



FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION

The Opportunities and Challenges

For Eastern Africa

A Synthesis Report of a Regional Workshop

Mombasa, Kenya

**Compiled by IUCN-EARO and WWF-EARPO
2002**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Executive Summary</u>	3
<u>Opportunities for Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) In Ethiopia</u>	4
<u>Background</u>	4
<u>Issues concerning Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	4
<u>How can these issues be addressed?</u>	4
<u>Required actions over the coming six months to two years</u>	4
<u>Concluding Statements</u>	4
<u>Kenya’s Position on Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	5
<u>Background to Forest Landscape Restoration in Kenya</u>	5
<u>What Contribution Can Forest Landscape Restoration Make?</u>	5
<u>How Can These Issues Be Addressed?</u>	6
<u>Concluding Statement</u>	6
<u>The Opportunities for Forest Landscape Restoration in Tanzania</u>	7
<u>Background</u>	7
<u>Forest Landscape Restoration in Tanzania</u>	7
<u>How can these issues be addressed</u>	7
<u>Issues and Actions</u>	8
<u>Conclusion</u>	8
<u>Uganda's position on the implementation of Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	9
<u>Background to Forest Landscape Restoration in Uganda</u>	9
<u>What Contribution Can Forest Landscape Restoration Make To Uganda?</u>	9
<u>How Can These Issues Be Addressed?</u>	9
<u>Concluding Statement</u>	9
<u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u>	10
1.1. <u>Introduction to Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	10
1.2. <u>Why the Need for Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	10
1.3. <u>Existing Progress on FLR in Eastern Africa</u>	12
1.4. <u>The Regional Workshop</u>	12
1.5. <u>Importance of Multi-Donor interest in Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	13
1.6. <u>Some Illustrative Next Steps after the Regional Workshop</u>	13
<u>Chapter 2: Lessons Learnt from Existing Practice</u>	14
2.1. <u>National and Regional Progress on Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	14
2.2. <u>Working Group Deliberations</u>	14
2.3. <u>Plenary Discussion</u>	16
<u>Chapter 3. Development of an Agenda for Action</u>	17
3.1. <u>Developing Consensus on Forest Landscape Restoration</u>	17
3.2. <u>Outcome of 4th Day meeting with Decision Makers</u>	17
3.3. <u>General Forest Landscape Restoration Workshop Recommendations and Action Points</u>	18
<u>Annex 1: Draft Timetable for Regional Forest Landscape Restoration Workshop</u>	20
<u>Annex 2: Participants List</u>	21
<u>Annex 3: VIP Participants for day 4</u>	25
<u>Annex 4: Some Examples of FLR in the Region</u>	27
4.1. <u>Coastal Forests of Kenya - Examples of FLR Approach (H. Kabugi)</u>	27
4.2. <u>Peri-Urban Plantation And Private Woodlot Farms Development Project In Uganda (D.N. Byarugaba)</u>	28
4.3. <u>Forest Landscape “Restoration” Experience Of Tigray-Region – Ethiopia (Y. Nega)</u>	28
4.4. <u>Restoration of Acacia Gum Gardens – Tendelti, Sudan (S. Maginnis)</u>	29
4.5. <u>Restoring Acacia tortilis Woodland in Turkana, Kenya (E.Barrow)</u>	29
4.6. <u>Ngitiri as a means to restore degraded lands in Shinyanga, Tanzania (E.Barrow)</u>	29
4.7. <u>Restoring Mangrove Forests in Tanga, Tanzania (E.Barrow)</u>	30
<u>Annex 5. Points from Plenary Discussions on National and Regional Presentations</u>	31

Executive Summary

The Eastern African region is losing an average of about 460,000 Ha of forest per year. This problem is further compounded by a declining condition of much of the remaining forest within the region. The consequences of forest loss and declining forest quality are severe. Loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services (watersheds, catchments, soil quality etc.) has direct and serious consequences for millions of people in the region. Perhaps one of the most serious consequences of deforestation and loss in forest quality is the loss of options for rural people to maintain their livelihoods now and into the future. Their livelihood options are curtailed as forest can no longer be as important as a fall back mechanism in times of need. This constitutes a huge opportunity cost not only to national governments, but also, and probably more importantly to rural people who cannot afford those opportunity costs. There is an urgent need to halt and reverse the current trend in forest loss. Forest Landscape Restoration provides a promising approach to do this.

A regional workshop was facilitated and organised by IUCN and WWF to address these issues in the context of Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR). The workshop was held in Mombassa in November 2001. The participants who came from Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Cote d'Ivoire, Switzerland and the UK, started by discussing the main objectives of the workshop. This was followed by presentations from Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Kenya, followed by the presentation of a regional report. The presentations were based on findings of national FLR studies conducted earlier in the year. The principles of FLR were discussed and studied in the context of forest regeneration initiatives and policy initiatives of these 4 countries. The discussions were intensive and gathered views from experts from all the countries mentioned above, as the participants shared their experiences of landscape restoration. On the fourth day decision-makers were also invited to join the participants as they developed ideas and recommendations for action at the national level.

It was agreed that Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) is an approach that can assist Governments, rural communities and people to restore the important goods and services which forests contribute. FLR can be implemented in a range of sites from formerly forested areas, to degraded woodlands, and on farm and pastoral landscapes. However it was agreed that corrective steps need to be taken immediately, and in particular to remove perverse incentives that promote the loss and degradation of forests in the region. This entails more effective and efficient use of existing resources, as well as optimising on the use of international funding instruments, such as those for carbon sequestration. Furthermore it is important that FLR be seen as an important tool in livelihood security, and so could make an important contribution to reducing poverty in the region.

However the FLR approach will require further analysis. Policy and legislation needs to be analyzed with respect to the opportunities and constraints that different sectoral policies and laws provide. From the presentations and discussions, there are many opportunities, which have hitherto not been properly explored in the context of FLR and the role of trees in general. There is need for more careful analysis of the opportunities and problems which FLR might face in the region. In particular it will be important to address the forest economic and valuation issues so that Governments value their forests more responsibly in future, as well as agreeing that local communities need secure rights and responsibilities for their land. In addition it will be important to ensure that the institutional arrangements for FLR are agreed to, so as to avoid confusion in future, as it is likely that there will be a number of institutions involved.

During this regional workshop, each country made their own country overviews, which form part of this synthesis, and will be used by the four countries to take the concept of Forest Landscape Restoration forward at the national levels. It was also agreed that national level FLR workshops should be held to raise awareness about the issues, and develop more definite follow up actions.

Opportunities for Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) In Ethiopia

Background

Historically, forest resources had occupied a significant portion (about 40%) of the Ethiopian landmass. However, due to the various human induced factors, the forest cover has dwindled over the last few hundred years. In 1975, 4.8% of the landmass was under forest, and this had reduced to 3.9% by 1990. Ethiopia loses an average of 163, 000 hectares of natural forest per year. The implications of these losses include; loss of plant and animal species, shortages of fuelwood, timber and other non-timber forest products and loss of ecosystem functions through soil erosion and fertility, deterioration of water quality, drought, flooding and reduction in agricultural productivity. The result is an ever-increasing level of poverty.

Issues concerning Forest Landscape Restoration

The main causes of forest destruction are, agricultural expansion, settlement, forest fire, over grazing and uncontrolled tree harvesting and utilisation. The forest sector situations are further exacerbated by various issues. These include; population growth, poverty, lack of sectoral integration or co-ordination, lack of forest/landuse policies or their poor implementation, inadequate institutional arrangement and capacity, weak law enforcement and lack of adequate support from government and donors for the natural resource sector.

Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) is an approach that would address some of the above issues. It is a process, which uses various tools for recovering forest functions in a holistic manner. It can be promoted in all land uses by all stakeholders including, formerly forested areas, farmlands, pastoral areas and degraded lands.

How can these issues be addressed?

The following approaches can possibly be applied to address issues mentioned above:

- Increased political commitment to the forest sector
- Increased level of awareness of all key stakeholders on sustainable management of natural resources
- Issuance and harmonisation of sectoral and cross-sectoral policies
- Institutional reform and stability
- Capacity building/strengthening
- Increased involvement of all actors in FLR and related initiatives
- Utilising existing resources on a sustainable basis
- Analysis and promotion of valuation of forest functions to society
- Establishing FLR networks at national and regional levels

Required actions over the coming six months to two years.

1. In next twelve months
 - Conduct regional case studies for the national workshop on FLR.
 - Organise and run national workshop on FLR to come up with national and regional priorities and strategies.
2. In next two years
 - Refine and proclaim draft national and regional policies on land-use, forests, wildlife and related sectors.
 - Establish a strong and effective national and regional institutional set-up for the forestry sector.
 - Create awareness on FLR at all levels through national and regional workshops.
 - Initiate FLR on available resources and seek additional support on need basis.
 - Plan and implement FLR on a pilot basis and learn lessons.
 - Mobilise resources for planning and implementation.
 - Link up national FLR initiatives with neighbouring countries such as Kenya and Sudan.

Concluding Statements

FLR is a technical opportunity to take into account all forest functions, poverty reduction and food security. The principles and practices of FLR provide an opportunity to call upon all institutions at all levels to help integrate landscape conservation and development approaches and to contribute directly to poverty reduction and food security. A major challenge for the government, donors and all other stakeholders is to enhance the realisation and practices of FLR at country and regional levels.

Kenya's Position on Forest Landscape Restoration

Background to Forest Landscape Restoration in Kenya

Eastern Africa is facing a forest crisis that negatively impacts upon people's livelihoods and severely limits governments' options to reduce poverty. In Kenya, it is estimated that we are losing about 5,000 hectares per year from gazetted forests. Currently, there is a proposal to excise another 70,000 hectares (170,000 acres) of gazetted forests mostly for agriculture and settlement. Furthermore, this only accounts for loss from gazetted forests¹. The remaining forests, which account for about 2% of the total land area, are becoming increasingly degraded through legal and illegal activities. These activities include encroachment, unsustainable harvesting, charcoal burning, selective logging, uncontrolled shamba systems², fires, marijuana growing, unsustainable agriculture, overgrazing, quarrying and soil harvesting. All these activities not only degrade individual sites but also have an inevitable impact across entire landscapes, resulting in pollution of watercourses, siltation, widespread soil loss, decline in agricultural productivity and significant biodiversity loss.

Sustainably managed forests and woodlands provide a wide range of goods and services to society at large, and forest-adjacent communities in particular. For example, 90% of total domestic fuel energy consumption comes from fuelwood. Also, owing to the current high cost of health care about 75% of Kenyan citizens depend solely on herbal medicines. Forests also play a key role in maintaining water catchment functions including the supply of clean drinking water to rural and urban populations, hydroelectric power generation and agricultural irrigation schemes that contribute to the nation's food security. More extensive and less degraded forest cover in key water catchment areas could have helped buffer against the effects of the year 2000 drought that provoked major power blackouts throughout the country. In addition, forests make a significant contribution to the nation's environmental security and thus it's economic prosperity. Unfortunately official statistics never adequately reflect the true contribution that forest goods and services make to the nation as a whole, and the lives of the rural poor in particular.

What Contribution Can Forest Landscape Restoration Make?

Forest Landscape Restoration is unique in that it brings together a number of existing development, conservation and natural resource management principles and applies them to the restoration of both forest quality and quantity. In particular Forest Landscape Restoration emphasizes:

- The importance of activities that address both ecological integrity and human well-being, especially those that improve rural livelihoods.
- Goods and services that forests can deliver rather than just simply concentrating on increasing forest cover.
- Decision-making process by stakeholders and thus ensures that any ensuing activities increase the forest goods and services that stakeholders want.
- Recognition of the shortcomings of site-based approaches and thus scales-up action to a landscape level.
- Recognition that tradeoffs need to be made between various forest goods and services but seeks to ensure that no existing forest function is supplied at a sub-optimal level at the landscape scale.
- The need for a multi-sectoral approach because forest functions impact more than just the forest sector.

The workshop was concluded that it was worthwhile to take corrective steps now by addressing perverse incentives that promote loss and degradation such as:

- Government policies that promote the settlement of people on forest land.
- Failure to properly value the wide range of forest goods and services that deliver real benefits to people and their environment, and land so making it profitable to convert forest land to other land-uses such as agriculture.
- Overpricing of alternative fuel via high taxation which makes fuelwood a more attractive source of energy, and thus more loss and degradation of forests and woodlands.

There are also further opportunities to better utilise existing resources more efficiently including:

- Institutional restructuring in terms of strengthening extension programmes in relevant Ministries such as Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources (Forest and Water Departments).
- Building capacity, facilitating, collaborating and networking with local NGOs, CBOs, government departments and private sector.

¹ Gazetted Forests refers to those forests which have been reserved by Government as Forest Reserves or, in some cases National Parks

² The shamba system refers to the establishment of plantation forests using cultivation of crops (mainly maize) in between the rows of trees, and ensure that the tree seedlings are kept weeded for the first few years. This system is now referred to as non-resident cultivation (NRC)

- For Government's to lobby the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), more commonly called the Kyoto Protocol, to direct funds for carbon sequestration towards activities that support livelihood activities, rather than simply supporting the establishment of large-scale industrial plantations.
- Better address forest activities within national energy programmes including the promotion of multi-functional rural and peri-urban forests to meet rising energy demands.
- Promote and support the diversification of markets for forest products.
- Review land tenure and develop incentives to encourage landowners to retain and plant forests.
- Improve on technologies for natural resource management including those that add value.

Nevertheless, even though Forest Landscape Restoration can be advanced through removal of perverse incentives and more efficient use of existing resources, additional support will also be needed. The workshop suggests that multi-lateral institutions and private investment may be able to help here and points to the experience at Bamburi, East African Portland and Kakuzi as possible examples. However, Government will also need to increase budgetary allocations for the management of forest resources, particularly to provide incentives to people to increase diverse agroforestry practices and to expand and maintain both planted and naturally regenerated woodlots. In addition there is also the requirement for better governance and more transparent management of the Forest Estate.

How Can These Issues Be Addressed?

Although scattered, there are numerous provisions in the existing policy and legal framework that support Forest Landscape Restoration – however, these still need to be properly identified and subsequently utilised. In addition the newly enacted Environmental Management and Co-ordination Act 1999, provides for a holistic approach to the expansion and maintenance of forest resources. For example, Forest Landscape Restoration could facilitate adjacent district environment committees to plan and implement their activities using a landscape approach rather than their district boundaries. The group also identified the need to inform on-going policy review processes so that all the Forest Landscape Restoration principles can be captured in new laws and programmes.

Better use of the numerous existing studies on natural resource management and rural development needs to be made. These studies should be synthesised, simplified, packaged and disseminated to all relevant stakeholder groups, including decision-makers. Guidelines also need to be developed to help government departments, communities and the private sector interpret and implement existing policies with respect to Forest Landscape Restoration.

There is also a need to strengthen existing institutions and enhance their capacities for collaboration and better co-ordination. The private sector needs to be encouraged to invest in Forest Landscape Restoration activities. At a regional level the Government should utilise existing and new opportunities, such as, the East African Community Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, and the Inter Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD).

In the next 6 months, IUCN and WWF should:

- Facilitate the identification of representatives from key stakeholders - such as the Forestry Department, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Kenya Forestry Working Group, and others players.
- Convene a stakeholder meeting to develop a workplan and budget – including to review and identify gaps in Forest Landscape Restoration knowledge, appoint an interim secretariat and develop a proposal and identify possible funding mechanisms.
- The country and regional studies should be finalised and disseminated.
- Identify incentives and disincentives for the provision of goods at household, community and national levels.

Concluding Statement

The government has in place various initiatives to address poverty, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), National Poverty Eradication Paper (NPEP) and the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) that Forest Landscape Restoration can significantly contribute to in the following ways:

- Soil conservation, improved crop productivity, hence food security;
- Increase of tree cover in the landscape which will increase the supply of various goods and services, such as better health through improved water quality and stable electrical energy supply through water quantity; and
- Conservation of biodiversity – improved livelihoods, increased revenue from tourism and scientific knowledge that contributes to industrial growth.

Therefore Forest Landscape Restoration is an opportunity that Kenya needs to give special consideration.

The Opportunities for Forest Landscape Restoration in Tanzania

Background

It is estimated that Tanzania is losing between 130,000 and 500,000 ha per year out of a total forest cover estimated to be between 8,500 Km² and 16,185 Km² (which includes the Miombo woodlands of Tanzania). Most of this loss is occurring in general or unreserved lands, which constitutes most of the forestlands. As a result there has also been a loss of biodiversity and a loss of some forest functions, such as the goods and services that forests supply.

In the short term some people receive immediate benefits from forests in the form of charcoal making, timber extraction, shifting cultivation and grazing. However, in the long-run, the society is losing, for example the loss of non timber forest products, increased energy prices, insecure water sources, and hence becoming more vulnerable as a result, through impacts such as:

- Increased soil erosion and loss of soil fertility;
- Reduced water availability resulting in reduced power generating and access to clean water
- Siltation of rivers, and estuaries;
- Increased incidence of floods; and
- An increasingly critical fuel wood shortage.

These losses constitute a huge opportunity cost to Tanzania and its people.

Forest Landscape Restoration in Tanzania

Forest Landscape Restoration provides a holistic approach for recovering in forests, and seeks to ameliorate the loss of forest goods and services in impoverished and degraded landscapes. It can be applied to existing production systems such as formerly forested areas, farm and pastoral lands. Examples of this include soil conservation and afforestation programmes in Dodoma, Iringa, Shinyanga, Lushoto and Arusha regions. However, working against Forest Landscape Restoration are a number of perverse incentives and gaps that promote the loss and degradation of forests. These include:

- Unclear land security and lack of security of use rights;
- Inadequate livelihood options;
- Unaffordable prices of agricultural inputs and low technology;
- Inadequate market channels for key crops and tree products;
- Inadequate extension services;
- Environmental legislation which has gaps and loopholes;
- EIA guidelines, which can facilitate trade-offs, have not yet been approved by the Government. As such the forest sector specific EIA guidelines can not be developed; and
- The existence of pieces of legislation, which are not harmonized.

For Forest Landscape Restoration to succeed, it is important to take corrective steps to remove these perverse incentives, utilize existing incentives more effectively, and mobilize additional resources for Forest Landscape Restoration.

How can these issues be addressed

Tanzania has formulated an overall long-term Development Vision 2025, which seeks to realize patriotism, nationalism and to strengthen national cohesion. In line with this, Tanzania has also formulated the following tools to implement the revised forest policy (1998):

- The Forest Act (in finalization process); and
- A National forestry programme (NFP), which is a framework, endorsed by the Government in November 2001 for planning that provides strategic orientation for the forestry sector in harmony with other sectors of the national economy; and action which provides an environment for concerted and co-ordinated implementation and activities by all stakeholders based on mutually agreed objectives and strategies.

Based on the needs of the communities and other stakeholders, the NFP has four development sub-programmes or initiatives, which are:

- Forest resources conservation and management;
- Institutional and human resources development;
- Legal and regulatory programme; and
- Forestry based industries, products that contribute to sustainable livelihoods.

The key elements of Forest Landscape Restoration are already built into these NFP development initiatives. Other sector policies supporting Forest Landscape Restoration include wildlife, agriculture, livestock, bee keeping, mineral, tourism, water, lands, fisheries, science and technology, women's development and gender, and the environment.

In terms of the institutional arrangements, governance and implementation is focused on the district level. Currently the Government is undertaking the Local Government Reform Programme (LGRP) to strengthen capacity at the district level. However, there is a weak linkage between the central and local Governments.

Issues and Actions

The Tanzania group considered a range of issues that need to be addressed in the short and medium term, together with a set of actions needed. These are summarized in the table below

Issue	Action within 6 months – 2 years
1. Unclear land tenure – particularly with respect to forestry and forests outside reserved areas	Create awareness and publicize Land Act No. 4 and Village Land Act No. 5 of 1999. Translate into Kiswahili and disseminate to district and village levels <i>Action by: Lands, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MOAFS), and by the Presidents Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PO-RALG).</i>
2. Inadequate livelihood options – high dependence on forest resources	Initiate income generating activities e.g. bee keeping, eco-tourism, marketing of non-wood products, fish farming, gardening, consumptive use of wildlife resources <i>Action by: MNRT, Ministry of Community Development and Women's Affairs (MoCDWA), PO-RALG</i>
3. Inadequate market channels and strategies for key crops and tree products	Improve rural infrastructure; encourage investment in agro-processing industries; diversification of agricultural crops <i>Action by: Min. Industries, MOAFS, MoCDWA</i>
4. Inadequate extension services	Build capacity (retrain, recruit and provide facilities) at district and community levels <i>Action: MNRT, PO-RALG, Prime Ministers Office (PMO), NGO's, Private sector</i>
5. Affordable prices for agricultural inputs and use of low technology	Promote agroforestry, use organic fertilisers, establish rural credit facilities <i>Action by: MoAFS, MNRT, Min. Finance, CBO's, NGOs, Private Sector</i>
6. Slow process in finalisation of environment legislation and EIA guidelines	Speed up the process <i>Action by: Vice-President's Office – Environment Division (VPO-ED), Pressure groups</i>
7. Inadequate funding of implementation of Forest Landscape Restoration as part of NFP	Solicit funds from Gov., development partners, private, special funds <i>Action by: MNRT, NGOs</i>
8. Existence of un-harmonised pieces of legislation	Lobbying is required for other sectors, in particular in agriculture, tourism, mining and energy <i>Action by: VPO, PO-PP</i>

Conclusion

Forest Landscape Restoration is one of the opportunities we should bank on to integrate forest functions with poverty reduction

(Report compiled by Prof. G.C. Kajembe, Mr. B. Kaale, Mrs. A. E.J. Mayawalla, Mr. J. Mgoo, and Mrs. H. Ramadhani)

Uganda's position on the implementation of Forest Landscape Restoration

Background to Forest Landscape Restoration in Uganda

The Government of Uganda (GOU), NGOs, communities, individual households and the private sector have all been involved in forest restoration initiatives over the past decades with considerable success. Although this success has been registered, there is a need for further initiatives in Forest Landscape Restoration because there is still a negative net loss in forest cover countrywide. As a consequence, there are reduced opportunities for rural livelihood and economic growth, a continued drain on the national treasury, declining agricultural productivity and perpetual forest resources-use conflicts. Further, the remaining forest cover can no longer provide adequate forest functions and services to the growing population.

The net loss in forest cover is caused by weak governance, irrational agricultural expansion, perverse incentives and institutional weaknesses. In addition, Uganda's rural people have limited alternative sources of livelihood, and as a result, there is an over-dependence on forest based products to meet their basic needs, and in particular for household fuel. Based on these factors, there is an increasing realisation that a more co-ordinated process to increase forest cover and their functions is necessary. This can be achieved if GoU and all stakeholders (landowners) embrace Forest Landscape Restoration.

What Contribution Can Forest Landscape Restoration Make To Uganda?

Forest Landscape Restoration is a planned process that aims to regain ecological integrity and enhance human well being in degraded or deforested landscapes. This implies that Forest Landscape Restoration is a process-oriented approach that ensures active participation of all stakeholders at the landscape level (central government, local governments, NGOs/CBOs, communities, private sector and individual households) into a framework for forest restoration. It also takes into account the ecological, economic and socio-cultural considerations in reaching consensus, and making trade-offs at landscape level which lead to ensuring that the commitments and capacity to implement forest restoration are galvanised. To achieve Forest Landscape Restoration, the following issues must be addressed:

- removal or redirecting perverse incentives;
- formulation of land-use plans and influencing on-going policy reforms such as the Forestry Act, and the National Forestry Plan (NFP), so that they in turn provided the enabling environment for Forest Landscape Restoration implementation. This should include participatory decision-making and community based action.

On the other hand, the opportunities to propel Forest Landscape Restoration such as recent policy reforms (e.g., the Forestry Policy (2001), Land Act), Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), Sector Wide Approach to Poverty (SWAP), and Political will should be tapped. Finally, additional financial, human and logistical resources will be required because bringing other stakeholders, particularly private land resources into Forest Landscape Restoration initiatives on a wider scale needs more resources than has been the case.

How Can These Issues Be Addressed?

There are a number of actions that can and should be undertaken to address the above issues. These include:

- addressing policy gaps by analysing and influencing relevant policies;
- publicising Forest Landscape Restoration; and
- integrating Forest Landscape Restoration into the Sector Wide Approach to Poverty and development of frameworks for Forest Landscape Restoration implementation.

In addition, there is a need to inform Policies and legislation that relate to forestry which can be achieved through interacting with and providing input into the ongoing process of developing the New Forest Act and NFP and lobbying key Government organs and regional bodies. Lastly, it is necessary to re-orientate institutions so that they can implement Forest Landscape Restoration.

Concluding Statement

The current analysis concludes that Forest Landscape Restoration is desirable and is possible to implement. It adds value to the Poverty Eradication Action Plan, and the Sector Wide Approach to Poverty strategies and their implementation. However, it is a long-term undertaking that must receive the required institutional, political and policy-level commitment if it is to succeed.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Introduction to Forest Landscape Restoration

Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) is a joint initiative of the WWF International and IUCN- The World Conservation Union global alliance. FLR aims to regain ecological integrity and enhance human well being in deforested or degraded forest landscapes (Annex 1). In the past, forest restoration focused more on tree planting (for short-term goods) than the larger service functions of forest landscapes, and tree planting was used as the indicator of successful restoration effort. The more the trees planted, the more successful the intervention was said to be, irrespective of the species planted and the ecological functionality of the created “forest landscape”. Though these aspects of forest restoration are important, they are not enough, as forests provide many more goods and services to human welfare than purely wood based products.

More recently, efforts have been made into improving community participation and equity in benefit distribution. FLR helps to re-focus on the restoration of forests for their functions as opposed to simply increasing tree cover. In particular, emphasis is placed on the relationship between the various functions within the landscape. FLR is a relatively new approach based on existing development, conservation and natural resource management work, that has been initiated in parts of Asia and Europe. Based on this, IUCN and WWF wish to contribute to conservation in East Africa by initiating a process to understand Forest Landscape Restoration in the region and identify needs and priorities for future action.

At present the IUCN-WWF Forest Landscape Restoration partnership has initiated the following activities in the E. African region:

1. Identification and contracting of national consultants to undertake national studies on Forest Landscape Restoration in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda;
2. Identification and contracting of a regional consultant to carry out the regional Forest Landscape Restoration study; and
3. An inception workshop was held in April 2001 to agree on the framework for the analysis, the outline for the reports and the time line for the national and regional studies.

1.2. Why the Need for Forest Landscape Restoration

Africa in general, and the four countries of Eastern Africa, in particular, have seen a tremendous reduction in the area under forest. This is due to a number of reasons including

- The unsustainable exploitation of forests for timber and other products, and in particular indigenous hardwoods;
- Population pressures creating an increased pressure for land for cultivation;
- Encroachment; and
- A lack of real understanding of the important catchment services and roles which forests play, together with the other values of forests at a regional level.

Table 1 provides an indication of this loss for the region, which is now expressing itself in the increased effects of dry and drought times for example through water shortages, lack of capacity for hydro-electric generation, reduced availability of trees for people etc.

The four countries involved with this process have been undertaking poverty reduction strategy processes and programmes. The goods and services provided by forests are a vital, yet under recognized and under valued component of both livelihood and environmental security. The Forest Landscape Restoration approach being undertaken, and the outputs of the workshop will demonstrate the importance of these linkages, and so assist with the mainstreaming of forest conservation issues as part of national and economic planning.

Table 1: Summary of Forest Status in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda

	Ethiopia	Kenya	Tanzania	Uganda
Original Extent of closed canopy forest (sq. km)	249,300	81,200	37,576	103,400
Remaining Area of Moist tropical forest (sq. km)	27,500	6,900	8,500 to 16,185*	7,400
% Remaining	11%	8.5%	22.6 to 43.1%	7.2%
Average annual loss 1981-1985 (%)		1.7%	0.7%	1.3%
Total Area of all Forests (Ha)	13, 579,000	1,292,000	32,510,000	6,104,000
Forests as % of Country	13.6%	2%	36.8%	27%
Natural Forest 1995 (Ha)	13,439,000	1,174,000	32,356,000	6,084,000
Ha Forest per capita	0.2	0.045	1.1	0.3
Average Annual Forest Loss 1990-1995 (Ha)	62,000	3,000	323,000	59,000
Total Loss 1990-1995 (Ha)	312,000	17,000	1,613,000	296,000
% Annual Rate of Change	-0.5%	-0.03%	-1.0%	-0.9%
% Mangrove Forest Lost	-	70%	60%	-

Source (FAO, 1997)

* Difference is related to whether Miombo woodland is included or not

Many groups and governments are aware of the damage that has been, and continues to be done with respect to forest conservation and management in the four countries. Some of the efforts to restore trees to the landscape include:

- Forest Department or Authority tree replanting programmes;
- The work of FACE-Uganda to reforest areas around Kibale and Mount Elgon National Parks in Uganda;
- Efforts to promote the natural regeneration of important trees, particularly in the drier lands, where actual tree planting is a costly process;
- Agro- and social- forestry to increase the number of trees on farm, so as to improve livelihood security and reduce dependence on naturally growing trees;
- The increased move by Governments, especially Tanzania and Uganda to embrace responsible involvement in forest management through collaborative or community based forest management; and
- The World Food Programme's (WFP) extensive food-for-work programme that promotes tree planting, particularly in Ethiopia and Kenya.

However there are large gaps in, for instance sharing of information, stemming continued encroachment and reduction of important forest areas, lack of integration of the importance of forest goods and services in national economic planning. Such activities tend to focus on conservation functions or livelihood benefits, but rarely both. For example, tree planting is often done in a reactive manner with inadequate consultation, insufficient consideration of species, soil conditions or establishment methods. As a result the root causes are not usually addressed so that many large investments in "tree planting" have failed. For example, the overall Sahelian community forestry projects since the UN conference on desertification saw "\$160 million spent on 20,000 "not doing very well hectares of trees", or a cost of \$8,000 per hectare. There are similar trends globally, for example on average 50-75% of the establishment costs of commercial plantations are paid from the public purse (Bazett, 2002).

FLR is a novel approach in terms of attempting to address scale, its consideration of both people and biodiversity, its comprehensive approach including addressing root causes before tackling the symptoms and its willingness to work on trade offs (see Annex 1).

In addition, in East Africa, there are important regional issues to consider. National forest areas are critical catchments for regional ecosystems, for example the Lake Victoria catchment includes the forests of Mt. Elgon (Uganda and Kenya), and the Mau Forest (Kenya).

The latter is also part of the catchment for the Mara Serengeti ecosystem, which straddle both Kenya and Tanzania. Ethiopia and Uganda are the major catchment area for the Nile basin.

1.3. Existing Progress on FLR in Eastern Africa

1.3.1. Inception workshop

The consultative process introducing FLR in Eastern Africa was initiated during an inception workshop held in Nairobi in April 2001. A core group of IUCN and WWF staff as well as national consultants for the regional FLR study participated. The objectives of the inception workshop were to:

- Create a common understanding on concepts and underlying principles of FLR;
- Identify regional study objectives, outputs and processes; and
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities, expectations, logistics and technical support required.

1.3.2. Regional and National Studies

The regional study identified components for the successful adoption of FLR in the region. The four national consultants and one regional consultant were contracted for a period of between 20 and 30 days each to complete the national and regional studies. This work started in April 2001, and was completed in November 2001.

1.4. The Regional Workshop

This workshop brought together decision-makers and key stakeholders to discuss the importance of Forest Landscape Restoration in the four countries and the region, and to draw up the elements of a short and long term strategic plan as to how forest landscapes can be restored so as to improve forest functions, yet contribute to livelihood security. The findings from the national and regional studies were presented, and formed the basis for the workshop deliberations. The workshop aimed to generate the following outputs:

- Build a knowledge base on an integrated and function-based forest restoration approach;
- Share lessons from practical experience; and
- Develop long-term national, regional and international strategies for socially and ecologically sound Forest Landscape Restoration.

The objectives of the workshop were as follows:

- To present and analyse case studies from the various countries;
- To increase understanding of the FLR and share lessons learnt;
- To identify issues relating to forest policy and application and share these with governments and other field actors;
- To draw up short- and medium-term plans of action for the countries in the Eastern Africa region.

It was anticipated that the regional workshop would be an important decision-making forum for this process. The first three days were devoted to technical issues relating to Forest Landscape Restoration. During the fourth day senior Government decision-makers were invited to discuss the implications and findings of the workshop, in order to gain their support and commitment for identified and agreed activities. The workshop targeted participants from the following fields:

- Focused community and civil society representation, including NGO's;
- Government Departments particularly those relating to Forest Landscape Restoration, and also Departments responsible for agriculture, energy, poverty alleviation, finance, planning and economic development. This was important so that the approach could be recognized as critical, and to strengthen/support the cross-sectoral aspects;
- Relevant national and international agencies, including donors;
- Research institutions;
- Private sector interests with overlapping landscapes (e.g. Bamburi Cement Works); and
- Politicians and environmental lobby groups.

Approximately eight participants from each country attended the whole workshop as national participants, together with additional people from IUCN, WWF, and the national consultants. On the fourth day this group was joined by another twenty four people representing senior Government Officials from the four countries together with some donors. The structure for the workshop followed the outline in Annex 1.

1.5. Importance of Multi-Donor interest in Forest Landscape Restoration

Forest Landscape Restoration is, and will be a very large and important task, if the region is to regain some of the essential forest services so badly needed, especially for water regulation, watershed and catchment functions together with the important goods which forests provide rural people and the countries, including timber and non timber forest products.

Many donors are already involved in one way or other with Forest Landscape Restoration. But much of this is on a piece meal basis, which would be given great value-added if the approach was strategically coordinated and integrated. It is also clear that a strategic approach to Forest Landscape Restoration will require significant funding over a long period through a range of mechanisms. It is for this reason, that we wished to encourage a number of donor agencies to jointly fund this regional workshop.

1.6. Some Illustrative Next Steps after the Regional Workshop

As a result of the information gathered during the national consultation process, together with the outcomes of the regional workshop, some follow up activities might include:

1. A more focused process at the national levels, through for example the Forest Department, and the regional level, through the EAC and IGAD, to co-ordinate and integrate Forest Landscape Restoration activities;
2. Integrating Forest Landscape Restoration into poverty reduction plans and processes in the four countries and demonstrate that FLR is critical for both livelihood and environment security;
3. A more detailed national level plans for FLR, and a process to implement them through both large and smaller scale activities. Such activities would be funded by both bilateral, multilateral and NGO sources;
4. The implementation of a range of FLR activities in the four countries, with mechanisms in place to learn lessons and improve practice; and
5. An agreed regional mechanism to track the scale of FLR in the four countries, and the value that accrues to the region and countries.

Chapter 2: Lessons Learnt from Existing Practice

2.1. National and Regional Progress on Forest Landscape Restoration

At the regional workshop a range of presentations were made to explain progress to date on Forest Landscape Restoration both within the four countries, and more widely. The following presentations were made:

1. Introduction to Forest Landscape Restoration – the Concept and Principles
2. National Study Presentations for Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda
3. Regional Overview of Key issues for Forest Landscape Restoration

The above presentations are not included in this report, as they were distributed to participants and will be included in the CD being compiled for distribution. The case studies are presented in Annex 4.

2.2. Working Group Deliberations

The participants were divided into mixed groups to share experience and deliberate on the following questions:

1. What are the key elements of Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR)
2. How can we apply these practically in our country/region
3. What further information is needed
4. What changes are needed in our current approaches

The group outputs are listed in the following in Boxes 1, 2, 3, and 4

Box 1 The Key Elements of FLR?

- Restores the functions of a forest – e.g. Ecological, economic and social;
- It involves planning at landscape level;
- It involves all stakeholders at all levels from planning implementation and even in monitoring;
- Adopts a coordinated multidisciplinary approach in the design of initiatives to ensure that there are multi-sectoral linkages and complementarity;
- It involves negotiations which results in trade offs at the landscape level that involves halting major forest loss;
- Level 1 – conceptualization – FLR is a deliberate attempt to bring the landscape into FR initiatives. Also important that not new approach but a different approach;
- Level 2 – Analysis and design;
- Analyzing forest functions to be restored from society’s point of view rather than individual stakeholders at a landscape;
- Making trade off among forest functions, between forest functions and other land use options. Tradeoffs or sacrifices to pay. Compromises/opportunity cost;
- Working and focusing on consensus building, and participatory planning;
- Using broad range of techniques, approaches beyond merely planting trees for example enclosures, agroforestry, afforestation, reforestation, etc.;
- Land and resource use planning, and ecosystem approach;
- Partnership, collaboration and coordination;
- Sharing of costs, benefits and responsibilities;
- Enabling environment (policy and legal framework);
- Incentives (awareness, tenure, access, participation, etc.);
- Where are key areas for FLR - e.g. mangrove, miombo;
- Focus on the proliferation of biodiversity, landscape integrity, human well-being/welfare;
- Unique and characteristic set of habitats, socio-economic aspects etc, that includes geographical range, spread of activities, and ecological range.

Box 2: How can we apply these practically in our country/region?

- Create awareness on FLR from policy makers to community level;
- Identify critical areas that require restoration developing resource mobilization strategies using existing structure – policy makers, donor, community;
- Develop Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with institutions to develop benefit and cost sharing mechanisms including marketing of forest resources;
- Undertake restoration activities including natural regeneration, afforestation, and agroforestry;
- Design programmes to fit national programmes like poverty reduction strategies;
- Build on existing initiatives, experiences or practices;
- Promote and facilitate the trade offs, and negotiation processes;
- Start involving stakeholder in FLR process;
- Planting trees - all Stakeholders (communities/households, private investors, government agencies, NGOs, CBOs, civic society);
- Partnerships collaboration/ coordination - MoUs, lease, concessions, by-laws, agreements, committees, networking; land-use planning, harmonization of land use policies; policy and legal guidelines & principles (developing, strengthening or enforcement); institutional framework; tenure and rights to land and resources, and land classification, mapping & categorization;
- Ecosystem Approach - participatory and integrated resource management; ecosystem based management; capacity building/strengthening; and sensitive and response to the needs and aspirations of stakeholders.

Box 3: Information sharing and dissemination

- Trade-offs, sacrifices, compromises, opportunity costs, cost/benefit analysis;
- Resource valuation, data and information and recognizing values and norms;
- Good governance, governance structures, and goodwill and trust;
- Negotiation skills, arbitration & conflict management, and empowerment;
- Sharing of costs, benefits & responsibilities;
- Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement, collaborative resource management, joint management;
- Benefits sharing schemes, and policy and legal environment;
- Enabling environment (policy, legal, peace);
- Policy and legal enforcement, and policy harmonizing and coordination;
- Develop incentives - awareness, tenure, access, participation;
- Initiator, coordinator, or lead agency with organisational structure that has little sectoral bias, e.g. **Uganda** (*DDP, SDP, Parish, Village DP*), **Tanzania/Kenya** (*District Council, Division, Ward/Location, Village*);
- Should fit into existing structure, and be representative of key stakeholders;
- Promotion / sensitisation for National with decision-makers, and local with implementers; and
- Training - re-orientation in pilot landscape followed by long-term curricula development.

Box 4: What changes are needed in our current approaches?

- Review and harmonize enabling policies and legal framework, and Exchange information;
- Build capacity - Sensitize and train people on FLR;
- Coordinate mechanism for implementation;
- Institutionalize mechanisms for conflict management/resolutions;
- Disseminate case studies of emerging practices - undertake in-depth analysis of the FLR;
- Mobilize incremental resources - secure commitment, and so enable action;
- Institutionalize collaboration/partnerships, and undertake consultations and dialogue;
- Obtain political will - publicize/market FLR;
- Change attitudes at all levels of all stakeholders towards FLR principles;
- Better understanding and valuation of forest functions;
- Pilot FLR approach, and carry out FLR actions on the ground - Pilot initiatives that feed into and inform the improvement of policies and laws (adaptive learning);
- Policy influence at government and funding institution level;
- Thinking and planning beyond sites - broaden planning vision;
- Thinking and planning beyond our discipline - multi-sectoral planning;
- Diversification of gender - focus on women and youth;
- Improvements in policies and laws, adapt existing national programmes; and
- Resources – financial: see whether it can be fitted into existing budget lines and seek additional funding where necessary; and human to refocus skills.

2.3. Plenary Discussion

Land Use planning

All participants mentioned the importance of land use planning in the context of FLR. What does land use planning actually mean, and who is it for, for example Government land use planning, community, private? On private land, for example at Bamburi, land use planning is individual and so easier. But if it is community or village lands, then it becomes more difficult. Here land use planning needs to look beyond the boundaries of Protected Areas, and into community land. It is vital to involve them in planning on what they want to do with that land, before implementing any actions.

Ecosystem Approach

More information is required on the ecosystem approach, and how it relates to FLR. FLR looks at all functions, and so there is a need to look at ecosystem perspective as well. It is important to include human well being functions, as this may also influence ecosystem functions. The combination of the ecosystem together with human well being contributes to the landscape. There are significant overlaps between the principles of FLR, and those of the ecosystem approach.

Link to ecological restoration

There is a need to clarify what is meant by the term “ecological restoration” and how it is different from FLR. Ecological restoration looks at ecological integrity and is not so much concerned with human benefits. FLR uses forestry options to restore a forest ecosystem, and focuses on livelihoods, poverty and human well being. The entry point for FLR is the forest and trees, and FLR is built from practical experience in the field, for example in Costa Rica and Nepal where lands and policies are being restored. It is clear that existing practical experience should be used as a starting point. In addition it is important to focus on the different stakeholder groups so as to ensure some are not marginalised, for example for gender and equity considerations.

The difference between piloting and a deeper analysis for FLR is needed as the two appear to contradict. Some say it is important to understand the forest and then pilot. However the reality is that there is little time for piloting, and we need to act now, using existing experience as a starting point to better understand FLR, through the use of good case studies on the ground. This will help us to explore existing initiatives to see how they fit with FLR.

Coordination is a key concern, as forest and tree issues are addressed by many differing Government bodies. Perhaps FLR could be a theme around which more functional coordination can be achieved.

Like any approach, there are trade-offs, or there cannot be FLR at all. However there is need to balance the tradeoff at the landscape level with those at the land user level. In reality we cannot restore everything in all places! There has to be a balance in terms of scale (landscape or land user) and amount (area) to restore. In addition there is a challenge for FLR proponents, which is to explain to concept to non-foresters. This needs to be done with care, so as not to confuse.

It is clear that any proponents of FLR need to analyse the enabling environment in terms of what else do we need to know, and how should we optimize on existing opportunities, before we look at creating new policies which will take time to evolve and have approved. For example, it is clear that Ethiopia does not have the enabling environment, as there is no forest policy, and no land use policy. Yet in Ethiopia there is a huge opportunity for forestry as an important tool in poverty alleviation. Further there needs to be some limit on what is, and is not FLR – what are the boundaries for FLR. This in part is definitional (what is a forest?), but in reality it needs to be user defined on the ground. So it does not simply refer to reserved areas but includes trees, woodlands and forests on communal and private lands

Chapter 3. Development of an Agenda for Action

3.1. Developing Consensus on Forest Landscape Restoration

The facilitator had drafted some notes to help the plenary group develop some consensus on Forest Landscape Restoration. Participants agreed on three major areas:

FLR has many advantages. FLR is an approach which seeks to restore forest functions at a landscape level. It is also an option to rehabilitate degraded forest and land resources, and focus on poverty reduction and improvement of livelihoods. FLR also takes into account societies needs, which has been a missing link and fits in well with government's macro-economic programmes. FLR also looks at forest functions and tries to build on existing experiences at a landscape level. FLR is important for Eastern Africa. FLR enables incorporation of multidisciplinary approaches. Clearly FLR is an approach which has indeed many advantages.

However, FLR does have some drawbacks. One is that FLR is difficult to implement because sector policies and frameworks are not harmonized. Due to the drawbacks it may be necessary to make clear analysis as we move forward. Another drawback of FLR is that policy-makers do not know the actual contribution of forest resources to the national economy. Land use conflict is envisaged in the implementation of FLR. The concept may be difficult for the people involved to appreciate and accept. It involves a lot of people and trade-offs, which means that people may have to give up things they do not want to give up. FLR involves many stakeholders and will therefore require strong co-ordination. It may be difficult to obtain balance between ecological integrity and human needs. The costs of reaching consensus may be very high.

In the long run, as population grows and land becomes scarce, FLR application will need to be intensified. Increasing land productivity per unit area will be needed. FLR should be aligned with national priorities. Reforestation will not be easy. FLR should intensify efforts on family planning and awareness. Although intensification will be necessary, we will not restore, rather we will rehabilitate. FLR should take advantage of opportunities through carbon sequestration for people and economic benefits. It also has potential in enhancing rural livelihoods and stemming rural-urban migration. FLR will contribute to the change of the rural landscape. It will require an ongoing process of learning and improving. FLR will need to compete with other forms of land use. FLR can be enhanced through the active participation of all those involved in this workshop.

3.2. Outcome of 4th Day meeting with Decision Makers

A range of questions (Box 2) were developed as a guide for the discussions with decision makers, and also helped in fine tuning the national position statements. The summary points from these discussions are in Annex 5, and the main workshop recommendations and action points presented here. The issues in box 2 below were discussed and contributed to formulation of workshop recommendations.

Box 2: Questions for Decision Makers

1. How can policies better deal with massive destruction of forests?
2. If we shy away from individual trees as components of forests, are we not risking failure?
3. How can we incorporate FLR with the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD)?
4. No consideration for natural regeneration while computing statistics on forest loss, should we be talking about NET LOSS instead?
5. Carbon sequestration and carbon trading are emerging as important elements in the international agenda, particularly under the Kyoto protocol. While this may be used for FLR, what may be the benefits/costs for communities?
6. An important element of FLR is to understand the root causes of forest loss and linking this to any attempt at restoration.
7. What sorts of trade offs does FLR entail in practice?
8. Does FLR consider land tenure and population pressure?

9. Does restoration mean returning back to original forest cover / composition - if not is restoration an appropriate name?
10. Governments want to link poverty reduction initiatives to industrial development - some of the industries might not be environmentally friendly. How do we balance this trade off?
11. How can we persuade stakeholders to invest in long term strategies?
12. If FLR is not new then what are we asking policy makers to do?
13. What are the sorts of financing mechanisms that could be applied under FLR?

3.3. General Forest Landscape Restoration Workshop Recommendations and Action Points

During the final session of the workshop, a more general set of workshop recommendations were developed:

1. It was agreed that in Uganda the Forestry Department would take the lead on the process in future. In Tanzania the Department of Forestry and Beekeeping would take the lead. In Ethiopia the Ministry of Agriculture is the Focal Ministry for such issues. In Kenya the overall responsibility for Forest Landscape Restoration lies with the Forestry Department. It was also agreed that there are a range of other and counterpart organizations and institutions that need to be involved with FLR.
2. WWF-IUCN will assist in the processes that follow, but this is linked to will and interest of partners to follow up. As a result there will be need for some seed funding for some actions in short term.
3. More dialogue/fora/debate at national levels will have to take place within the next 12 months. It was agreed that IUCN/WWF would help facilitate this
4. It is important that case studies on the various types of existing FLR be undertaken, with at least one in-depth case study per country. This will help in the understanding of what makes FLR work on the ground. IUCN/WWF were requested to assist in funding.
5. Based on the national reports, the case studies, this workshop and the national statements, it is important that each country formulate national action plans
6. The World Summit on Sustainable Development is being held in August-September 2002. It was felt that it is important that the FLR process in Eastern Africa should link into WSSD. There is an opportunity to influence actions and commitments of Governments for the next years on FLR. It was felt important that the products of this process should feed into these deliberations. IUCN was requested to support Forest Department in countries to develop case studies so as to help get FLR on the agenda for WSSD through the national preparatory meeting (PrepComms) being held early in 2002.
7. IUCN should publicize successes by Jan-Feb 02 for the inputs at national level, and as input into UNFF meeting, which will be held in Costa Rica in March 2002. But it was noted that timing would be an issue.
8. In March 02 the UNFF meeting will try and agree on a forestry position for Rio+10. There will be a high-level country meeting, where National Governments (at Minister level) will be able to state their positions. In addition there will be an NGO meeting. IUCN/WWF are organizing a side event at UNFF for FLR. It is important that this Eastern African process feed in at least one case study into this. The Costa Rican minister will raise FLR in the ministerial session, and this may be an opportunity for a Minister from Eastern Africa to support this.
9. While UNFF/WSSD are the immediate concerns, there are other convention opportunities which need to be explored and exploited in terms of FLR.
10. There is an IGAD meeting being held in Kampala in December 2001 on the rehabilitation of degraded lands, with a parallel meeting of NGOs. Again this is an area where FLR as a concept could be highlighted.
11. It was felt important that a high level meeting for Government Ministers and Permanent Secretaries should be organized to discuss this and related issues.
12. It was agreed that the products from this workshop would be put on CD, together with a hardcopy of the workshop report, and a separate policy brief prepared for each country, which includes the National statements and the overall workshop recommendations.

Annex 1: Draft Timetable for Regional Forest Landscape Restoration Workshop

Day	Time	Workshop Content
25 th Nov		Participants arrive by Sunday Evening
26 th Nov.	8.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration
	9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background to the Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative Introductions, informal opening and expectations
	9.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FLR – what it is and what it implies
	10.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tea
	10.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion of Tanzania National Report
	11.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion of Uganda National Report
	11.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion of Ethiopia National Report
	12.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion of Kenya National Report
	12.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch
	2.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and discussion of Regional Report
	2.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed regional group discussions on key lessons and issues emerging from practice
27 th Nov	8.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary from First day
	9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group Discussion continue, and Plenary presentation on lessons learnt from existing practice to date
	10.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tea
	10.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SWOT analysis in country groups - practice and policy, links between ecology and human well being, linkages to national and economic planning, synergies and conflicts
	1.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch
	2.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SWOT analysis continues and plenary presentation
	5.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> End of day
28 th Nov	8.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary from second day
	9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing and agreeing on an agenda/strategy for action including important actions needed (Policy, pilot practice, key stakeholder groups) – potential areas for policy intervention, role of conventions, functionality and human well being, agreement on priority areas for FLR action, key emerging issues in FLR, linkages of FLR with National economic and development planning, role of regional institutions (EAC, IGAD)
	1.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch
	2.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Afternoon field trip to Forest Restoration – Bamburi Nature Trail
29 th Nov.	8.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VIPs arrive and register
	9.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductions, and workshop format to date
	9.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official Speeches blessing the meeting
	10.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tea
	10.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of Draft Recommendations and Action Points
	11.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country group discussions and agreements on action points, strategy and recommendations with plenary presentation before lunch
	1.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lunch
	2.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed Group discussion to discuss issues which are of wider regional importance, and agree on recommendations and action points Agreement on action points required, and the agenda for action
	3.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tea
	4.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation and workshop agreement on overall recommendations, action points and strategies
	5.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop closure
	7.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cocktail party
30 th Nov.		Participants depart in morning

Annex 2: Participants List

KENYA

Major Murakaru Kaigwa, Trustee
Ngong Road Forest Trust Sanctuary
P. O. Box 1047, Ruaraka 00618
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel:-254-72-705997
Fax: 254-2-860388
Email: jacana@swiftkenya.com

Mr. David Mbugua
Deputy Chief Conservator of Forests
Forest Department
P. O. Box 30513
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-764010/764249
Email: fd_hqs@nbnet.co.ke

Dr. Joseph Mutangah, Coordinator
Plant Conservation Programme
National Museums of Kenya
P. O. Box 40101
Nairobi, Tel: 254-0150-20627
Fax: 254-0150-22777
Email: Jmutangah@eapcc.co.ke

Mr. Hewson Kabugi
Assistant Chief Conservator
Kenya Wildlife Service
P. O. Box 40241
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-501081
Email: forests@kws.org

Dr. Ebby Chagala
Kenya Forestry Research Institute
P. O. Box 20413
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-154-32949
Fax: 254-154-32844
Email: kefri@arcc.or.ke

Mr. Enock W. Kanyanya
C/o Kenya Forest Working Group
P. O. Box 20110
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-571335
Fax: 254-2-570335
Email: kfwg@eawildlife.org

Ms. Violet Matiru, Consultant
P. O. Box 60563
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel. 254-2-441761
Tel: 0733-810023
Email: mmatiru@net2000.co.ke

Dr. Daudi Waithaka, Facilitator
Peace & Development Foundation
P. O. Box 51168
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-512423
Fax: 254-2-226447
Email: pdafrica@yahoo.com

Dr. Azene Bekele, Consultant
RELMA
P.O. Box 63403
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-522575/80
Fax: 254-2-524401
Email: Azene.bekele@cgiar.org

UGANDA:

Dr. D.N. Byarugaba
Acting Commissioner for Forestry
P. O. Box 7152
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-1-233485/251917
Fax: 251-1-251918
Email: Mawander@avumuk.ac.ug

Mr. Fred Mawanda
P. O. Box 1732
Masala, Uganda
Email Mawander@avumuk.ac.org

Mr. Ruth Mubiru
Uganda Women Tree Planing Organization
C/o IUCN Uganda Country Office
P. O. Box 10950
Kampala, Uganda
Email: Ruthmubiru@yahoo.com

Mr. James Okonya
Chief Warden
Uganda Wildlife Authority
C/o Mt. Elgon Conservation Area
P. O. Box 1943
Mbale, Uganda
Tel: 256-45-33170
Fax: 256-45-33332
Email: uwaface@imul.com

Mr. Levand Turyomurugyendo
Biodiversity Specialist, ICRAF
P. O. Box 311
Kabale, Uganda
Tel: 256-0486-23931
Fax: 256-386-23913
Email: afrenakabale@africaonline.co.ug

Mr. Alex Muhweezi
Head, IUCN Uganda Country Office
P.O. Box 10950
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-233738
Fax: 256-41-342298
Email: iucn@imul.com

Mr. Steve Nsiita Amooti
Acting Assistant Commissioner
Forestry Department
P. O. Box 7152
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 006-41-231866
Fax: 006-41-236016
Ecforest@star.com.co.ug

Ms. Eunice Nyiramahoro
Deputy Director, Community Conservation
Uganda Wildlife Authority
P. O. Box 3530
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-346278
Cell: 256077-417505
Email: eunice.mahoro@uwa.or.ug

Mr. Cornelius Kazoora, Consultant
Sustainable Development Centre
P. O. Box 5463
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-4-531660
Email: sdc@imul.com

Dr. Joseph Obua
University Lecturer
Dept. Forest Biology & Ecosystems Management
Makerere University
P. O. Box 7062
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-543647
Fax: 256-41-533574
Email: Obua@forest.mak.ac.ug

TANZANIA

Mr. Bariki Karusi Kaale
Natural Resource Management Specialist,
Tanzania Specialist Organisation on Community
Natural Resources and Biodiversity Conservation
[TASONABI]
P. O. Box 8550
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 255-22-2462923/2462923
Fax: 255-22-2113388
Email: bkkale@hotmail.com
Or bkkaale@yahoo.com

Mr. Juma S. Mgoo
Senior Forest Officer
Forestry and Beekeeping Division
P. O. Box 11004
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 255-22-2865816
Fax: 255-22-2855165
Email: misitu@twiga.com

Ms. Hadija Ramadhani
Head-Community Forestry
Forestry & Beekeeping Division
P. O. Box 426
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 007-254-22-2111062/1
Email: Misitu@twiga.com

Ms. Anna Mayawalla
Principal Planning Officer, President's Office
P. O. Box 9242
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 255-22-2112682
Email: Amayawalla@yahoo.com

Prof. George Kajembe
Professor, Social Forestry
Sokoine University of Agriculture
Faculty of Forestry & Nature Conservation
P. O. Box 3013
Morogoro, Tanzania
Tel: 255-23-2604741
Fax: 255-23-2-2604648/3718
Email: kajembe@suanet.ac.tz
Or infrisua@suanet.ac.tz

ETHIOPIA

Ato Million Bekele
Forestry Team Leader
Forest & Wildlife Conservation Dev.
Ministry of Agriculture
P. O. Box 60054
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-1-155085
Fax: 251-1-518977
Email: forcon@telecom.net.et

Ato Admasu Molla
Team Leader
Amahara Regional Bureau of Agriculture
P. O. Box 437
Bahir Dar, Amahara Region, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-8-201366/200939
Fax: 251-8-201510

Ato Maile Marian Behailie
Forestry Expert
Environmental Protection Team Leader
Bureau of Agriculture
Gambella Region, Ethiopia

Ato Daniel Dana
Forest Management Team Leader
Bureau of Agriculture
Southern Nations and Nationalities
P. O. Box 80
Amasa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-6-205984
Fax: 251-6-205933
Email: Tedmes@yahoo.com

Ato Yifta Nega
Team Leader
Bureau of Agriculture & Natural Resources
Tigray Region
P.O. Box 10
Mekelle-Tigray, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-4-400943
Fax: 251-4-403710

Mr. Rashid Hassen Mohammed
Team Leader of Land Use Planning Study
Regional Bureau of Agriculture for
Southern Ethiopia Regional State
P. O. Box 80
Awassa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-6-205984
Fax: 251-6-205933
Email: tedmes@yahoo.com

IUCN

Mr. Edmund Barrow
Forest Conservation & Social Policy Coordinator
IUCN EARO
P. O. Box 68200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-890605/12
Fax: 254-2890615
Email: egb@iucnearo.org

Ms. Florence Chege
Programme Officer, IUCN-EARO
P. O. Box 68200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-890605/12
Fax: 254-2890615
IUCN EARO
Email: fwc@iucnearo.org

Florence Njiriri
Secretary, IUCN EARO
P. O. Box 68200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-890605/12
Fax: 254-2890615

WWF

Mr. Mark Aldrich
WWF International
CH-1196, Gland
Switzerland
Tel:41-22-364-9010
Fax: 41-22-3640640
Email: MAldrich@wwfint.org

Mr. Stewart Maginnis
Senior Forest Officer
WWF International
Avenue du Mont Blanc 27
1196 GLAND
Switzerland
Tel:41-22-364-9010
Mobile: 41-79-6161894
Fax: 41-22-3640640
Email: Smaginnis@wwfint.org

Dr. Patrick Milimo
Conservation Programme Director
WWF Regional Office
P. O. Box 62440
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-577355
Fax: 254-2-577389
Email: Pmilimo@wwfeafrika.org
Or Pbmilimo@yahoo.com

Mr. Gezahegn Negussie
Programme Manager, EACF
WWF EARPO
P. O. Box 62440
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-577355
Fax: 254-2-577389
Email: Gnegussie@wwfearpo.org
Negussie_gezahegn@hotmail.com

Mr. Ermias Bekele
Project Leader
WWF-EARPO, DEGIS WWF
Forest Conservation in High Priority Areas
C/o WWF Regional Office
P. O. Box 13113
Addis-Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-1-509450/157138/517819
Fax: 251-1-509452
Email: wwfethio@telecom.net.et

Mr. Martin Ganje
Regional Forest Officer – WWF
Western African Regional Programme Office
P. O. Box 1776
08 B.P. Cocody Danga
Abidjan – Cote D'Ivoire
Tel: 225-22-448786/448776
Email: Mganje@wwfwarpo.ci

Mr. Tom Erdmann
Technical Advisor
WWF Madagascar
B.P. 738
Antananarivo 101
Madagascar
Tel: 261-202240284
Fax: 261-20-2234888
Email: Terdmann@wwf.mg

Annex 3: VIP Participants for day 4

KENYA:

Mr. Joseph Mutie
Chief Conservator of Forests
Forest Department
P. O. Box 30573
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: Direct 254-2-246287
Tel: 254-2-764010/764249
Email: Fd_hqs@nbnet.co.ke

Mr. Kinuthia Mbugua
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources
Maji House
P. O. Box 30561
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-727407
Fax: 254-2-727622

Mr. Simon Mbarire
Acting Deputy Director
National Environment Secretariat
P. O. Box 67839
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel : 254-2-248852/243839
Fax: 254-2-248851

Mr. Gideon Gathara
Forestry Coordinator
Kenya Wildlife Service
P. O. Box 40241
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-602345/501081
Email: Forests@kws.org

Mr. Ali Kaka
Executive Director
East African Wildlife Society
P. O. Box 20110
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-574145
Fax: 254-2-570335
Email: info@wildlife.org

UGANDA

Hon. Lawrence Kezimbira Musingo
Minister of State [Environment]
Ministry of Water, Lands & Environment
P. O. Box 7122
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 006-41-342931/342933
Fax: 006-41-230891

Mr. Deo N. Byarugaba
Ag. Commissioner for Forests
Forestry Department
Ministry of Water, Lands & Environment

P. O. Box 7124
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 254-41-251917
Fax: 256-41-251918
Email: ecforest@starcom.co.ug

Ms. Apophia Atukunda
Director Planning Monitoring & Research
Uganda Wildlife Authority
P. O. Box 3530
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-346287/8
Fax: 256-41-346291
Email: uwa@uwa.or.ug
Am.aphophia@uwa.or.ug

Ms. Francis Osoto Esegu
Director of Research
National Agricultural Research Organisation
(NARO)
Forest Resources Research Institute [FORRI]
P. O. Box 1752
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-255163/4
Fax: 256-41-255165
Email: foridir@infocom.co.ug

TANZANIA

Mr. Ruzika Muheto
National Environment Management Council
[NEMC]
P. O. Box 63154
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 007-741-340049 [cell]
Email: nemc@nemctz.org

Mrs. Rehemma Tibanyenda,
Assistant of Director
Research, Training and Statistics
Ministry of Natural Resources
Wildlife Division
P. O. Box 585
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Email: wildlife-division@twiga.com

Mr. T.N. Mmari
Gender & Development
Presidents Office, Planning Commission
P. O. Box 9242
Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: 255-56-4498
Fax: 255-56-3725
Email Edinem@hotmail.com

DJIBOUTI:

Mr. Maina Karaba
Chief, Natural Resources & Energy Section
Intergovernmental Authority of Development
IGAD
P. O. Box 2653
Djibouti
Tel: 253-354050/354378
Fax: 253-356994/356284
Email: igadh@intnet.dj

ETHIOPIA:

Dr. Belay Demissie Yezew
Head, Bureau of Agriculture
Amhara Regional State
P. O. Box 102251
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: 251-1-186006
Fax: 251-1-625817

Ato Simon Galwalk
Head Bureau of Agriculture
Amhara Region
Ethiopia
Tel: 251-7-510229/510109

IUCN

Dr. Eldad Tukahirwa
Regional Representative
IUCN Regional Office for Eastern Africa
P.O. Box 68200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-890605
Fax: 254-2-890615
Email: emt@iucnearo.org

WWF

Dr. Sam Kanyamibwa
Regional Representative
WWF Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office
P.O. Box 62440
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-577355
Fax: 254-2-577389
Tel: skanyamibwa@wwfeafrika.org

DONORS

Mr. Martin Leach
DFID Kenya
P. O. Box 30465
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254-2-717609
Fax: 254-2-719112
Email: m-leach@dfid.gov.uk

Annex 4: Some Examples of FLR in the Region

4.1. Coastal Forests of Kenya - Examples of FLR Approach (H. Kabugi)

Coastal forests are characterized by fragmented patches of forest ranging from a small forest of less than 3ha to the two largest continuous forests of Arabuko-Sokoke and Shimba Hill, an area of 42,000 ha and 23,000 ha respectively. Various initiatives, with different objectives for specific forests have been developed in the past five years. Each initiative has targeted specific patch of forest without consideration of the entire landscape.

4.1.1. Arabuko-Sokoke Forest

The Arabuko-Sokoke forest has a large area covered by *Cynometra-Brachylaena* and *Brachystegia* woodlands. It supports six threatened forest mammals and eleven woody species. The forest is also a source of fresh water for domestic use by the forest adjacent dwellers as well as supporting the mangrove ecosystem located between the Arabuko-Sokoke terrestrial forest and the shore line.

In 1997, Forest Department, Kenya Wildlife Service and Birdlife International started to implement a conservation and management programme for the area with objective to enhance the conservation of the forest while contributing to livelihood improvement. Later, National Museums of Kenya and KEFRI were brought on board as collaborators through the Memorandum of Understanding. Activities include

- Ecotourism development and education
- Rural development
- Forest management
- Research and monitoring

Two key activities benefiting communities are butterfly farming and Bee Keeping.

Conservation Functions

- Fresh water as opposed to salt water is available in the forest
- For community, livestock and wildlife
- Fresh water recharges the mangrove forest
- Biodiversity conservation

4.1.2. Kaya Forest

This project under National Museums of Kenya – Coastal Forest Conservation focuses on conservation of Kaya forest. Kaya forests or sacred groves are traditionally protected but have been degraded by illegal loggers. An initiative to conserve them for both spiritual and socio-cultural values is on going. The beneficiaries are the local communities. Some Kaya are gazetted as national monuments forest reserves or trustland. The Kayas harbour some of the endemic species.

4.1.3. Mwaluganje Sanctuary

The local community have organised themselves and agreed to utilise a migratory corridor between Shimba Hill forest and Mwaluganje for tourism development. They have fenced the corridor and put up tented camps for tourists. Already, they have started tapping revenue from this venture. The direct benefits realised from the venture has made the local community within the sanctuary (migratory corridor) to have positive attitude to conservation of wildlife and forests.

The initiatives are site specific and by design do not embrace FLR as such but with improvement and enhanced institution collaboration already established provide a good ground to pilot the FLR approach.

4.2. Peri-Urban Plantation And Private Woodlot Farms Development Project In Uganda (D.N. Byarugaba)

Background

Historically forestry plantations were established in all the areas that developed as urban centres since the turn of the century. The first was in 1918 at Entebbe. These came to be known as Town Forest Plantation. By 1970, there were over 12,000 ha throughout the country. Their main objectives when established were:

1. To provide fuel wood energy for the town dwellers
2. To provide fuel for the East African Railways locomotives wherever the rails were laid
3. To provide of transmission poles for power and telecommunications
4. To provide building poles for the local communities.

During the period of mid seventies and early eighties, the politics of the time led to their destruction. People turned to Natural Forests for the products mentioned above leading to their destruction.

Project Activities

- In order to halt this destruction, the above project was conceived.
- Its implementation started in November 1989.
- The planting was done by the forest department and rural people.
- Members of the public as individuals, groups and companies were permitted to establish private wood lots on government lands (Forest –Reserves).
- Once this matured, they became ready sources of fuelwood and buildings poles. This lends to relieving of pressure from Natural Forests.
- They also became sources of income for the owners.
- The degraded natural forests were able to recover and some people’s incomes improved.
- To-date over five thousand (5,000) permit holders own more than ten thousand (10,000 ha) of fuel wood plantations in the project area of Government gazetted land (Forest Reserves)

4.3. Forest Landscape “Restoration” Experience Of Tigray-Region – Ethiopia (Y. Nega)

Tigray-region is located in the northern part of Ethiopia, and its forest resources are highly degraded. Due to this fact, the regional government and the community are undertaking extensive rehabilitation program to bring back the functions of forest. These activities are implemented by difference stakeholders, including individuals, Communities and the State. Among these, the experience of community forest rehabilitation and development especially related to area closure seems as follows:

Area closure is a technical intervention to rehabilitate degraded forestland and forest by protecting illegal human and animal interventions. Through this intervention about 300,000 hectares of degraded forestland is rehabilitating in the region. The objectives of area closure is to rehabilitate the degraded forest land and forest resources in order to bring back ecological and socio-economic functions of the forest in sustainable manner.

The approaches used build on communities participating starting from problem identification up to implementation and resources/benefit/utilization and management. The main activities carried in the area closures include:

- Protecting from illegal human and animal interference.
- Enrichment planning and the construction of soil and water conservation structures
- Utilizing the resources in regulated way

The achievements to date of Area Closure include

- Good rehabilitated vegetation cover
- Increased water yield of existing spring as the result of ground water recharging effect of the rehabilitated area

- Community has started to benefit from the rehabilitated area closure by harvesting, forage for his cattle, fuel wood, and farm implements and construction wood.

However there are a number of issues with respect to Area Closures, including

- Absence of proper community based management plan which enable the community to use the resources in sustainable manner.
- There is shortage of resource to enhance the rehabilitation process and restore the forest functions.
- Hence FLR techniques are expected to enable the integration of ecology and human well being in sustainable manner.

4.4. Restoration of Acacia Gum Gardens – Tendelti, Sudan (S. Maginnis)

1. During 1985 Sahelian drought Sudanese farmers were forced to clear gum gardens to make charcoal.
2. Two projects in Tendelti district - Kordofan
3. One classic forestry approach - high tech nursery, large block planting in “degraded areas”
4. The other - an agriculture extension approach - dispersed planting of Acacia over wide area - including along field boundaries
5. Forestry project - failed -trees browsed by goats
6. Agricultural extension project - 80% survival

4.5. Restoring Acacia tortilis Woodland in Turkana, Kenya (E.Barrow)

For instance dramatic revegetation of formerly bare ground through natural regeneration has occurred at Lorugum, Turkana, Kenya, where there was a large famine relief and feeding camp in the late 1960s and early 1970s. People had cut down most of the existing vegetation, except some of the riverine forest, for making houses, fences and for fuel. As the effects of the famine receded, the people gradually accumulated livestock, mainly goats. The goats fed in the riverine forest and consumed a lot of *Acacia tortilis* pods. The hard seeds were deposited in the goat droppings and germinated during the rains. Then with the onset of good rains, people gradually left the famine camps and returned to their pastoral ways. During the 1980s, the chief of the area together with the elders agreed to conserve the natural regeneration of *Acacia tortilis* and this was done at the local people's own initiative, though later with moral and extension support from the forestry department. He said that at the start there were only 5 large acacia trees remaining; they are still visible about 2-3 metres higher than the surrounding young forest. The young trees vary from a few centimetres to over 3 metres in height and covered approximately 30,000 ha. How much would that have cost to re-plant with trees?

The reasons given by the chief for the conservation of the area were shade for livestock while grazing and pods from the trees. Not everyone agreed with the conservation policy at first but it prevailed with the beneficial consequences now evident in the area. This indicates the real opportunities and potentials that exist in such areas. Opportunities and potentials should be used to enhance natural resource management and not be eroded.

4.6. Ngitiri as a means to restore degraded lands in Shinyanga, Tanzania (E.Barrow)

The Sukuma agropastoralists, in the Shinyanga region of Tanzania practise making *Ngitiri* grazing reserves. This practise is known all over the region, and many thousands of *Ngitiri* exist in Shinyanga and Mwanza regions. Though not practised in all villages it is culturally a well-established concept. Everybody knows what a *ngitiri* is and what it entails. In order to have access to pasture during the dry season, areas within the village borders are closed in the beginning of the wet season. In the dry season, when pasture is becoming scarce, the *ngitiri* is opened up for grazing.

There are two types of reserves made, namely, family reserves and communal reserves. Family reserves can only be made on arable land in fallow, since there is communal access to all land that is not efficiently cultivated. Communal reserves can be made on any village land that is suitable for dry season grazing. The opening of the "ngitiri" is done in sections; one section being completely grazed and finished before the next is opened. The underlying idea is to maintain an area of standing hay until the next rains. The last section is ideally not opened before November or December, ie. at the onset of the rains.

The village maintains a strict control over the communal reserves and there are severe sanctions for trespassing herders. The village government decided on where to make the reserves and village *Wasalaama* guards were responsible for enforcement of the *Ngitiri* rules. *Ngitiri* as a concept of conservation could be enhanced to include village woodlots and forest reserves, ie. *Ngitiri* as a concept of conservation for the common good.

For instance in one village, Isagala, the villagers had, on their own, made a large stretch of land into a village reserve. This reserve was divided into two sections. One section was totally closed for any use. From the other section, the villagers were allowed restricted cutting based on a letter from the 10-cell leader signed by the village secretary. People from other villages paid shs 50/= for a head load and shs 100/= for an ox-cart of firewood, at approximately US \$0.25 to \$1. The reserve was spoken of as our property. Patrolling of the reserve was carried out by the *Wasalaama* or local guards of the village. When the former chairman of the village was asked why it was possible to implement this, he said it was because the village made the decisions themselves, and they were not imposed on them.

4.7. Restoring Mangrove Forests in Tanga, Tanzania (E.Barrow)

The Collaborative Management Memorandum of Understanding (CM-MOU) between the two villages of Kipumbwe and Sange in Pangani District, and district and central Government specifies the roles, rights and responsibilities of the collaborating partners, and recognizes the important contributions that the villagers of Kipumbwi and Sange have made in terms of the sustainable use and management of the forest. The area which the CM-MOU covers relates to the Msangasi Mangrove Reserve area (422 ha.) in Tanga region. All management blocks have a protected buffer strip of 15 meters from the edge of any stream to protect stream banks from erosion. The Kipumbwi and Sange (KiSa) Plan honors the zones indicated in the Tanzania Government's Mangrove Master Plan. Surveys undertaken in 1997 and 1998 as part of the formulation of the KiSa plan showed that some compartments previously designated for protection, had sufficiently recovered to be designated for use.

With the draft agreement in place it is clear that the mangrove forest is better managed, that local people are gaining access to products, and that areas of land have been replanted with mangroves. This demonstrates that rural villagers are capable of making technical and management decisions about natural resources they are knowledgeable about. However the real test of this agreement will be when the agreement is formally approved by Central Government so as to enable the two villages to accrue revenue from the sale of products, on a sustainable basis.

The Management Plan describes the silvicultural regime and institutional arrangements for forest management and is divided into a number of sections that describe the forest, the roles of partner organizations and protection and management arrangements. The crucial elements in the negotiated roles are that the:

- Forest users have exclusive rights to forest products made available through the implementation of the management plan;
- Forest users are accountable to village government but retain authority to make management decisions;
- The Lands and Environment Committees represent the forest users;
- Forest users can delegate responsibilities and authority to the Lands and Environment Committee and the Co-ordinating Committee, but they can change the decisions made by those committees or remove any members based on a majority vote in a meeting of a quorum of members; and
- Central Government provides advice and assistance on demand.

Annex 5. Points from Plenary Discussions on National and Regional Presentations

- Need a better/clearer answer to the landscape question with examples -- what scale or area are we looking at?
- Degraded forests have had little focus, especially their rehabilitation.
- Context of forest restoration in Africa. What is FLR? Functions, values, goods and services, species diversity and communities. Restoration. What do we mean by landscape in terms of scale/area?
- Focus on scale and integration. A challenge...link with poverty, deforestation increases. We need new approaches.
- Focus on plantations - addressing only forest cover issues, without addressing needs and input of local people, addressing policies.
- Working in poor countries, with poor people is not easy. Many look at short-term benefits while FLR has long term scale.
- Committed, work in partnership. Expertise available. National level support through existing policies - direct or indirect.
- Wildlife returning is a service provided by forests, and should not be regarded as a problem, instead it should be managed sustainably through community wildlife arrangements.
- Importance of taking livelihoods onto account, and links with conservation. Policies towards poverty reduction primarily aimed at agriculture and industrial development - e.g. forests vs. sugar cane.
- Why are the forests being degraded? Are we attacking the symptoms rather than the cause?
- Issues of land tenure and population pressure - trade offs/benefits for small-scale farmers.
- Link to previous strategies Forestry Action Programmes - what is the difference with this new strategy.
- Case studies - relatively few small-scale successes, related to the size of forest losses. How to deal with this disparity - still many incentives towards forest destruction vs. incentives towards forest clearance.
- What are the major components of our forests? No single focus on forests - instead must include on-farm trees, sparse trees and woodlands, secondary forest, and closed forests.
- Concern - question of statistics 6-14M globally. Annual rates do not take into account natural regeneration. Should talk bring net forest loss into the equation.
- "Outside the box" - wildlife issues should be incorporated into the planning of FLR.
- Carbon credits - benefits to the community? Further study needed into how these projects/systems operate. Carbon - tradable rights, FACE example is very interesting.
- Sharing the challenge of benefits from FLR initiatives. Not easy to ask local communities to make changes now for long-term benefits.
- Trying to find a new approach to an old problem. Why have we allowed the problem to develop? One problem is the lack of consideration of the inner mechanisms of the ecosystem - which is very important. Follow up with higher representatives very important on this issue.
- Restoration - to original status. Why not rehabilitation - how far are we trying to restore?
- Problems - important to talk about solutions - what is the new value? How are we going to use this concept to demonstrate how we can make a difference?
- Presentations and approach all sounds right. But other pressures often overtake politicians, making it difficult to implement.
- Important to consider necessary incentives for politicians (and parties) to encourage them to support and adopt approach.