention Code: 28206402

Budget: MFA contribution-EUR 1 044 910. URT contribution TZS 81 million

Overall Project Objective: NFP implementation effectively coordinated and monitored.

Project Purpose: The framework and mechanisms for effective coordination of the NFP implementation established by the Coordination Unit.

Main components of the project were:

- i) Establishment of planning, implementation, budgetary, monitoring and evaluation systems for the NFP.

NFP – Implementation Support (NFP- ISP)

Duration: 2004–2007

MFA Intervention Code: 28227501

Budget: Total budget, EUR 607 500, Finland contribution EUR 597 500, URT contribution 10 000

Overall Project Objective: Conservation and sustainable utilization of forest resources to meet local, national and global needs promoted.

Project Purpose: Sustainable management and utilization of forests and woodlands, giving priority to catchment areas, biodiversity and soil conservation enhanced.

Executing Body: Forestry and Beekeeping division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania.

Main components of the project were:

- i) Protection forest reserves and forests in general lands; and
- ii) Co-ordination and capacity building.

Joint Participatory Forest Management (JPFM)

Duration: 2005–2009

Budget: USD 1,9M

Executing Body: Forestry and Beekeeping division and Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG)

Main components of the project were:

- i) Forestry condition and quality;
- ii) Forest governance; and
- iii) Enhanced livelihoods.

Mama Misitu Advocacy Campaign (MM)

Duration: 2008–2009

Budget: Finland contribution, EUR 440,576

Main components:

- i) Forest-adjacent communities become aware of the economic value of forest resources and begin to demand and receive benefits arising from sustainable forest management.
- ii) Key forest governance issues are recognised and addressed through increased stakeholder awareness and the adoption of appropriate stakeholder actions focused on stopping the illegal timber trade and promoting best practices in forest management.

National Forest Resources Monitoring and Assessment (NAFORMA)

Duration: 2008–2011

Budget: Finland contribution- EUR 1 929 593. URT contribution USD 3,811,357

Development Objectives:

- i) Contribute to the sustainable natural resources management and utilisation through improved, efficient and cost effective forestry related activities;
- ii) Facilitate the sustainable development of the country;
- iii) Improve the productivity of the rural livelihoods; and
- iv) Mainstream the benefits of better forest resources management in national economies and policies for better involvement of women, alleviation of poverty and meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

National Forestry and Beekeeping Programme (NFBKP)

Duration: 2008–2011

Budget: EUR 13,700,262

Overall Project Objective: Conservation and sustainable utilisation of forest and bee resources to meet local, national and global needs promoted. Executing Body: Forestry and Beekeeping division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania.

Main components of the project are:

- i) Forest Resources Conservation and Management;
- ii) Institutions and Human Resources;
- iii) Legal and Regulatory Framework; and
- iv) Forestry-Based Industries and Sustainable Livelihood.

3 ASSESSMENT OF INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation Question 1

Did the respective budget appropriations, overall policy measures, sector policies and their implementation plans adequately reflect the development agenda in general, and in particular the major goal of poverty reduction?

All interventions were in line with the environment, forestry and land policies and the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) which makes reference to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

However, there is hardly any mention of MDG targets in the documents. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is well addressed under the component addressing Climate Change issues through reduced emissions from deforestation in the NFBKP prodoc. There is also mention of supporting Man and Biosphere Reserves in NFP-ISP preparatory phase proposal (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2003).

There is evidence of lesson learning in the documents especially in the completion reports of NFP-CUSP and NFP-ISP from other sector wide approaches but how those lessons have translated into better project designs or implementation was not clear.

In NAFORMA, the fourth development objective is about mainstreaming the benefits of better forest resources management in national economies and policies for better involvement of women and alleviation of poverty and meeting the MDGs.

With respect to the use of ecological and socioeconomic baseline data, there were baselines conducted on beekeeping and forest based small and medium-size enter-

prises (SMEs) under the NFP-ISP (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2007c).

The JPFM had a research component and by 2008, out of 12 projects, only 2 quantified forest parameters had been established to measure forest health improvement. In addition, linkages between Tanzanian research institutions and the JPFM were found to be weak in the 2008 evaluation.

NAFORMA is currently collecting baseline information on biophysical and socio-economic components related to the forestry sector and a database is being finalised. This information will lead to harmonisation of the Forest/land use classification system, maps of state and changes produced based on remote sensing data, new baseline information encompassing wide range of data to both local and international users generated and disseminated and specific and management oriented inventory in priority areas designed and implementation projects formulated. NAFORMA has also integrated the collection of baseline data that can be used for REDD + and carbon tracking.

NAFORMA will also be linked to the National Forestry and Beekeeping database (NAFOBEDA) which is being funded by Denmark, Finland and the World Bank. The challenge here however is that NAFOBEDA is currently not in use as some trained staff have been shifted to other locations. The MNRT therefore needs to train more staff on the system (KPMG 2010).

Evaluation Question 2

Are the interventions responding to the priorities and strategic objectives of the cooperating party, are they additional or complementary to those done by others, or are they completely detached and stand-alone – in other words, what is the particular Finnish value-added in terms of quality and quantity or presence or absence of benefits, and in terms of sustainability of the benefits and in terms of filling a gap in the development endeavour of the partner country?

Whilst it is was not clear from the documents exactly where or what Finnish added value was due to the pooling mechanism, it became clear during the field visit. Finnish added value has been in the financing of NAFORMA which no other donor is doing. NAFORMA will produce information that can be used by the government and other development partners not only when planning and making decisions in forestry but in other sectors such as agriculture, energy, land use, livelihood improvement amongst others. The database being developed will be able to link the forestry sector with poverty reduction over time as permanent monitoring sites have already been established. This intervention when completed will serve as a best practice in forest resource monitoring for sustainable development in the region.

Value addition was also seen in the assistance to the Forestry Training Institutes (FTI) especially the one in Arusha which is now operating at full capacity due to Finnish aid. Over the years assistance to these institutions has increased the country's capacity in forest management.

Finland is also the biggest donor in PFM as it has provided support to 27 districts whilst Denmark has provided support to 18 districts. As a result of this support and the potential success of PFM the Norwegian government is also interested in supporting PFM.

Finnish added value was also seen in the encouragement of private-public partnerships. Tree grower associations have been established in pilot districts and a new Finnish funded project on private forestry and carbon is scheduled to begin soon.

There is evidence of joint planning and reviews by government and donors. The NFP-ISP Preparatory Phase enabled the first rounds of joint annual planning and budgeting by interested donors who supported projects/interventions under the Government of Tanzania's (GoT) Medium-term Expenditure Framework – MTEF (MNRT 2007c). Similarly, the joint planning and budgeting exercises enabled joint annual sector reviews (reviews of implementation vs. annual plans) in 2006 and 2007 (Government of United Republic Tanzania & Government of Finland 2006). However despite these joint planning and reviews follow-up of recommendations by responsible institutions is still weak.

There was evidence of cooperation in planning and coordination for example:

- ❖ Supervision missions were jointly conducted by stakeholders for the Tanzania Forestry and Conservation Management Project (TFCMP) (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2006);
- ❖ There was joint planning and budgeting and inclusion of the PFM component and Forest Policy Implementation Support Project (FOPIS) interventions in the MTEF;
- ❖ Under the PFM a harmonised system of disbursement to districts was established and implemented;
- ❖ There was rational use of the PFM and Financial Management Advisors (MNRT 2006);
- ❖ Under NFP-CUSP there was Joint financing of SWAp “Roll-Out Plan” and use of government procurement systems (MNRT 2006);
- ❖ Joint funding and implementation of NFBKP initiatives (MNRT 2006);
- ❖ Joint meetings between Government and Development Partners (DP) (MNRT 2006);
- ❖ Improved coordination and communication among DPs (MNRT 2006); and
- ❖ The first Joint NFBK Programme Review was conducted in February/March 2006 (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2007b).

However, despite the joint planning and reviews, there is still no harmonisation of donor aid in Tanzania in the forestry sector. Different donors fund through different aid modalities and there is no real consensus on the best funding modality for the forestry sector. For example it is only Finland that is funding the National Forestry and Beekeeping Division through MNRT. Denmark is funding PFM through PMO-RALG

and World Bank was channelling its funding directly to communities through the Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF).

Under NFP-CUSP there was one TA based in Finland who supported the project remotely. However this was deemed ineffective in guiding the SWAp process as the process was behind schedule. In the ISP, short-term TA inputs, both international and local, and backstopping were provided particularly for the SWAp process and getting the Implementation Phase framework document in place. The allocated international TA (specified in the contract) was originally maximum EUR 50,000 (which was a very small amount compared with the complexity of the task). With the extension of the contract that ceiling was waived but as the budget was not increased very little additional TA inputs could be provided.

Finnish expertise has been useful in guiding the development of the new Private Forestry and Carbon trading project which seeks to link private tree grower associations with the carbon market in order to encourage tree planting in Tanzania.

Benefits in the forestry sector will hopefully be realised after the current projects are successfully completed, JFM interventions are successful and impact assessments provide evidence of sustainable benefits.

Evaluation Question 3

How have the three dimensions of sustainability been addressed in the intervention documents, and were the aim modalities and instruments conducive to optimal materialisation of the objectives of the aid intervention?

Attention to the three dimensions of sustainability in the documents is very limited. However under NFP-CUSP the project facilitated the integration of National Forestry and Beekeeping programme (NFBKP) with the NSGRP, also known as MKUKUTA. The NFP has therefore been considered satisfactorily embedded into the wider framework of the national macro-economic policies and strategies for sustainable development, which focus on poverty reduction, enhancement of economic growth, environmental conservation and development of cultural and spiritual values.

Finnish supported initiatives were being implemented under the loose SWAp arrangement. Under the JPFM review (MNRT 2008) 5 funding modalities in Tanzania were identified namely: budget support, sectoral grants in the Local Government Capital Development Grant (LGCDG) system, loose SWAp mechanism operated by the PFM, the TASAF mechanism, the conventional project fashion of channelling funding through line ministries to districts or directly to activities. The conclusion of the review mission was that the LGCDG mechanism was the best option as opposed to the loose SWAp and the TASAF mechanisms. The former is not sustainable especially when the donor stops funding and the latter is less appreciated by the Government of Tanzania (GoT) and some Development Partners and is not entirely in line with the Paris Declaration of Aid effectiveness.

In addition the Joint Assistance Strategy of Tanzania (JAST) stipulates that Development Partners need to align their assistance to GoT policies and procedures and further concretised in the Joint financing agreement (JFA). However the JPFM review found that the DPs had not finalised the necessary steps towards supporting the JAST in their support to PFM.

Currently Finland is the only donor using the loose SWAp arrangement for PFM because other donors in the forestry sector are using other modalities.

Evaluation Question 4

What are the major discernible changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended, direct or indirect) and are these changes likely to be sustainable, and to what extent these sustainable changes may be attributed to the Finnish aid interventions or to interventions in which Finnish aid have been a significant contributing factor?

The greatest changes have been the harmonised, planning, implementation and monitoring of forest sector interventions which has lead to less duplication of activities. However, it is not possible to discern the extent to which Finnish Aid has been responsible for these changes.

As earlier noted, forest industries and livelihood enhancement activities were greatly underfinanced. There was no evidence of sustainable interventions that had led to poverty reduction under NFP-CUSP and there was limited income generation from JPFM and Community Based Forest Management interventions. However, under NFBKP establishment of Savings and Credit Cooperative Society (SACCOS) has been promoted in order to address livelihood and poverty reduction issues around forest reserves.

Forests under community based forest management in Tanzania have features of private forests, which is uncommon in East Africa. Villages can declare and later gazette forest areas on village lands as village land forest reserves (VLFRs). This gives villagers secure long-term tenure rights which entitles them to assume full management responsibility, collect and retain tax revenues from forest products, undertake patrols, levy fines for illegal forest users, issue licences for forest products, and set rules and regulations for forest management. Villages can also decide whether to buy forest management services from the local government, NGOs, or private providers. The VLFR arrangement is a very progressive model, but is not yet fully functional. It still needs to be made financially viable to villagers (Simula 2008 p 62).

The JFM approach under the PFM was meant to enhance joint management of forests with communities. However, the JFM guidelines on benefit sharing had not been distributed by 2008 as they had not yet been endorsed by MNRT and this was having a negative impact on improving livelihoods. In 2010, the benefit sharing mechanisms have still not been agreed upon by the government and communities are becoming frustrated and losing confidence over the matter. There seems to be reluctance on the

part of the government in benefit sharing as this may lead to loss of illegal income for some forest officers at district level.

In addition, whilst the design of the Community Based Forest Management was found to be satisfactory its delivery was facing challenges as it was being implemented through the local government structure and district forest officers. It has taken about 3-4 years for villages just to get the whole process finalised to the approval stage at the village assembly level before the implementation of the management plans, due either to lack of capacity of local government or hindrances by the district forest officers due to vested interests.

In addition FBD cannot give directions to PMO-RALG, under which PFM works. In comparison FBD/PMO-RALG are behind the National Land Use Planning Commission, which has more concrete/standardized/budgeted guidelines for VLUPs than FBD has for PFM.

Thus evidence on poverty reduction is not yet evident. However, some villages have benefited through collection of incomes from fines. They receive 20% of the fines in the village account after they arrest an offender in the forest.

The objectives of the private sector and carbon trading project being financed by Finland revolve around enhancing the role of forestry in economic development with specific focus on private led forestry as a tool for poverty alleviation with due consideration for environmental sustainability. The project strategy will focus on interventions at field level, but will also expand stakeholder cooperation mechanisms at national and regional levels. It will also ensure that appropriate information is available for decision making in the long term on support to private forestry and carbon trading. It is hoped that this project will have sustainable economic results and will therefore assist in the alleviation of poverty when completed.

There is no evidence that directly links the forestry sector to ecological, social and economic gains in national MDGs.

Meetings with the private sector and studies on private sector involvement in the forestry sector were concluded and disseminated as part of devising strategies for forestry and forestry industries in reducing poverty under the interventions.

According to a report on the development of criteria and indicators for monitoring the sector (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2001), data on public sector employment in the forestry and beekeeping sector can be monitored through the monitoring system and is reliable. However this system is not being used by MNRT due to lack of capacity.

Data on private and informal sectors is not available but information on foreign exchange earnings and export trade is available but inaccurate and data on industrial de-

velopment is occasionally prepared by government. Thus linkage of the interventions to an increase in employment in the forestry sector may be difficult at this point in time.

Recent information collected during the field study shows that there has been an increase in revenue from forestry from TZS 10.9 billion in 2005/6 to 23 billion in 2009/2010. Other forestry products are not captured in the GDP but the planning unit in FBD is currently working with the National Bureau of Statistics to include charcoal sales as part of the revenue from forestry. Again attribution of this to Finnish Aid interventions is difficult.

Smallholder timber trade is an emerging sub sector offering many opportunities and challenges. Currently marketing of *Grevillea sp* and other exotic timber species require marketing planning support to redress customer concerns about product features, performance and reliability. Given time farmer learning and experience curves will grow to allow for more competition in the sub-sector (Blomley & Iddi 2009).

The following has occurred under decentralisation, accountability and transparency:

- ❖ There has been integration of NFP-ISP with district and village plans;
- ❖ The surveying and demarcation of Angai Village Forest reserve in order to transfer full legal rights in management of reserve has been concluded;
- ❖ The formulation of JFM guidelines which stipulates 40%–60% benefit share between communities and government has been finalised, however guidelines have not been distributed or endorsed by government as there seems to be reluctance on the part of the government to implement benefit sharing, as this may lead to loss of illegal income for some forest officers at district level;
- ❖ Members of VNRC participate in patrols, protection against forest fires, surveys and assessments, management plans, training in capacity building activities, tree planting on boundaries, inter village coordination and meetings; and
- ❖ Under the NFP-ISP, the SWAp process in forestry contributed significantly to strengthening of structured and well-functioning stakeholder participation (NGOs and private sector) in forest sector governance. In the longer term once the SWAp process is strengthened it will considerably contribute to the Local Government Reform through PFM, the basic structures of which are already in place for 50 districts in different parts of Tanzania.

Despite the successes above, a recent audit of NFBKP conducted by KPMG found the following concerns with respect to accountability and transparency:

- ❖ Programme funds had not been audited since inception of the NFBKP and the Embassy was not actively following-up on implementation of the Programme;
- ❖ Procurement procedures have not been strictly followed. There had been direct procurement without any explanations of the reason;
- ❖ There was no sufficient follow up of imprest accounting or advances;

- ❖ There were no contracts for research sub-grantees financed by both DANIDA and MFA;
- ❖ Supporting documentations were missing for training sessions, workshops and meetings;
- ❖ There was no programme budget follow-up against actual costs;
- ❖ NFBKP were not using the national accounting software Epicor but Excel and there was lack of internal control;
- ❖ There was no reconciliation of financial reports between MNRT, PMO-RALG and the districts;
- ❖ No audit of the NFBKP funds has been performed by the National Audit Office, and no financial statements of the NFBKP have been issued;
- ❖ NAFOBEDA was not in use because personnel were not fully trained and there was lack of data collection monitoring. Thus reports were not being used for decision making; and
- ❖ A process for monitoring of fixed assets was not in place and a comprehensive list of all assets funded by the project was missing.

As a result of these findings, the Finnish Embassy suspended funding to NFBKP until the issues that needed immediate attention were sorted out.

There has been increased income at community level as shown from the following examples (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2007e). However, information on household income from forestry-related enterprises and improved productivity to develop sustainable livelihoods is lacking as it is not collected by the various interventions.

These examples are detailed below:

- ❖ Four groups from 25 households in areas adjacent to mangroves in Tanga, Coast, Dar es Salaam, Mtwara and Lindi regions were supported to construct 4 salt pans. Another 9 households were supported to construct a fish pond while 99 households engaged in sea weed farming were provided with tools and equipment. As a result of these activities, 2 groups sold 28,000 kgs of salt and earned TZS 1,680,000 while the seaweed farming group earned TZS 844,000 from selling 3,839.5 kgs of seaweed;
- ❖ A total of 30 participants representing 15 Village Beekeeping Associations from Kondoa, Kibondo, Uyui, Manyoni and Handeni were facilitated to participate in the Dar es Salaam International Trade Fair and Dodoma National Honey Show. The groups collected TZS 72 million from sales of honey during the trade fairs;
- ❖ Mpingo Conservation Project initiated a process to evaluate potential for certification of community managed mpingo in Kilwa. Mapogoro Beekeepers Association sold 1000 litres of honey and 170 kgs of beeswax.

There was no evidence on access by marginalised groups to forest resources. At district and village levels, the local government and the VNRCs are yet to consider how the poorest of the poor or physically challenged individuals will benefit from PFM.

Outcomes and impact from Finnish Aid are yet to be fully felt in the forestry sector. Finland is the biggest donor of PFM which is yet to elicit sustainable outcomes such as improved livelihoods. The MNRT and FBD capacities are still weak despite the capacity building efforts. Table 4 shows the progress under PFM as at 2006. Little has changed since then. The delivery of PFM through the PMO-RALG is quite bureaucratic and the approval of the management plans by village councils can take time especially when after elections a new batch of people who were not part of the process are elected.

Table 4 Overview of Community Based Forest Management on mainland Tanzania as at 2006.

Number of villages with CBFM established or in process	1,102
Area of forest covered by CBFM arrangements	2,060,608ha
Number of declared Village Land Forest Reserves	329
Number of Gazetted Village Land Forest Reserves	53
Number of districts where CBFM is implemented	50
Primary forest types where CBFM has been promoted	Miombo, coastal and acacia woodlands
Percentage of public land forests now under CBFM arrangements	10.2%
Percentage of villages on mainland Tanzania that are engaged in CBFM activities	10.5%

Source: Blomley & Iddi 2009.

The private sector, including the timber industry, has been involved in various ways with the FBD and strategies for its engagement have been formulated. The private sector is also mentioned as an implementing agency under the NFBKP but the modalities are not explained. The private sector was also used extensively in the training of beekeepers and the marketing of beekeeping products which led to increased incomes (MNRT 2007e).

Evaluation Question 5

Have the financial and human resources, as well as the modalities of management and administration of aid been enabling or hindering the achievement of the set objectives in the form of outputs, outcomes, results or effects?

Under NFP-CUSP the total financial input of the Government of Finland to the NFP CUSP was EUR 1, 044, 910. The actual GoT financial contribution was TZS 81 million, The Finnish financial contribution was fully disbursed for the planned activities during the time span from April 2003 to June 2006. However, the project duration was extended twice because the original implementation schedule was too optimistic

and the planned activities and budgets were not achieved. This made it possible to finalize not only many originally planned activities but also to do some reallocation between the budget items. For example, originally too much money was allocated for the budget item on workshops, while the activities for popularising and communication could not be carried out fully due to insufficient implementation capacity at FBD (MNRT 2006).

By the end of 2007, the approved budget for NFP-I 2006/07 financial year was TZS 3,421.7 M from GoF. According to the Bilateral Agreement, total disbursement made to Ministry of Finance was EUR 2,000,000 which was equivalent to TZS 3,289.4 millions. Out of this total amount, MNRT received TZS 1,952.8 millions. The remaining amount (TZS 1,336.5 millions) was disbursed to PMO-RALG.

Actual expenditure for MNRT (FBD) was TZS 257.3 millions giving a variance of TZS 1,695.5 millions. For PMO-RALG, actual expenditure was TZS 429.1 millions giving a variance of TZS 907.5 millions. These balances were carried over to 2007/08 financial year. Disbursement of Funds from MFA Finland were made in December 2006 and arrived at MNRT (FBD) and districts in April and June 2007 respectively. This accounted for the high cash balances (MNRT 2007b).

It was also noted in the Joint Annual reviews of NFBKP that the majority of funding was earmarked for forest management and related operations, while forestry industries and sustainable livelihoods were found to be greatly underfinanced.

Under the NFP-CUSP there was no separate project management unit. FBD through NFP Coordination Unit staffed with two officers provided overall coordination of the implementation. The officers collaborated with FBD Schedule Officers, PMO-RALG and Districts Technical Staff. NFP activities were therefore integrated into the government structures and institutions that implement activities at all levels. At the implementation level the majority of staff who are under PMO-RALG carried out activities through their respective district councils. This system, designed to increase efficiency, was hampered by slow procurement and agreement signing procedures.

The NFP-ISP Preparatory Phase financial delivery was organised through a MFA-Consultant contract whereby the consultant (Indufor) financed the project and was reimbursed for its costs by the MFA against time sheets for consultancy time and for receipts for other costs. Financing delivery was efficient, though there were delays in implementing some of the activities, and particularly in getting the system and structures in place enabling the NFP-ISP Implementation Phase financing through GoT financing management system (under SWAp framework). In addition NFP-ISP Preparatory Phase enabled the first rounds of joint annual planning and budgeting by interested donor supported projects/interventions under the GoT's Medium-term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). Similarly, the joint planning and budgeting exercises enabled joint annual sector reviews (reviews of implementation vs. annual plans) in 2006 and 2007.

Under the NFBKP the funds are channelled through the MNRT which then releases the funds to the FBD. Whilst this was supposed to build on the MNRT capacities built in the first two phases, this modality has not worked well hence the suspension of funding to the programme.

Evaluation Question 6

What are the discernible factors, such as exit strategies, local budgetary appropriations, capacity development of local counterpart organisations or personnel, which can be considered necessary for the sustainability of results and continuance of benefits after the closure of a development intervention?

A lot of capacity building and establishment of various procedures and processes took place in the various interventions. They are detailed below:

- ❖ There has been training of FBD and district staff on M&E, community management, record management, entrepreneurship, forestry and private sector involvement;
- ❖ Training for FBD and development partners done on SWAP;
- ❖ Development of the FBD M&E system was ongoing as at 2006;
- ❖ Framework for incorporating NFP into national planning and budgeting processes taking shape under the SWAP process;
- ❖ There was joint financing of SWAP roll-out plan;
- ❖ There was joint funding and implementation of NFBKP initiatives under JFA;
- ❖ The NFBKP was being integrated into MKUKUTA;
- ❖ There was an ongoing process to establish loose SWAP with government and development partners in forestry and beekeeping (integration of government and project activities without pooling of funding);
- ❖ There was no separate management unit for CUSP and ISP but adoption of the SWAP approach for institutionalisation (MNRT 2006 & MNRT 2007c);
- ❖ Under SWAP process, new planning, and budgeting processes and formats, co-ordination and communication structures, M&E processes and formats were formulated (MNRT 2007c);
- ❖ Staff from Forestry Training Institute (FTI) and Forestry Industry Training Institute (FITI) were supported and staff were trained in various long courses;
- ❖ The NFP-ISP activities were to be integrated into GoT organisational structures and institutions such as district development plans and VNRCs and other local level organisations; and
- ❖ Three CBOs in Kilwa District received training on good governance, financial budgeting and bank procedures and how CBO members could contribute to good village governance.

The biggest effects in capacity development may have been felt in the forestry training institutions that Finland has supported over the years and the training of Tanzanians in Finland on various aspects of forestry. About 63% of the funding has gone to the institutions.

Despite all the training and capacity building, the relocation of staff already trained under the programme on forestry to other departments which do not implement the programme has had a negative impact on the programme and therefore capacity building will always remain to be a challenge as long as Government departments do not work in a coordinated manner (KPMG 2010).

In addition there is no follow up mechanism for training done at district and regional levels; and there has been no coordination of training based on needs and specific requirements across districts in order to save costs.

However, all is not lost as the impacts of capacity building can take as long as 10 years to become visible. Amongst the FBD's directors, foresters in the field and in other organisations the attitudes and perceptions are constantly changing, but require time to mature to accept change. For example in 2000 an establishment of the Tanzania Forestry Service (TFS) was almost an impossible idea, as well as going for promotion of private small-holder forestry, but presently these issues are being promoted. Thus sustainable changes due to capacity building may still be realized.

The level of counterpart funding is low as compared to Finnish funding. In addition there have been challenges in the GoT disbursing their contribution for NAFORMA and this is slowing down activities. During the financial year 2006/2007, there was a budget cut in the Tanzanian development budget. This affected implementation of some planned activities that required contribution from GoT. Currently, the Treasury only provides perhaps 20–30% of collected stumpage and other revenues (50% collected from Governmental plantations and 50% from natural forests, respectively) back to the MNRT/FBD under the retention fund.

Structural changes in MNRT that will transform the FBD into TFS which is expected to be semi-autonomous and which will be able to collect revenues in order to sustain itself are taking place. It is envisaged that with TFS keeping almost all the forestry revenues forestry activities could become self-financing. However, no financial resources have been allocated in the GoT FY 2010/2011 budget for the TFS establishment as yet.

Due to the creation of awareness and sensitization on illegal logging by the Mama Misitu (MM) campaign there was increased awareness among local citizens about forest crimes and the flow of information on illegal logging from the villages to the district forest offices has increased. The number of illegal incidences reported by villages has also increased. Some citizens have been demanding for PFM process to start in their villages (Mtyelambuko and Utunge). There is also a high and increasing demand for Mama Misitu campaign to spread to other regions in the country such as Rukwa region (to Kisanga forest area), Kigoma region, etc. This was revealed during and after the TV spots whereby people made phone calls demanding the campaign to reach their respective areas in the country (Tanzania Natural Resource Forum 2010).

The advocacy campaign also spilled over to the neighbouring villages that were not covered in the pilot phase leading to multiplier effects where communities not targeted have begun asking for PFM.

Apart from the above, no other evidence on wider sectoral changes was found. The FBD is undergoing reform and there seems to be lack of focus on the longer term goals for the forestry sector. This is causing concern in the Finnish Embassy as higher levels of government seem disinterested in dialogue.

Evaluation Question 7

What has been the role of considering the cross-cutting issues of Finnish development policy in terms of contributing to the sustainability of development results and poverty reduction; has there been any particular value-added in the promotion of environmentally sustainable development?

In NFP-CUSP a study to develop gender and community issues was conducted but its outcomes in other documentation is not evident. The role of women in forest management was taken into account in original documents but was lacking in planning and implementation processes.

In the JPFM the issue of women's participation is clearly stated when it comes to formation of VNRCs, at least a third have to be women. It is also stated in the training manual for practitioners. Thus women form a third of the committee, 5 out of the 15 member committee.

The role of women and men in enhancing sustainable forest management was also mainstreamed in the NFP programme implementation. Some of the interventions included financial support to NGOs which addressed gender aspects on implementation of environmental issues. Also, at community or lower level implementation, the programme sought to assure responsibility and benefit sharing among women, men and youth.

Women in Handeni district, KwediBangala village under PFM were trained in energy saving stoves. After 15 were trained, they trained others and currently there are 50 households which have energy saving stoves. The women with energy saving stoves now only collect firewood once a week as opposed to 7 days a week saving them time for other productive activities. In the long term there will be less damage done to the forest if all households adopt the stoves.

The consideration/participation of minority groups is not evident in the intervention design or implementation. There is no evidence of change to minority groups related to programme outcomes.

In JPFM in collaboration with Tanzania Commission for AIDS, FBD trained some of its staff in HIV/AIDS on creation of awareness and distribution of condoms. They were then meant to mainstream this training when implementing their activities.

Under the MNRT HIV/AIDS strategic Framework a Training of Trainers on HIV/AIDS for five FBD Peer Educators was conducted and follow-up activities at 3 FBD out stations were supported to train staff and adjacent communities on HIV/AIDS related issues.

There is no evidence on any changes arising from the training mentioned in the previous section. It is not evident from the documentation how country based environmental strategies and best practices were incorporated in intervention design.

Evaluation Question 8

Evidence that outcomes are positive or neutral on environmentally sustainable development?

It was noted in the 2008 review that forests managed jointly or exclusively by the community through JPFM were in a better state than open access or exclusively state managed forests. NFP-CUSP/ISP created an enabling environment towards promoting sustainable forest management and reducing the loss of forest cover and was thus seen to be compatible with the principles of environmental sustainability (MNRT 2006; 2007c).

Evaluation Question 9

Evidence of engagement in and consideration of best practice from international environmental regimes?

There is reference to linkages with the Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) in the new NFBKP II which will be implemented from 2009–2011.

Finland has supported a research study “The role of Participatory Forest Management in Mitigation of Adaptation to Climate Change: Opportunities and Constraints” which aimed to analyse how the communities could benefit from improved forest management through international funding for reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD). This work contributes towards the National REDD Strategy for Tanzania which Norway has funded. REDD initiatives are being coordinated by a secretariat and development partners are complimenting each other in implementation. For example Finnish support to the National Forestry Monitoring Assessment has incorporated the collection of REDD data so that when the roll out begins there will be a basis for calculating carbon credits.

Evaluation Question 10

How is the society touched upon by the development interventions taken into account in the strategic and project/programme plans, and what have been the major modalities for the society to influence and affect the development interventions and the decision-making on them?

The main institutions that were involved in the interventions were the MNRT, Forestry and Beekeeping division, PMO-RALG, DPs such as DANIDA and World Bank, SWAp Technical Team, Local Government Authorities and the Village Natural Re-

source Committees (VNRCs). The VNRCs particularly are involved in planning and implementation of activities at village government level.

For the Mama Misitu Campaign, involvement of the local communities and district authority in the design and agreement on priorities were found to be inadequate but there are plans to rectify this in the next phase.

Due to participation by different stakeholders in planning and implementation, duplication of efforts has been minimised by DPs due to better coordination and communication which has led to joint planning and harmonised implementation between FBD and PMO-RALG.

Structures that were used for participation for DPs, government structures and communities in the interventions included:

- ❖ Workshops with environment and trade committees, Ministers and Permanent Secretaries, Senior Executives in related sectors under the Support to National Forest and Beekeeping Programme implementation;
- ❖ In the roll out of the SWAp process, round table meetings with development partners were held;
- ❖ At community level Participatory Forest Resource Assessment (PFRA) were conducted under the JPFM; and
- ❖ Under the JPFM there were joint meetings and reviews with development partners and implementing stakeholders. However the follow up of recommendations from these meetings still remains a challenge.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Tanzania with all the goodwill being shown by donors has the potential to set best practices in forest monitoring especially under NAFORMA. However, the sustainability of this comprehensive monitoring system after Finnish funding ends will remain to be seen.

PFM has not really worked as communities are yet to benefit fully. It may be difficult for the programme in its current state to be self-financing particularly where JFM works (catchments, biodiversity areas etc.) and mostly also where CBFM is working with very degraded woodlands. In case of common goods, like water and biodiversity the government has to finance the major part of the work, in addition incentives/grants are required in those VLFMs where expected income flow is limited. When the new Tanzania Forestry Service is in place it should be able to finance PFM through enhanced revenue collection as about 50% of the stumpages revenues are still collected from natural forests and part of this needs to be channelled back into forestry.

In addition in the future, donor money to PFM could be channelled through competitive bidding among service providers (NGOs, private companies, and local district councils) in order e.g. through a forestry-specific PFM Fund as currently donors are financing PFM through different modalities and institutions. Thus the PFM guidelines may have to be revised to accommodate this.

Evaluations and impact assessments have not been conducted for a number of interventions being implemented by the MNRT. It is essential that these are done in order for lessons to be learnt and appropriate action is taken to improve implementation, accountability and transparency.

The Mama Misititu Campaign project was a success and it needs to be replicated and upscaled in other districts. In addition, there is need for the campaign to be linked to a fund which can finance PFM for interested communities.

Finally overcoming the issues of weak capacities within government will remain a challenge for Finnish Aid as results are not evident. There may be need to review how the NFBKP planning, implementation and monitoring should be changed in order for the programme to cease being seen as a project. Thus for the merger of NFP-CUSP and FBD to become a reality the assistant directors can be made responsible for implementation of their respective parts of the NFBKP and they would need to involve the FBD management team and technical committee.

REFERENCES

Blomley T & Iddi S 2009 *Participatory Forest Management in Tanzania: 1993–2009. Lessons Learned and Experiences to Date*. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Forestry and Beekeeping Division, Dar es Salaam.

Government of United Republic of Tanzania and Government of Finland 2006 *Tanzania Joint Annual Review Report*. Dar es Salaam & Helsinki.

KPMG 2010 *Financial Review of NFBKP*. Final Report. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Dar es Salaam.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Finland 2009 *Tanzania Development Cooperation Plan 2009–2011*. <http://formin.fi/public/download.aspx?ID=55216&GUID=%7BE9FE54FA-4152-4C26-ACC8-9BE533512CC0%7D>.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010 (<http://www.finland.or.tz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31653&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>).

MNRT 2001 *Support to National Forest and Beekeeping Programmes Implementation*. Quarterly Progress Report No. 2. August – October 2001. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2002a *National Forest and Beekeeping Programme Bridging Phase*. Progress report July 2001–January 2002. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2002b *National Forest Programme Implementation Support Project (NFP-ISP) 2003–2006*. Project Document MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2003 *National Forest Programme Implementation Support Project. Preparatory Phase Proposal (2003/2004)*. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2006 *Completion Report on National Forest Programme Coordination Unit Support Project (NFP CUSP)*. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2007a *Natural Forestry Resources Monitoring and Assessment*. Prodoc. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2007b *Annual Report on Support to National Forest Programme Implementation*. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2007c *Completion Report on National Forest Programme Implementation Support Project (NFP ISP) Preparatory Phase*. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2007d *Joint Financing Arrangement between the Ministry of Natural Resources and*

Tourism, Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) and Development Partners for the National Forest and Beekeeping Programme (NFB-KP). MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2007e *Report of the Third Joint Annual Review of NFBKP September–October 2007.* MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2008 *Joint Review Report of Joint Participatory Forest Management in Tanzania 2008,* Dar es Salaam.

Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Preliminary Evaluation Study Forestry Sector,* Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki [Published as Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Forestry Sector: Preliminary Study.* Evaluation report 2010:5/III. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Koppijyvä Oy, Jyväskylä, 145 p. ISBN 978-951-724-880-8 (printed)].

Simula A-L 2008 *Commercially Viable Forest Partnerships. Holopainen, Jani and Marieke Wit (eds). Financing Sustainable Forest Management.* Tropenbos International, Wageningen, The Netherlands. xvi +176pp (p.62).

Tanzania Natural Resource Forum 2010 *Mama Misisu Pilot Phase Report.* Tanzania Natural Resource Forum, Dar es Salaam.

United Nations Industrial Development Organisation 2010 (<http://www.unido.org/index-php?id=6452>).

ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Embassy of Finland in Tanzania

Mr. Heikki Haili, Deputy Head of Mission
Ms. Merja Makela , Counsellor Natural Resources

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism

Mr. Deogratius Gamassa , M&E Unit
Mr. Peter Nyaronga, Planning and Policy Unit
Mr. Chamuya, NAFORMA
Mr. Soren Dalsgaard, NAFORMA

Forestry and Beekeeping Division

Mr. D. Bwoyo, NFBKP Coordinator
Mr. Joseph Kigula, PFM Coordinator

Embassy of Denmark in Tanzania

Mr. Lars Mikkell Johannessen, Chair of DPG-E

Handeni District, Tanga Region

Mr. Gilbert Temu, District Forestry Officer
Mr. Uhuru Muhondi, Forestry Officer
Mr. Eliri Haki, Forestry Officer

Kwedi Bagala Village

Village Natural Resource Committee members

Mazingara Village

Village Natural Resource Committee members

Tanzania Natural Resources Forum

Ms. Carol Sorenson, Coordinator

DFID

Ms. Magdalena Banasiak, Donor Focal Person Climate Change

ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Government of United Republic of Tanzania and Government of Finland 2001 *Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Finland and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania on Support to Implementation of National Forest Programme*, Dar es Salaam.

LTS International 2003 *Evaluation of the Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation*. Evaluation report 2003:2 part 1 & 2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 122 p. (part 1), 180 p. (part 2). ISBN 951.724-407-X (part 1); ISBN 951-724-416-9 (part 2).

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Development Policy Programme 2007, Towards a Sustainable and Just Humanity Policy*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 38 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Evaluation Guidelines of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 84 p. ISBN 978-951-724-624-8.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) & FAO 2008 *Agreement between the Government of Finland and the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Landuse and Livelihoods – National Forestry Resources Monitoring and Assessment in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Environment*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 26 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Forest Sector*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 18 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010 *Partner Countries and Regions*. <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?nodeid=15378&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT) (undated) *Sector Wide Approach in Forestry and Beekeeping, National Forest and Beekeeping Programme. Planning and Budgeting Processes and Formats*. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT (undated) *Lessons learned and experiences to date*. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Dar es Salaam.

MNRT 2005 *Revised Budget for the NFP-ISP Preparatory Phase*. September 2005. MNRT, Dar es Salaam.

National Bureau of Statistics Tanzania 2002 *Household Budget Survey 2000/01*. National Bureau of Statistics Tanzania, Dar es Salaam.

Tanzania Natural Resource Forum 2001 *Tanzania Draft Project Document*. Tanzania Natural Resource Forum, Dar es Salaam.

Evaluation

**Finnish Support to Forestry and
Biological Resources**

**Country Reports
Part 4. Zambia**

Evaluation report 2010:5/II (4. Zambia)

Evaluation

Finnish Support to Forestry and Biological Resources

Country Reports Part 4. Zambia

Alex Forbes

Evaluation report 2010:5/II (4. Zambia)

MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF FINLAND

This evaluation was commissioned by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland to LTS International Ltd. The Consultants bear the sole responsibility for the contents of the report. The report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	vii
SUMMARY.....	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Brief Overview of Forestry Sector.....	3
1.2 Overview of Finland’s Support in Zambia.....	5
2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR.....	5
3 ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	9
4 CONCLUSIONS.....	18
REFERENCES.....	20
ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED.....	22
ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....	24
TABLES	
Table 5 Forestry interventions in Zambia 2000–2013.....	6

ACRONYMS

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CC	Climate Change
CFM	Collaborative Forest Management
ECZ	Environmental Council of Zambia
ENRMMP	Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme
EQ	Evaluation Question
ESP	Environment Support Programme
DENRM	Department of Environment and Natural Resources Management
DF	Department of Forestry
DTD	Department of Tourism Development
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resource Management
EUR	Euro
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FMC	Forest Management Committee
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoZ	Government of Zambia
GoM	Government of Mozambique
GoT	Government of Tanzania
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
ha	Hectare
HIPC	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IUCN	EASARO International Union for the Conservation of Nature Eastern and Southern African Regional Office
ILUA	Integrated Land Use Assessment
JFM	Joint Forest Management
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
MTENR	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NDP	National Development Plan
NFMA	National Forest Monitoring and Assessment
NHCC	National Heritage Conservation Commission
NRM	Natural Resource Management

NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
PFAP	Provincial Forest Action Programme
PFM	Participatory Forest Management
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SI	Statutory Instrument
SME	Small/Medium Enterprise
SSA	Sub-Sahara Africa
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms Of Reference
VRMC	Village Resource Management Committee
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN	United Nations
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	US Dollar
ZAWA	Zambia Wildlife Authority
ZFAP	Zambia Forestry Action Plan

SUMMARY

The country synthesis draws on a desk based review of key country and project documents and a country mission that took place in April and June 2010 respectively. In addition, consultations took place with MFA Headquarters and other stakeholders in Finland. Key stakeholders that were consulted in Zambia include staff of the Department of Forestry in Lusaka and Ndola, the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR), the Ambassador and staff of the Embassy of Finland, donor and partner institutions, civil society and representatives of village forest management committees adjacent to Katanino forest.

The Government of Finland has had a long-standing cooperation programme with Zambia, starting back in 1966. It was suspended between 1996 and 2004 due to concerns on undemocratic developments in the country although support to the forest sector continued through a regional SADC forestry training project and the Provincial Forestry Action Programme (PFAP). Zambia is regarded as one of the highly forested countries in Southern Africa, characterised by its extensive indigenous Miombo forests.

The evaluation assessed the Provincial Forestry Action Programme (PFAP) Phase II (Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources 2000–2010) implemented by the Department of Forestry and the National Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) project also implemented by the Department of Forestry and with technical support from the FAO. The mission also met with the Lusaka based Coordinator of the IUCN implemented and MFA funded Regional Programme on Climate Change and Development.

Key findings from the evaluation include:

- ❖ All MFA funded interventions address key objectives and priorities of Government as defined in Vision 2030, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme (Government of Zambia 2002–2004) and the 5th National Development Plan (Government of Zambia 2006–2010). The 5th NDP makes reference to sustainable environmental and natural resource management within the context of achieving development objectives.
- ❖ Both the PFAP and ILUA respond to the needs and priorities of the Department of Forestry, namely strengthening capacity in facilitating participatory forest management and forest/land use surveys towards achieving sustainable forest management. Whilst DF staff have applied PFM skills for other donor supported activities (e.g. USAID), the staff have not benefited from exposure to PFM implementation since the Forest Act (Government of the Republic of Zambia 1999) has not come into effect and the Statutory Instrument No. 47 (2006) does not issue benefit sharing mechanisms between the GRZ and communities as intended under JFM plans.

- ❖ The PFAP evolved from a broad based decentralised institutional capacity programme to one centred on piloting participatory forest management and resulted in the preparation and endorsement of collaborative forest management plans to be implemented by organised and trained village management committees in collaboration with the Department of Forestry. However, the legal framework has not yet been commissioned by the Department and therefore collaborative forest management has not been implemented.
- ❖ Consequently there are no discernable impacts of PFAP outcomes at economic levels other than some very limited benefits to village committees from sale of honey and timber resulting from inputs provided by PFAP (and not from implementing CFM). At a community level the outcome is mixed; at one level expectations remain high that CFM will eventually be implemented and benefits will reach communities while at another level it is apparent that the village committees have been empowered in organisational management and basic management.
- ❖ Once the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) comes into effect and benefit sharing mechanisms that effectively support JFM are put in place, there will be pressure from village management committees and the Department of Forestry to implement endorsed collaborative forest management plans and to further roll out CFM in Zambia. The Director of the DF stated that the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) could come into effect as soon as September 2010 due to pressures from partners and preconditions under REDD+ readiness planning. Should this be the case, then the MFA as lead donor for the last ten years on PFM will be under pressure to provide technical support to the DF. However it does not appear that a provision is in place for anticipating such a request from the DF should it arise. Although the Embassy stated that in such an eventuality an option would be to support small/medium enterprise (SME) engagement and local administrations at decentralised levels to support village committees in forest product based enterprises.
- ❖ Finland has been the lead coordinating donor in the environment and natural resource management sector since 2006, a role that is positively received by other key donors and partners although it was stated that MFA decision-making remains centralised (i.e. Helsinki based) compared to other in-country missions.
- ❖ The ILUA I programme has successfully produced a forest cover and land use map for Zambia drawn from an extensive database that also includes socio-economic information from household surveys. The intervention has benefited from FAO technical support at country, regional and headquarters levels. The DF positively comments on the outcomes of this project as providing a valuable planning tool although there is little evidence that the information and analysis has yet been used to inform policy. Wider distribution and sensitisation on the planning tool with key stakeholders in Zambia remains to be done and so as to maximise the number of users.
- ❖ ILUA II has been elaborated with a main focus of providing core monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) requirements for REDD+ within the context of replicating the forest and land cover inventory in 2012-2013.

1 INTRODUCTION

Zambia has a population of 11.8 million of which approximately 67% live below the poverty line. Approximately 39% of the population lives in urban areas along major transport routes linking Lusaka and Copperbelt Provinces. Per capita income in 2009 was USD 490, down from USD 964 in 1965 owing largely to the reduction in world copper prices during the 1970's and 1980's (Government of the Republic of Zambia 2008). The Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) borrowed heavily which rendered Zambia one of the most heavily indebted countries in SSA. Although Zambia was granted debt relief in 2000 as part of the HIPC initiative, in 2009 18.1% of the national budget was covered by donor support. The resurgence of world copper prices has provided a positive boost to the economy with annual growth rates averaging 4.8% in the early to mid 2000s.

Vision 2030 sets out the long-term economic development policy goals for the country, namely to ensure that Zambia becomes a prosperous middle income nation. The long-term plan sets out economic and poverty reduction objectives that will be achieved through five year national development plans. The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (GoZ 2002-2004) provided the overall framework for national planning and identifies priorities action in each sector that also reflects the MDGs. Building on from this, the Fifth National Development Plan (GoZ 2006-2010) placed emphasis on revitalising the agriculture sector to attain food security (90% of the population is food secure); increase foreign exchange earnings (up from 3–5% to 10–20%); attain 10% growth per annum in the agriculture sector; increase incomes to farmers and overall increase of the sector's contribution to GDP.

1.1 Brief Overview of Forestry Sector

Zambia is regarded as one of the highly forested countries in Southern Africa with a forest cover, of approximately 42.37 million hectares of Miombo woodland and 75,200 hectares of plantations (FAO, 2005). According to the FAO (2005), the estimated deforestation rate is between 250,000 and 300,000 hectares per year. The causes for forest cover decline and degradation include encroachment from shifting cultivation and unsustainable agricultural methods, over grazing, forest fires, increasing demand for wood-based energy, and demand for timber resources for mining and construction sectors.

Until the early 1990s, forestry development in Zambia focused mainly on industrial plantations and little attention was given to sustainable management of indigenous Miombo forests. In response to the FAO Tropical Forestry Action Plan of 1987, the Zambia Forestry Action Programme (ZFAP) planning process was initiated in 1995. ZFAP was undertaken as an integral part of the National Environmental Action Plan process, which was developed to incorporate environmental issues into social and

economic policy and development planning. The outcomes of the ZFAP planning process include the National Forestry Policy (GoZ 1998) and Forestry Act (GoZ 1999). Whilst the Forestry Act was endorsed by Cabinet and Parliament in 1999, to date it has yet to be commissioned.

In addition to the ZFAP, there have been a number of sectoral development programmes which are based on environmental principles in their formulation and implementation, including for example the Danida and MFA funded Environmental Support Programme (ESP), the Finnish funded Provincial Forestry Action Programme (PFAP I, 1995–1998 and PFAP II, 2000–2010), and Community Based Natural Resources Management Programme (CBNRM) (1999–2003).

The Department of Forestry is one of four operational departments of the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (MTENR). Established in 2002, the MTENR consists of an administration and human resources department and four operational departments:

- ❖ Department of Environment and Natural Resources Management (DENRM);
- ❖ Department of Tourism Development (DTD);
- ❖ Department of Forestry (DF); and
- ❖ Planning and Information Department.

There are also a number of Statutory Bodies that fall under MTENR including three that are directly responsible for management of environment and natural resources:

- ❖ Environmental Council of Zambia (ECZ);
- ❖ Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA); and
- ❖ National Heritage Conservation Commission (NHCC).

The Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme (ENRMMP 2008–2012) aims to improve coordination and implementation capacity to the environment and NRM sector. Led by the GRZ and under the guidance of a Joint Task Force comprising MTENR departments and statutory bodies, and Cooperating Partners (Finland, Denmark, Norway and UNDP), the programme serves as an umbrella sector coordination mechanism.

In October 2009, with support from UNDP, the GRZ published a draft National Forestry Policy, which was defined as a review of the National Forest Policy of 1998. The new Policy addresses new challenges and other emerging issues including strategies related to the contribution of the forestry sector to poverty reduction and Zambia's national economy based on projects anchored in the national sustainable development criteria, and carbon forests and trade.

Zambia is one of the nine pilot countries for the global UN REDD Programme, launched in September 2008. The programme aims to assist tropical forest countries by establishing a fair, equitable and transparent REDD regime. In 2010, UN REDD awarded a grant of USD 4.49 million to prepare Zambian institutions and stakeholders for effective nationwide implementation of the REDD+ mechanism. Key objec-

tives include: build institutional and stakeholder capacity; develop an enabling policy environment for REDD+; develop REDD+ benefit-sharing models; and, lastly develop Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) systems for REDD+.

1.2 Overview of Finland's Support in Zambia

Finnish development co-operation to Zambia started in 1966 but it was interrupted in 1996, during which time no new development projects were started, due to the Government of Finland's concern regarding undemocratic developments in Zambia. Development co-operation officially resumed in 2004 after the democratic situation in the country had improved. However, support to the forestry sector had continued during this time through a regional SADC forestry training project and the Provincial Forestry Action Programme (PFAP).

Originally centred on support to industrial, technical and research, the MFA forestry support in Zambia shifted during the 1990s to support participatory forest management and field resource surveys. It also reflected a shift in approach from donor established priorities to country established priorities and ownership as mirrored in the 2007 MFA global development policy. The Government of Finland and Zambia's co-operation sectors are currently: the environment and natural resources; developing the private sector; and agriculture and rural development.

The MFA environment and natural resources sector support in Zambia aims to be broad and reflect Zambia's priorities and foster local ownership and direction. The Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme, is a multi-donor sector-wide programme led by the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, which MFA is actively engaged in through the Embassy of Finland in Lusaka. Key components include institutional capacity building, sector reform processes, climate change adaptation and mitigation, environmental mainstreaming and Private-Public Partnerships. In addition, MFA is supporting the MTENR/FAO's Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA) programme centred on acquiring information on forest cover and land use changes over time in order to inform decision-makers and in doing so strengthening institutional capacity within MTENR and its partners.

2 INTERVENTIONS IN THE FORESTRY AND BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTOR

The portfolio of forestry and biological resources interventions in Zambia supported by Finland during the period 2000 to date is included in Table 5.

Table 5 Forestry interventions supported by Finland.

Title and Timeframe	MFA Code	Duration	MFA Spent
National Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA I&II)	28813901/2	Phase I: 2005–2008 Phase II: 2010–2011 2012–2013 (tbc)	USD 437,854 (GRZ USD 317,760, FAO USD 413,495) EUR 1,953,096 EUR 2,000,000 (tentative)
Provincial Forestry Action Programme (PFAP II)	28808602	2000–2005 2006–2010 (No Cost Extension) <i>Note: MFA data indicates end 2005 while Embassy data indicates project no cost extension until end 2010</i>	EUR 6,976,056 of which Finnish support EUR 6,389,056, GoZ EUR 179,520 and Private Sector EUR 40,610.
REGIONAL: IUCN : Climate Change and Development – Recognising the role of forest and water in climate change adaptation (Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia)		Phase I: 2007 Phase II 2008–2010	EUR 100,050 EUR 2,211,383 <i>Note: Covers 3 countries</i>

Source: Ruotsalainen 2010; Embassy of Finland in Zambia (pers communication).

Based on the MFA global list of projects related to biological resources (i.e. projects supporting partner countries to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)) there are no country specific interventions that aim to support the Government of Zambia or its partners to implement the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Provincial Forest Action Plan (PFAP)

PFAP I (Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources 1995-1999) centred on Luapula, Central and Copperbelt Provinces and on strengthening capacity of DF staff at Provincial and national levels in participatory forest planning. The main outcome of Phase I was a new Forest Act (GoZ 1999) which was endorsed by Cabi-

net and Parliament but never commissioned. Various reasons are put forward for this non-action by Government including a concern on the viability of transforming the Department of Forestry into a parastatal Forest Commission.

PFAP II (Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources 2000–2010) centred on Luapula, Copperbelt and Southern Provinces and shifted focus to participatory forest management. Following a Mid-Term Review in 2002 a further re-emphasis on Joint Forest Management (JFM) was adopted by the project. The PFAP II revised objective, purpose and results included:

Objective: Improved livelihoods and status of forests in Zambia

Purpose: Sustainable collaborative forest management practices bring implemented in seven pilot forest areas and experiences shared.

Results:

- i) Capacity and resources of DF staff strengthened for effective JFM implementation.
- ii) Capacity of local institutions/organisations/individuals for sustainable forest management strengthened.
- iii) Enabling mechanisms and processes established at institutional level for implementation of collaborative forest management.

The main outcomes from PFAP I and II include the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) although the law has not come into effect as of now, awareness and capacity in participatory forest planning and management with DF, seven JFM plans, capacity built in 45 Village Resource Management Committees (VRMCs) and 7 Forest Management Committee (FMC) for JFM planning and implementation, and guidelines for JFM planning and implementation, and a model (although largely untested) for collaborative forest management.

National Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA)

The project is implemented by the Department of Forestry (DF) with technical support from FAO Zambia, the FAO regional office in Zimbabwe and FAO Rome. There is a Letter of Agreement between FAO and Government, and an Agreement between FAO and MFA defining the modality of implementation of the project document.

ILUA Phase I (2005–2008) overall objective was to assess forestry and other related resources and land use practices to provide up-to-date qualitative and quantitative information on the state, use, management and trends of these resources. The project logical framework included the following outputs:

- ❖ Assist land use institutions in developing and strengthening their capacity to: collect; compile; process; and, disseminate reliable and updated information on land use to policy makers;
- ❖ Assist land use institutions in planning and carrying out pilot national land use assessments, develop up-to-date and sound baseline information and set up a long-term resource monitoring systems. The assessment covers a large array of

biophysical and socio-economic variables with emphasis on the management and use of resources.

Main outcomes were:

- ❖ Application of a systematic environmental field sampling based on 292 sample plots along 73 tracts (29.4% of the originally planned 248 tracts and 992 sample plots) supplemented by corresponding household economic and socio-economic surveys;
- ❖ DF staff trained in ecological and socio-economic field surveys, data analysis and GIS applications; and
- ❖ Major findings from the analysis and mapping of the field survey results include:
 - Forest cover estimated at approximately 49.9 million ha (or 66% of the total land cover of Zambia);
 - Total growing stock (volume) across all land uses is estimated at 2.9 million m³, with a majority of this volume, 2.1 million m³, held in semi-evergreen Miombo dominated forests;
 - Mean volume of the forests is relatively low, ranging from 40m³/ha to 67m³/ha depending on the forest type;
 - Some 61% of the forest is disturbed by human activities, although only 5% is considered to be heavily disturbed; and
 - Most of the land is practically owned and managed by customary authorities (61%). Of the forest land, 31 million ha (63%) are located on customary land, 12 million ha (24%) on State land and approximately 5 million ha (13%) on private land.

The ILUA field survey data is in a database held at the DF and is available to inform policy makers on issues of land use and land management.

ILUA Phase II (2010–2011) overall objective is to strengthen capacity in planning and implementation of sustainable forest management (SFM) and REDD through better information, capacity building, dissemination of information and improved multi-sectoral dialogue. Phase II outputs include:

- ❖ Output 1: Effective means of dissemination and utilisation of the information for multi-sectoral dialogue;
- ❖ Output 2: Improved methodological and human capacity in collecting and analysing forest, resource information for SFM, REDD monitoring and carbon inventory; and
- ❖ Output 3: Implementation of mapping and field survey activities.

Draft Phase II project document and implementation modalities were being discussed in June 2010 between ENRMMP/GRZ, FAO and the Embassy of Finnish, with an aim of ensuring effective coordination.

Regional: IUCN Climate Change and Development Project

Building on from a one year pilot phase implemented in Zambia in 2007, the three year regional project implemented by IUCN covers Zambia, Mozambique and Tanzania. Its purpose is “Climate Change (CC) related policies and strategies lead to adaptation activities that emphasise the role of forests and water resources in supporting people’s livelihoods and associated farming systems”. The main approach of the project is to undertake community-based vulnerability assessments, to identify and pilot appropriate adaptation activities, and to use lessons learned to influence climate change policies at national, regional and global levels.

The project coordinator is based in Lusaka and also serves as the Regional Programme Coordinator of the IUCN Regional CC Programme. The programme is coordinated by IUCN Headquarters and devolved to the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Programme office. The project was subject to an external Mid-Term Review (MTR) between December 2009 and March 2010, and IUCN is finalising a revised programme of work for the remaining project period based on the MTR recommendations.

3 ASSESSMENT OF INTERVENTIONS AGAINST THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The assessment of the MFA country/regional forestry and biological interventions in Zambia consisted of a two step process: 1) an assessment of each project against evaluation questions TORs based on the review of project and country reports and documentation; 2) in country assessment involving discussions with beneficiaries and key stakeholders, and acquisition of additional documentation. The report was also informed by discussions between the forestry team and the MFA Headquarters staff. This report is the combined outcome of both steps.

Evaluation Question 1

Did the respective budget appropriations, overall policy measures, sector policies and their implementation plans adequately reflect the development agenda in general, and in particular the major goal of poverty reduction?

All interventions address key objectives and priorities of the Government as defined in Vision 2030, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (GoZ 2002–2004) and the 5th National Development Plan (GoZ 2006–2010). It should be noted that the PRSP was largely silent on forestry and NRM whilst the 5th NDP makes reference to sustainable environmental and natural resource management within the context of development objectives. PFAP’s objectives to improve livelihoods as well as safeguard forest resources are in line with these national government policies. ILUA’s links are on the other hand indirect in that the information and planning tool aim to firstly improve

national and sub-national level decision-making on sustainable forest management and achieve reduced carbon emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD). It is inferred that achieving SFM and REDD+ will then lead to poverty reduction and socio-economic benefits.

There was evidence of consideration of MDG targets, international forest and biodiversity regimes (e.g. UNFF goals, SFM, indigenous peoples' rights, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) and NFP) and best practice in intervention design and assessment.

PFAP was significantly informed by recognised principles of sustainable forest management in particular centred on aiming to empower communities to become local managers for forest resources for their own benefits and that of the DF and the country as a whole. The same goes for ILUA which aims to strengthen capacity and methods for acquiring knowledge on the state of forests and trends over time. ILUA I established ecological and socioeconomic baseline data for Zambia based on data collected in the period 2005/2007. The Zambia component of the IUCN Regional programme offers to draw out lessons learned from climate change adaptation pilot projects to inform national and sub-national development plans.

Regarding PFAP, the Phase II project document provides very little insight on whether the outcomes and lesson learned from Phase I were captured in the Phase II project preparation. There is little reference to baseline information obtained and processed from Phase I to inform Phase II project design. The Phase II Mid-Term Review (MTR) led to a substantial refocusing of the project centred on piloting joint forest management (JFM), which could imply that insufficient attention was applied to drawing on Phase I achievements and lessons learned, during Phase II design.

At the end of PFAP I and prior to the endorsement of PFAP II in 2000, the MFA applied a pre-conditionality whereby Parliamentary approval of the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) was required to enable resumption of funding to PFAP II. Whilst Parliament approved the Forest Act (GoZ 1999), the MTENR did not issue a commencement order that would have put into effect the Act. It was only in April 2006, after the first five years of PFAP II, that Statutory Instrument No. 47 on joint forest management was issued but it did not offer benefit sharing mechanisms that would enable piloting of JFM as intended in JFM plans agreed with communities. Nonetheless the piloting of JFM within available legal frameworks was undertaken during the no-cost extension of PFAP II (MTENR 2006–2010).

Whilst Parliament endorsed the Forest Act (GoZ 1999), it is reported that it was not put into effect mainly due to concerns by GRZ on the economic viability of the proposed Forest Authority. This was at the same time that the ZAWA, a newly established parastatal, was requiring substantial state funds and hence putting into question the benefits of transforming a Government department into a semi-autonomous parastatal. As a consequence all other provisions in the Forest Act, including joint forest

management, have not obtained regulatory direction. The Statutory Instrument No. 47 of 2006 was an attempt to provide a regulatory framework for JFM (Jere 2005 & Kokwe 2007b). However absence of direction on benefit sharing as recommended by PFAP piloting and maintenance of GRZ policy on the collection, by state offices, of revenue from the access and use of state natural resources raises doubt on whether FD and MTENR are willing to apply benefit sharing approaches that enable implementation of JFM (Kokwe 2007a).

In terms of financial allocations, 63% of the PFAP Phase II budget of EUR 6,976,056 was spent on technical assistance (TA) costs (Provincial Forestry Action Plan II 2005). This is high for a participatory planning project and also reflects earlier assessments of Finnish support in Zambia (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2002) which noted high technical assistance costs for its in country bilateral assistance programmes. The extension of PFAP from 2005 to 2009 to enable completion of activities by DF using remaining funds (approximately EUR 500,000) necessitated substantial time input also reinforcing the notion of challenges in DF absorption and management capacity. The issue of capacity within DF Headquarters to engage, coordinate and guide effective implementation of partner supported programmes is an issue picked up in earlier assessments and remains a concern today.

Evaluation Question 2

Are the interventions responding to the priorities and strategic objectives of the cooperating party, are they additional or complementary to those done by others, or are they completely detached and stand-alone – in other words, what is the particular Finnish value-added in terms of quality and quantity or presence or absence of benefits, and in terms of sustainability of the benefits and in terms of filling a gap in the development endeavour of the partner country?

Both ILUA and PFAP responded to identified priorities defined by the Department of Forestry of the Ministry of Environment as defined in Forestry policies, and respond to requests originating from the DF to the Embassy of Finland. PFAP intended to strengthen capacity in FD and pilot participatory forestry management, a management strategy identified by the DF to improve its management of forest resources for the benefit of adjacent communities and the country as a whole. ILUA responds to the identified need to improve DF capacity to acquire ecological and socio-economic information on the status and use of forest resources in the country, and more recently to use the methodology to address monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) under REDD.

The MFA, through its Lusaka Embassy, has been actively engaged in the environment/NRM sector coordination group, having become the lead Cooperating Partner since 2006. Its main function is to facilitate the coordination of Country Partner's support to the environment and natural resources (ENR) sector. It is reported by other partners that this leadership from the Embassy of Finland is well received and positively commented on, although it is stated that since MFA Helsinki retains main decision-making on programmes and projects, partners have learned to accept that ex-

tended timelines on key decisions are required from the Embassy of Finland as it has to seek decisions from Helsinki.

Both PFAP and ILUA have been complemented by effective coordination provided by the Embassy of Finland so as to minimise overlap with other partner initiatives and to maximise on synergies. This is evident in the context of ILUA I and II in terms of maximising integration within DF operations and ensuring complementarity and coordination with UNREDD initiatives.

Finnish added value is historically significant in training (e.g. well received support to the national forestry training college), forest plantations and forestry industries. The input in participatory forest management was increasingly important during the 1990s and early 2000s within the context of PFAP but is not necessarily perceived to be one of specific Finnish specialisation, other than potentially in the area of extension services. It appears that the specialisation of monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) within the context of REDD is potential strengthening in MTENR and draws on technical Finnish expertise in forestry surveys and data analysis. It is also noted that the ILUA benefits from additional MFA support channelled through FAO which also draws on Finnish expertise.

Evaluation Question 3

How have the three dimensions of sustainability been addressed in the intervention documents, and were the aim modalities and instruments conducive to optimal materialisation of the objectives of the aid intervention?

The elements of economic, social and environmental sustainability were addressed in the PFAP and ILUA project documents. However, it is questionable whether sufficient emphasis was placed on undertaking an economic appraisal of PFAP since the economic viability of JFM was not explored during design and implementation, and was questioned by the end of project report. The economic viability of JFM still has to be demonstrated in Zambia.

The continued high expectation by community members for rolling out JFM potentially indicates that perceived benefits will ensure social sustainability, but once again in the absence of actual implementation of JFM this remains an assumption. However, it cannot be ignored that additional donor support will be required to support DF and its partners to support implementation of JFM in the short-term. Drawing from past PFAP experience, this external support would have to be conditional to the Government of Zambia applying benefit sharing regulations that enable local communities to collect and receive revenue from permits and fees in accordance with agreed regimes defined by FD and joint forest management plans.

Zambia offers an interesting comparison in aid modalities since three approaches are applied. The direct bilateral support for PFAP, and country-based support to FAO and DF for ILUA, and the MFA Helsinki link to IUCN Headquarters. Gaining an understanding of the rationale and decision-making for the choice of each instrument

is not possible based on available country assessment information. In the case of PFAP, the Government of Zambia requested support from MFA to support PFM in designated Provinces while for ILUA the GRZ and FAO elaborated the project document and sought funding from MFA via the Embassy of Finland in Lusaka.

The ILUA intervention is implemented by the DF with technical support from FAO (Forest Resource Management Service). There is a Letter of Agreement between FAO and GRZ, and an Agreement between FAO Zambia and Embassy of Finland. There is no indication of rationale for this arrangement other than an indication that GRZ and FAO elaborated the intervention and sought funding from the Embassy.

Evaluation Question 4

What are the major discernible changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended, direct or indirect) and are these changes likely to be sustainable, and to what extent these sustainable changes may be attributed to the Finnish aid interventions or to interventions in which Finnish aid have been a significant contributing factor? (Individual intervention impact plus interventions supported by others, Aggregate programme level?)

PFAP I and II, as reported in earlier evaluations (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2002), the project completion report (PFAP 2005) and lessons learned (Kokwe 2007a) from joint forest management, raised awareness on and capacity for joint forest management, supported the preparation of 7 JFM plans which were endorsed by DF and prepared guidelines for joint forest management. However, JFM plans have not been fully implemented since the regulatory framework governing benefit sharing between DF and communities has not been put into place to date. The Forest Act (GoZ 1999), which contained JFM and benefit sharing policies, has not come into effect as a commencement order has not been issued by MTENR. A Statutory Instrument (SI) No. 47 of April 2006 was issued to support JFM implementation but it did not address the key issue of modalities for benefit sharing as reflected in JFM arrangement. Consequently there have not been significant positive changes to livelihoods and forest management since the JFM plans have not been implemented as intended.

The current situation remains one of high expectation by communities and DF on eventually implementing the seven JFM plans and rolling out the PFM approach in other areas. The high expectations could be considered as a negative change at this point in time but could easily be reversed once GRZ puts in place a regulatory framework for benefit sharing that enables communities to acquire revenue from sustainable forest management.

ILUA II promotes sustainability of continued field inventories and data analysis through retention of staff and activities through revenue generated from REDD inflows.

Evaluation Question 5

Have the financial and human resources, as well as the modalities of management and administration of aid been enabling or hindering the achievement of the set objectives in the form of outputs, outcomes, results or effects?

MFA support is channelled through three funding modalities in Zambia and thus offers an interesting case study on merits of each approach. PFAP was supported through direct bilateral support to the Forest Department of the Ministry and technical assistance provided by a consultancy company. ILUA I and II is subject to a tripartite agreement between the Embassy, FAO Zambia office and the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources. It also receives technical and management support from the FAO Natural Forest Management Department in Rome which is itself supported by a MFA intervention (81500801 – FAO/Sustainable forest use in a changing climate). Lastly, MFA is supporting IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (EASARO) via its Headquarters (Gland) in the implementation of a regional programme entitled “Climate Change and Development – Recognising the role of forests and water in climate change adaptation”.

PFAP I and II were not hindered by the bilateral implementation arrangement with the Embassy of Finland. It also allowed the Embassy of Finland to halt funding during PFAP I when GoZ counterpart funds were not forthcoming but somehow this was not applied to pressure GoZ to commission the Forest Act. Post 2005, the Embassy of Finland sanctioned the extension of PFAP II up to 2009 to allow the DF to complete outstanding outputs (updating JFM guidelines and documenting lessons learned) using remaining funds (approximately EUR 500,000 from PFAP II). The modality required substantial time and energy by the Embassy of Finland, in particular past Counsellor(s) and the Forest Advisor, to coordinate and support the delivery of the project but it did on the other hand allow the Embassy to be directly engaged in the sector.

ILUA (I and II) is led by DF with support from FAO Zambia and Rome. It appears that the Embassy of Finland engagement has been through participation in Steering Committee meetings, and liaison between FAO Rome and MFA Helsinki. The reporting and feedback from ILUA appears to have been satisfactory to the Embassy, and likely to be influenced by the fact that ILUA is considered a successful intervention. Start-up discussions on ILUA II (2010) with DF and Embassy of Finland reveal that the project will be subject to closer coordination with the Embassy of Finland as its anticipated role in MRV/REDD will also require coordination within the umbrella ENRM programme funded by Danida and Embassy of Finland as well as other partners involved with UN-REDD (e.g. UNDP).

Evaluation Question 6

What are the discernible factors, such as exit strategies, local budgetary appropriations, capacity development of local counterpart organisations or personnel, which can be considered necessary for the sustainability of results and continuance of benefits after the closure of a development intervention?

Participatory forest management in Zambia largely remains an elusive quest in Zambia. Many of the key building blocks for enabling joint forest management were put in place under PFAP I and II. DF staff at national, provincial and district levels were trained, preliminary assessment undertaken, communities trained and empowered

and joint forest management plans elaborated and implemented. However, the inability of MTENR to issue a commencement order to put into effect the Parliament endorsed Forest Act (GoZ 1999) and formulate a Statutory Instrument NO 47 of 2006 to define benefit sharing arrangements between MTENR and communities has prevented the piloting and roll out of JFM. The lack of effective commitment and action by GRZ in this case has undermined the sustainability of the JFM.

Evaluation Question 7

What has been the role of considering the cross-cutting issues of Finnish development policy in terms of contributing to the sustainability of development results and poverty reduction; has there been any particular value-added in the promotion of environmentally sustainable development?

Cross-cutting issues of governance, equity and gender, and HIV/AIDS have been insufficiently captured in intervention design and implementation. Whilst all project documents make reference to the need to address cross-cutting issues and that MFA undertook a gender assessment in Zambia, these issues are not effectively addressed in intervention logical frameworks in terms of indicators and targets. In particular the “What” and “How” are insufficiently defined to give guidance during implementation.

For instance, whilst the number of women members of village management committees are defined and reported on, additional insight on the role and benefits to women are not sufficiently explored in project reports. ILUA has collected information on gender and other household socio-economic variables but it is not apparent how this information will be used in the future. Consequently, it cannot be assessed whether any changes in terms of equity, gender, HIV/AIDS has occurred as a result of these interventions.

PFAP and ILUA II project documents do not mention HIV/AIDS as a risk to the success of the project. However ILUA II Output 2 has an activity component titled “Analysis on expanded data needs pertaining to socio-economic aspects such as gender and HIV/AIDS”.

Lastly, development partners commented that they were not aware that Finnish Development Assistance Policy puts particular emphasis on these cross-cutting issues as part of their environment and forestry interventions.

ILUA is benefiting from FAO National Forest Monitoring and Assessment (NFMA) facility support, with particular emphasis on governance, communication and stakeholder participation. Phase II is also benefiting from links with the UN REDD Zambia programme. ILUA II is a vehicle where MFA is indirectly supporting UN REDD in Zambia, in particular in the context of MRV (Monitoring, Reporting and Verification).

Evaluation Question 8

Are there any concrete identifiable examples of interventions, which maybe classified to be environmentally, economically and socially sustainable, which have lead to poverty reduction or alleviation of consequences of poverty?

None of the MFA projects in Zambia can convincingly be described as having led to poverty reduction or alleviation of consequences of poverty at this point in time. The potential remains should benefit sharing mechanisms be put in place and it is rolled out in pilot provinces and nationally.

Since PFAP was not able to fully implement JFM pilots, its impact on local economic development and livelihoods has been minimal, and therefore it can only be concluded that at this stage that JFM is neither economically nor socially sustainable. The 2005 project completion report states that PFAP project support to pilot JFM cost approximately EUR 13,900 per community or EUR 285 per household, compared to annual per capita income not exceeding EUR 300 per year. A subsequent study commissioned by Savcor Indufor in 2005 (Puustjärvi, Mickels-Kokwe & Chakanga 2005) whilst quantifying the contribution of the forest sector to the national economy and poverty reduction also raises the concern that the size of forest areas under individual JFM plans severely limit the economic and ecological applicability of JFM. Nonetheless, once the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) and appropriate benefit sharing mechanisms are put into effect then effective JFM piloting can be undertaken to ascertain the economic and ecological viability of JFM in Zambia.

In terms of environmental sustainability, PFAP can be considered to have had a neutral impact on forest resources in the pilot provinces. The absence of the legal framework prevented the implementation of JFM and thus any positive outcomes on forest resources to be realised and recorded. It can be assumed that any degradation of forest resources has thus continued at its normal pace, and hence the conclusion that PFAP impact has been neutral on the status of forest resources. Discussions with representatives of village committees reaffirm that whilst they have attempted to reduce unplanned exploitation or degradation, they report that village chiefs have allowed in some circumstances encroachment and exploitation.

Evaluation Question 9

Have interventions which support economic development or private sector, been able to contribute towards sustainable economic results, let alone, raising people from poverty?

Since PFAP was not able to fully implement JFM pilots, its impact on local economic development and livelihoods has been minimal. Some limited income from bee products, mainly honey, and community generated timber is reported but no specific estimates are reported or available. The field visit to Katanino forest revealed that the three Village committees did not report livelihood benefits.

The MTR of the IUCN led programme stated that since implementation of climate change adaptation activities commenced in mid-2009, it was too early to conclude whether the pilot activities had generated economic benefits (Swennenhuis 2010).

The JFM model aims to enable communities to access and use forest products (e.g. timber, poles, NTFPs). PFAP supported the distribution of beehives and small-scale log sawing equipment in response to interests from communities. However, these pilots appear not to have been successful (i.e. beehives have not been colonised). PFAP I and II could have benefited from more extensive assessments to investigate the economic drivers of deforestation and identify local small-medium enterprise (SME) opportunities to assist local communities in obtaining best value from forest products. Interestingly, as part of looking forward and assuming that the legal framework supports a fair licensing system where fees are equitably distributed between communities and the GRZ, there is scope for the Embassy of Finland and its Cooperation Partners to support SME/private sector engagement at decentralised levels to support village committees in forest product based enterprises.

PFAP has played a central role in strengthening DF capacity at Provincial and District levels, in particular in the context of participatory forest management. Village Management Committee representatives engaged in the Katanino Forest (Ndola Province) demonstrate knowledge, awareness and commitment to sound forest management and ability to effectively manage their internal group affairs owing to the training and support received under PFAP. DF Provincial Office in Ndola reported applying participatory assessment and planning methods as part of their work under other partner initiatives (e.g. USAID COMPACT). It is evident that community and DF staff expectations on implementing joint forest management remain high and a level of frustration exists with both parties. The impasse of resolving the legal requirements for implementing the joint forest management plans resulting from passing required laws contained in the 1999 Forest Act is preventing communities from engaging in sustainable forest management as facilitated by PFAP (Kokwe 2007b).

Generally, the monitoring and reporting systems of MFA projects in Zambia would benefit from more rigorous reporting against indicators and targets that clearly define the economic outcomes from interventions.

Evaluation Question 10

How is the society touched upon by the development interventions taken into account in the strategic and project/programme plans, and what have been the major modalities for the society to influence and affect the development interventions and the decision-making on them?

Generally speaking the design of PFAP and ILUA appear to have been “top down” rather than engaging and responding to direct priorities and needs of key society stakeholders. However, in the context of PFAP it is appreciated that the participatory forest management approach adopted by the project responded to interests of Government and its constituents to engage with communities adjacent to forest resources

for the benefit of these communities. The MTR and subsequent refocusing of the intervention is partially in response to the need to better channel inputs to ensure success. It is also noted that with MFA Development Policy of 2007 (Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007), the Embassy of Finland has shifted from actively setting priorities on resource allocation to responding to country ownership and setting priorities. It is also noted that civil society institutions welcomed the PFM and joint forest management guidelines and piloting undertaken by PFAP and continues to have high expectations of forthcoming wider application once appropriate regulatory frameworks are put in place. The anticipated participatory process under REDD should ensure increased engagement of civil society in the formulation of the forthcoming REDD plan.

4 CONCLUSIONS

All MFA funded interventions address key objectives and priorities of Government as defined in Vision 2030, the PRSP (2002-2004) and the 5th National Development Plan (2006–2010). The 5th NDP makes reference to sustainable environmental and natural resource management within the context of achieving development objectives.

Both the PFAP and ILUA respond to the needs and priorities of the Department of Forestry, namely strengthening capacity in facilitating participatory forest management and forest/land use surveys towards achieving sustainable forest management. Whilst DF staff have applied PFM skills for other donor supported activities (e.g. USAID), the staff have not benefited from exposure to PFM implementation since the Forest Act (GoZ 1999) has not come into effect and the Statutory Instrument No. 47 (2006) does not issue benefit sharing mechanisms between GRZ and communities as intended under JFM Plans.

The PFAP evolved from a broad based decentralised institutional capacity programme to one centred on piloting participatory forest management and resulted in the preparation and endorsement of collaborative forest management plans to be implemented by organised and trained village management committees in collaboration with the Department of Forestry. However, the legal framework has not yet been commissioned by the Department and therefore collaborative forest management has not been implemented.

Consequently there are no discernable impacts of PFAP outcomes at economic levels other than some very limited benefits to village committees from sale of honey and timber resulting from inputs provided by PFAP (and not from implementing CFM). At a community level the outcome is mixed; at one level expectations remain high that CFM will be eventually implemented and benefits will reach communities while at an-

other level it is apparent that the village committees have been empowered in organisational management and basic management.

Once the Forest Act (2005) is commissioned and a legal framework for PFM put in place, there will be pressure from village management committees and the Department of Forestry to implement endorsed collaborative forest management plans and roll out CFM in Zambia. The Director of the DF stated that the Forest Act (2005) could be commissioned as soon as September 2010 due to pressures from partners and preconditions under REDD+ readiness planning. Should this be the case, then the MFA as lead donor for the last ten years on PFM will be under pressure to provide technical support to the DF. However, it appears that there is no provision in place should such a request from the DF arise. Although the Embassy stated that in such an eventuality an option would be to support SME/private sector engagement and local administrations at decentralised levels to support village committees in forest product based enterprises.

Finland has been the lead donor in the environment and natural resource management sector since 2006, a role that is positively acknowledged by other key donors and partners although it was stated that MFA decision-making remains centralised (i.e. Helsinki based) compared to other in-country missions.

The ILUA I programme has successfully produced a forest cover and land use map for Zambia drawn from an extensive database that also includes socio-economic information from household surveys. The intervention has benefited from FAO technical support at country, regional and headquarters levels. This has provided the DF with a valuable planning tool. Wider distribution and sensitisation on the planning tool with key stakeholders in Zambia remains to be done so as to maximise the number of users.

ILUA II has been elaborated with a main focus of providing core monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) requirements for REDD+. There is need for coordination by all partners in particular between DF, MTENR, FAO and MFA to make this ambitious programme a success. Similarly, FAO will need to actively liaise with UNDP and UNEP under UN-REDD to ensure effectively synergies with DF and MFA.

REFERENCES

- FAO 2005 *Global Forest Resources Assessment, Country Reports: Zambia*. FAO, Rome.
- Government of the Republic of Zambia 1999 *Forest Act 1999*, Government of Zambia, Lusaka.
- Government of the Republic of Zambia 2006 *Fifth National Development Plan 2006–2010*. Government of Zambia, Lusaka.
- Government of the Republic of Zambia 2008 *Zambia Millennium Development Goals, Progress Report 2008*. Republic of Zambia, Lusaka.
- ILUA 2005 *Integrated Land Use Assessment – Zambia (2010): Background and Status*. Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources and FAO, Lusaka.
- Jere P 2005 *Finding a legal way forward for Joint Forest Management in Zambia*. PFAP Programme Coordination Unit, P.O. Box 32022, Woodlands, Lusaka.
- Kokwe M 2007a *Lesson Learnt from Joint Forest Management in Zambia*. Provincial Forestry Action Plan II, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.
- Kokwe M 2007b *Proposed Guidelines for Joint Forest Management in Zambia*. Provincial Forestry Action Plan II, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.
- Ruotsi J, Lindberg O, Segerström J, Mboji D & Laxen J 2001 *Evaluation of the bilateral development cooperation between Finland and Zambia*. Evaluation report 2001:9. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Edita Prima Oy, Helsinki, 172p. ISBN 951-724-365-0.
- Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Development Policy Programme 2007, Towards a Sustainable and Just Humanity Policy*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 38 p.
- Provincial Forestry Action Plan II – PFAP II 2005 *Programme Completion Report 2000-2005*. PFAPII Project Coordination Unit, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.
- Puustjärvi E, Mickels-Kokwe G & Chakanga M 2005 *The Contribution of the Forest Sector to the National Economy and Poverty Reduction in Zambia*. Forestry Department of Zambia, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, SAVCOR, Lusaka.

Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Preliminary Evaluation Study Forestry Sector*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki [Published as Ruotsalainen A 2010 *Forestry Sector: Preliminary Study*. Evaluation report 2010:5/III. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Kopijyvä Oy, Jyväskylä, 145 p. ISBN 978-951-724-880-8 (printed)].

Swennenhuis J 2010 *Mid-Term Review Climate Change and Development Project: Zambia, Mozambique and Tanzania*. Funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland and implemented by IUCN. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Helsinki.

Zambia Forestry Department, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources & the FAO 2008 *Integrated Land Use Assessment (ILUA): Zambia 2005 to 2008*. Zambia Forestry Department, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, FAO, Lusaka.

ANNEX 1 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Embassy of Finland in Zambia

HE Ambassador Sinikka Antila

Ms. Marja Ojanen, Counsellor

Ms. Elizabeth Ndhlovu, Sector Adviser

Ms. Anu Ala-Rantala, Programme Officer for Local Cooperation Funds

Embassy of Denmark in Zambia

Litumelo Mate, Programme Officer

Ministry of Finance and National Planning

Mrs Agness Musunga, Director Monitoring and Evaluation Department

Mr. Bernhard Mumba, Senior Planner, Planning and Information Department

Mr. Lawrence Mulama, Chief Accountant, Accounts Unit

Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources

Mrs. Anna Masinja, Director of Forests, Forest Department

Mr. John Mulobwa, Principal Extension Officer, Forestry Department

Mr. Misael Kokwe, Mainstreaming Advisor, ENRM Coordinator

Mr. Bernard Mumba, Senior Planning Officer, Planning and Information Department

Mr. Davies Kashole, FMRP Coordinator, Forestry Department

Mr. Mindenda Pinde, Senior Extension Officer, Forestry Department

Mr. Jackson Mukosha, Provincial Forestry Officer, Luapala Province (ILUA I Project Coordinator)

Mr. Abel M. Siampale, Senior GIS Technical Officer, Forestry Department

CIFOR Zambia

Dr. Davison Gumbo, Regional Director

FAO

Mr. Mikko Leppänen, Programme Coordinator, Sustainable Forest Management in a Changing Climate: FAO – Finland Forestry Programme, Rome.

Ms. Rebecca Tavani, Forestry Officer, National Forest Monitoring and Assessment Programme, Rome

Mr. Christian Chomba, FAO Lusaka

IUCN Zambia

Mr. Excellent Hachileka, Regional Coordinator for Climate Change

Ms. Senja Vaatainen, Programme Assistant

UNDP Zambia

Ms. Winnie Musonda, UNDP Assistant Resident Representative – Environment and Energy Programme

NIRAS

Mr. T.S. Muyoya, Director, Niras Zambia

Copperbelt Province (Ndola)

Provincial, District and Local community members involved in PFAP II and members of pilot collaborative forest management committee

Mr. Chupa, Acting Principal Forestry Extension Officer

Mrs. Rhoda Chasaya, District Forestry Officer

Mr. Shadreck Sichone, District Forestry Officer

Mr. Chisenga, Deputy District Forestry Officer

Katanino Community Forest – Members of the Village Management Committees

ANNEX 2 DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Kokwe M 2007a *Community-based Monitoring of Joint Forest Management in Zambia: The Event Book System*. Provincial Forestry Action Plan II, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.

Kokwe M 2007b *Enterprise-Based Model for Joint Forest Management in Zambia*. Provincial Forestry Action Plan II, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.

LTS International 2003 *Evaluation of the Finnish Forest Sector Development Co-operation*. Evaluation report 2003:2 part 1 & 2. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Haka-paino Oy, Helsinki, 122 p. (part 1), 180 p. (part 2). ISBN 951-724-407-X (part 1); ISBN 951-724-416-9 (part 2).

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2007 *Evaluation Guidelines of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Hakapaino Oy, Helsinki, 84 p. ISBN 978-951-724-624-8.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) & FAO 2008 *Agreement between the Government of Finland and the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations. Strengthening Forest Resources Management and Enhancing its Contribution to Sustainable Development, Landuse and Livelihoods – National Forestry Resources Monitoring and Assessment in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Environment*. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 26 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2009 *Development Policy Guidelines for Forest Sector*, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, Erweko Painotuote Oy, Helsinki, 18 p.

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland 2010 *Partner Countries and Regions*. <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?nodeid=15378&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

MFA, GRZ, GoM, GoT & IUCN 2010 *Climate Change and Development Project, Recognising the role of forest and water resources in climate change adaptation*, Project Summary (post MTR). MFA, GRZ, GoM, GoT and IUCN, Nairobi.

Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources & INDUFOR 2010 *Completion Report on Provincial Forestry Action Programme II Non-Cost Extension I and II. Implementation Period September 2006 to November 2008*. Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources and INDUFOR, Lusaka.

Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources 2008 *Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme*. Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.

Provincial Forestry Action Plan – PFAP II 2005 *Lesson Learnt from Joint Forest Management in Zambia – The experiences of PFAP II*. PFAP II Project Coordination Unit, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Lusaka.

- REPORT 2008:2 Local Cooperation Funds – Role in Institution Building of Civil Society Organizations
ISBN: 978-951-724-701-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-702-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2008:1 Finnish Partnership Agreement Scheme
ISBN: 978-951-724-672-9 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-673-6 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION 2008:1 (SWE) FAO: Utmaning till förnyelse. Sammanfattning
ISBN: 978-951-724-670-5 (print), ISBN: 978-951-724-671-2 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION 2008:1 (FI) FAO: Haasteena uudistuminen. Lyhennelmä
ISBN: 978-951-724-655-2 (painettu), ISBN: 978-951-724-659-0 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- SPECIAL EDITION 2008:1 (ENG) FAO: The Challenge of Renewal. Summary
ISBN: 978-951-724-657-6 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-661-3 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:3 Implementation of the Paris Declaration – Finland
ISBN: 978-951-724-663-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-664-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:2 Meta-Analysis of Development Evaluations in 2006
ISBN: 978-951-724-632-3 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-633-1 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2007:1 Finnish Aid to Afghanistan
ISBN: 978-951-724-634-7 (printed), ISBN: 978-951-724-635-4 (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2006:3 Review of Finnish Microfinance Cooperation
ISBN: 951-724-569-6 (printed), ISBN: 951-724-570-X (pdf), ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2006:2 Evaluation of CIMO North-South Higher Education Network Programme
ISBN: 951-724-549-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2006:1 Evaluation of Environmental Management in Finland´s Development Cooperation
ISBN: 951-724-546-7, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:6 Evaluation of Support Allocated to International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGO)
ISBN: 951-724-531-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:5 Evaluation of the Service Centre for Development Cooperation in Finland (KEPA)
ISBN: 951-724-523-8, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:4 Gender Baseline Study for Finnish Development Cooperation
ISBN: 951-724-521-1, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:3 Evaluation of Finnish Health Sector Development Cooperation 1994–2003
ISBN: 951-724-493-2, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:2 Evaluation of Finnish Humanitarian Assistance 1996–2004
ISBN: 951-724-491-6, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2005:1 Ex-Ante Evaluation of Finnish Development Cooperation in the Mekong Region
ISBN: 955-742-478-9, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:4 Refocusing Finland's Cooperation with Namibia
ISBN: 955-724-477-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:3 Evaluation of the Development Cooperation Activities of Finnish NGOs and Local Cooperation Funds in Tanzania
ISBN: 951-724-449-5, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:2 Evaluation of Finland's Development Cooperation with Bosnia and Herzegovina
ISBN: 951-724-446-0, ISSN: 1235-7618
- REPORT 2004:1 Evaluation of Finnish Education Sector Development Cooperation
ISBN: 951-724-440-1, ISSN: 1235-7618

Development evaluation

PL 512
00023 GOVERNMENT

Telefax: (+358 9) 1605 5651

Operator: (+358 9) 16005

<http://formin.finland.fi>

Email: eva-11@formin.fi



MINISTRY FOR FOREIGN
AFFAIRS OF FINLAND