**FST/2011/014 - Mid Term Review Report**

**Conducted by Tony Bartlett and Don Gilmour: 12-22 January 2015**

1. ***Background***

ACIAR's project FST/2011/076 “Enhancing livelihoods and food security from agroforestry and community forestry in Nepal” (EnLiFT), is commissioned through the University of Adelaide and led by Dr Ian Nuberg. This five-year project, which is ACIAR’s first forestry project in Nepal, commenced in April 2013 and has a budget of $2.5m with additional co-contribution funding of $0.35m from the partner organisations. The aim of this project is to enhance livelihoods and food security from improved implementation of agroforestry and community forestry systems in the Middle Hills of Nepal, with its activities focused in Kabhre Palanchok and Lamjung districts.

ADAB and AusAID funded a series of community forestry projects in Nepal from 1978 to 2006 in two districts, Sindhu Palchok and Kabhre Palanchok, N.E. of Kathmandu. These projects were very highly regarded by both government officials and local villagers in Nepal. As a result there is a substantial legacy of good will that has made the ACIAR project well received at all levels. This is in spite of the gap of seven years between the close of the AusAID project and the commencement of the ACIAR project. However, the memory of the high performing previous projects has also created some problems, particularly in Kabhre Palanchok District, as there are expectations that the ACIAR project will follow-on from the previous development projects. It has been necessary to explain the differences between a development project with its large budget and many fully paid jobs and a more modest research project implemented primarily through collaboration with local partners. This distinction has been handled well by project staff.

The project was designed following a substantial scoping mission (managed by ICRAF) in February/March 2012. During the scoping mission five background papers were commissioned to collate an up-to-date summary of the biophysical, policy and institutional aspects of NRM in Nepal. A synthesis paper was also prepared to bring together the key points from the background papers of relevance for the project’s design. A three day participatory workshop with the key stakeholders was held in Kathmandu in June 2012 to establish the key research questions and activities and build in-country commitment to the project. After the stakeholder workshop a further study was undertaken to quantify the magnitude of under-utilisted land in selected areas of the Middle Hills of Nepal. All of these reports are being compiled by ICRAF into a single publication which will be released shortly.

Based on the outputs from the stakeholder workshop, the original design proposed activities in five districts under five interrelated objectives:

1. enhancing production through better interaction between community forestry and agroforestry practices, and a better understanding of factors underpinning productivity of agricultural and community forestry systems;
2. development of commercially viable agroforestry and community forestry options with appropriate market linkages;
3. developing appropriate institutional and governance frameworks that sustain and support improved production;
4. improving access of the poor and disadvantaged groups through tenure security enhancement and creating new arrangements; and
5. contributing to revision and change of policy and regulatory framework.

During the initial In House Review process, ACIAR considered the design far too ambitious for the available funding and requested that the scope of the project be reduced in terms of where the activities would be conducted and the breadth of the research focus. The final project design, which was approved by ACIAR in March 2013, involves both biophysical and social research on three inter-related topics: agroforestry; community forestry and under-utilised agricultural land. The project is quite a complex one, having 3 Australian or international partners and 7 Nepali partners, and is unusual (for an ACIAR project) in that the research is conducted in collaboration with experienced Nepali scientists employed by international and national NGOs. The project commenced in May 2013.

1. ***Summary of Progress and Issues until the Mid Term Review***

The FST RPM attended the inception activities in May 2013 and the first annual action research and planning workshop in January 2014. The project got off to a good start following the Inception activities and established effective mechanisms to facilitate communication, planning, action research, coordination and monitoring of project activities. At the first action research and planning meeting in January 2014, project team participants presented their work to date, action plans were developed and strategic issues, such as project management in Nepal and salary payment rates were discussed. To improve coordination and management, the project administration was restructured and Naya Sharma Paudel from ForestAction was appointed as the project coordinator in Nepal.

A two day action research training workshop was also conducted in January 2014. The partners agreed to criteria to guide the selection of the 3 study sites in each district. In Kabhre Palanchok the sites are Chaubas; Methinkot; and Dhunkarka. In Lamjung the sites are Nalma; Dhamilikuwa; and Jita Taxar. At each site 4 Community Forest User Groups, including the one for intensive research activities, have been identified. Quantitative baseline data was gathered from surveys of 672 households across the six study areas. Three qualitative baseline surveys were also undertaken in the study areas (for community forestry, agroforestry and underutilised land).

Following receipt of the first annual report in June 2014, the RPM assessment noted: “The project has made very good progress in the first year with most of the planned activities. I particularly commend the action learning approach that is being used by this project, not only with field activities but also in planning and monitoring”. Since then there has been communication with the project leader on a number of strategic issues including establishment of the project coordination committee, movement of funds between partners and activities associated with the community sawmill at Chaubas.

The project has secured two John Allwright Fellowships, with Lila Puri undertaking his PhD at University of Adelaide and Sujata Tamang undertaking her PhD at University of New South Wales.

1. ***Conduct of the Mid-Term Review***

In consultation with the project leader it was agreed that a mid-term review would be conducted in January 2015 (after 19 months of implementation), to coincide with the third action research and planning meeting and to allow refocussing of some activities. The review was conducted in Nepal between 12 and 22 January 2015 by Tony Bartlett (ACIAR Forestry RPM) and Dr Don Gilmour (leader of the scoping mission and mentor to the project) according to the Terms of Reference developed and shared with the project team (Appendix 1). The review included two periods of activity: a three day field trip to the three project sites in Lamjung district (12-14 January); and a two day workshop at the Himalaya Hotel in Kathmandu (21-22 January), with the review team undertaking preparatory work in Kathmandu on 20 January. This separation of the two components of the review enabled the project team to have meetings to prepare for the formal review workshop after the field trip. Project staff from University of Adelaide, University of New South Wales, ICRAF and the seven partner organisations from Nepal participated in the review. ICRAF’s SE Asia Regional Coordinator, Dr Ujjwal Pradhan, also participated in the workshop component of the mid-term review. The review workshop was chaired by Krishna Prasad Pokharel (Chief of Community Forestry Division- Department of Forests) who had recently taken over from Resham Dangi who held the position when the project commenced.

The field trip enabled the reviewers to understand the nature of the project sites in Lamjung, have discussions with the District Forest Officer and FECOFUN coordinator and meet with some farmers and communities who are benefiting from the project and visit some of the trial sites. At the workshop, the project leader presented an overview of progress against the milestones and updates on partners. The project team gave detailed presentations of the progress of project activities under the three objectives, mostly as a series of integrated thematic reports. The program for the mid-term review workshop is included as Appendix 2.

1. ***Project Progress Against Planned Activities***

An updated table of progress against the planned activities is included as Appendix 3.

**Objective 1,** on improving the capacity of household based agroforestry systems to enhance livelihoods and food security, includes activities on private forestry as well as other agroforestry practices. Activities have progressed well, after some initial delays, and are generally in line with the planned activities. The baseline studies under Activity 1.1 have been completed (more than 600 households surveyed) and an article has been published in the Journal of Forest and Livelihood on sustainable livelihoods through agroforestry systems in Nepal. This article partially meets Output 3, but because it is linked to the reportable KPI further work is needed to clarify the drivers of these systems, which is to be completed by June 2015. Under Activity 1.2, training has been run in both districts and a useful report on barriers to private forestry has been prepared, but further work is needed to define the researchable innovative market opportunities (Output 4). The work under Activity 1.4 on developing modelling of the interactions between farm and forest systems is progressing very well, utilising quantitative data from the baseline studies and some preliminary consideration of how to incorporate the policy and institutional aspects related to farmer decision making. Activity 1.5 involves all the participatory trials to enhance agroforestry systems and value chains. Engagement of farmers at each of the 6 sites has been good, local research groups have been established, training conducted in both districts, agroforestry nurseries established and some participatory trials commenced. While fodder species and non timber products have been identified with farmers at each site, the project team did not present a clear plan for the establishment of the agroforestry trails at the MTR (Output 12 due Dec 2014) and there appeared to be a disconnect between the trials that have been established and the value chain work.

**Objective 2** on improving the functioning of community forestry systems to enhance equitable livelihoods and food security for CFUG members includes activities on the institutions and policies that relate to community forestry as well as action research on interventions designed to improve the benefits that flow to CFUG members. The activities have progressed well and are generally in line with the expected achievements to date. The qualitative reports for the baseline studies have been completed under Activity 2.1. A comprehensive report has been prepared on innovative options for improving community forestry systems (Output 22), though it was missing a summary and it is not clear how this will be used to guide the interventions proposed for action research under Activity 2.5. A useful report (and associated paper for the National Community Forestry Workshop) on the prospects for marketing timber and non timber forest products from community forests has been produced. Under Activity 2.3, while priority tree species and commodities have been identified for each of the six trial sites, it is not yet clear what value chain activities will be undertaken to help achieve the improvement of the community forestry systems. Under Activity 2.4, three good reports on research on Operational Plans, the Chaubas community sawmill and EnLiFT policy lab concept have been prepared, but the consolidated research report (Output 28) on the policy and institutional issues relevant to community forestry has not yet been produced. The project team has devoted considerable resources to the Chaubas site, which is necessary and appropriate given the potential benefits and lessons that will result if this community forestry enterprise can be revived. As with Objective 1, the planned participatory action research on community forestry and associated value chains under Activity 2.5 has not yet been articulated (Output 24 due Oct 2014). A good report has been prepared on the proposed silvicultural trials, but the proposed social research and value chain activities are yet to be identified.

The planned methodology for Objective 1 and 2 includes work in satellite districts, which has not yet commenced. While it is very appropriate that the research activities at the core locations be well bedded down first, it is not clear whether or not this component of the research design can be realistically implemented with the available resources. This issue is complicated by the significant decline in the exchange rate (AUD/NRS) in the 18 months since the project started. The review team identified some useful demonstration activities in Sindhu Palchock (from NAFP) that could be reactivated at relatively low cost, but the project team needs to consider this component further over the next 12 months.

**Objective 3**, on improving the productivity of and equitable access to underutilised and abandoned agricultural lands (Under Utilised Land – UUL) is probably the most challenging component of the project, but it could potentially provide some of the most significant contributions from the project. Under Activity 3.1, quantitative and qualitative baseline information has been prepared and a good report on the qualitative understanding of status of under-utilised lands across the six research sites has been prepared. Reports have also been prepared on the drivers and dynamics of under-utilised land in the Middle Hills, but the household case studies on land access, use and abandonment have not yet been completed (Output 42). It is now clear that there are two key stakeholder groups: absentee landowners and the land poor people in the area where the under-utilised land exists; and that the design approach of focussing this on the same six sites as the work under Objectives 1 and 2 is perhaps not appropriate given the available resources and challenges of establishing action research trials relevant to this Objective. The review workshop devoted some time to considering how to refocus this research to achieve the most useful results with the resources available.

The project has not yet established a website but has produced a large number of reports which are stored on the project’s internal web based communications site “Basecamp”.

1. ***Review and analysis of project reports and papers completed to date***

An impressive number of 53 papers and reports have been produced by the project team up to December 2014. Nearly half of these have been papers or posters for journals, conferences or workshops (Table 1). Overall, a substantial body of information has been accumulated in a relatively short period. Much of this is in the nature of assessments and summations of the current state of knowledge of Community Forestry (CF), Agroforestry (AF) and Under-Utilised Land (UUL), and this is an excellent basis for identifying and testing best-bet innovations for improving livelihoods and food security during the next couple of years. These reports (see Appendix 3 for a complete listing) document the project’s thinking and action. The preparation of most of these has been guided by activities set out in the project design and they have contributed to some of the major project outputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of report/paper | Number |
| Project documents | 2 |
| Baseline surveys | 4 |
| Activity/meeting/workshop reports | 18 |
| Journal/workshop/conference papers and posters | 22 |
| Draft discussion/research papers, suitable for future publication | 7 |
| Total | 53 |

***Table 1. Approximation of different categories of reports and papers produced.***

Six papers and four posters covering a range of agroforestry issues were presented at the World Congress on Agroforestry in New Delhi in February 2014. Four papers were contributed to the 6th National Community Forestry Workshop in Kathmandu in June 2014. This is quite a substantial contribution so soon after the project commenced, although most of the papers drew on pre-existing knowledge of project partners. These two conferences / workshops were useful vehicles for the project to announce its presence in the region, and the high quality of the presentations should ensure that the work of the project is taken seriously in both the scientific and policy arenas.

The regular National Community Forestry Workshops in Nepal (held at 4-5 year intervals) are important venues for policy dialogue, so exposure of the project’s activities at this workshop was very timely. Interestingly, three of the four papers presented under the project’s name at the workshop focused on issues associated with commercialising forest products from private land and community forests. This probably reflects the importance of this topic in the current policy discourse, something the project is uniquely placed to address during the coming years. It is difficult to judge how influential these papers were in shaping policy discussions and workshop outputs, but this important connection between science and policy is being well addressed by the project.

Several of the workshop papers contributed by ACIAR project staff also addressed the impediments faced by CFUGs and private tree growers in harvesting and marketing tree and forest products and thus gaining the full benefits from the efforts they have put in to improving the extent and quality of tree cover across the Middle Hills. There is a tremendous opportunity for trees and forests in communal and private lands to contribute much more to income generation and livelihood improvement, but this opportunity is being lost. This is an important policy issue and one that the project is in a good position to address.

The four baseline surveys (one overall quantitative survey and three qualitative surveys focusing on AF, CF and UUL) consumed a large amount of human and financial resources, but they do contain a great deal of useful information. One of the stated objectives of these surveys was to obtain a baseline against which progress can be measured. It will be interesting to return to these surveys towards the end of the project and see whether this can indeed be done. It will also be interesting to reflect on the massive data base obtained from the surveys and see how much of this is drawn on to inform activities during the project (and conversely, how much is not used).

While the total number of papers produced has been impressive, there is some room for improvement. Several reports and papers do not have dates on them, which will make it difficult in the future to go back through project archives to track progress and performance. In some documents the scientific rigour needs to be tightened up considerably. For example, it is frequently difficult to interpret the meaning behind some of the quantitative data that is presented, leading to a degree of confusion in the mind of the reader. Some of the reports lend themselves to journal and other forms of publication, but many are in early draft form and require additional data and further refining before being in a form suitable for submission.

The next year or so should see a significant number of quality papers submitted to conferences and journals. This raises the desirability of having a planned approach to preparing journal articles and some form of internal review process before papers are sent to journals. At some point, it will be desirable to establish a project web site where significant documents can be posted for wider access to the results coming from the project.

1. ***Reflections on aspects of the original project design and implementation approaches***
   1. Project design

The focus of the project (i.e. linking improvement in agroforestry and community forestry systems to enhancement of livelihoods and food security) was considered at the design stage to lend itself to research, and nothing has changed since project inception to alter that view. This topic is high on the policy agenda of the Nepal Government. The design has stood the test of time in terms of its overall structure and still makes logical sense. The institutional and biophysical context within which the project is set was appropriately identified at the design stage and is largely unchanged. The final project design identified six key research questions that need to be addressed in order to improve livelihoods from agro-forestry and community forestry, and experience since inception suggests that there is little need to modify these substantially. They remain relevant, but could be tweaked a bit if the project team felt the need to sharpen their focus in terms of guiding the research activities.

Based on experience since the commencement of the project, the three objectives and six outcomes in the original design are still appropriate, but the large number of planned activities (and their associated 51 outputs) was probably over-ambitious given the overall complexity, budget and time frame of the project. It could be useful to identify a relatively small number of “flagship” high priority activities and associated outputs that are considered “must do” to answer the research questions and achieve the desired outcomes. These can then be given focused attention during the remainder of the project.

Part of the design methodology proposed working intensively with six Community Forest User Groups (CFUGs) in Kabhre and Lamjung Districts (Category A sites), 18 secondary collaborating CFUGs in the same districts (Category B sites), and a further 24 satellite CFUGs in the adjacent districts of Sindhu Palchok and Kaski (Category C sites). Most field work to date has concentrated in the six Category A sites, although the baseline surveys included the Category B sites. Some training activities and interaction with Agroforestry farmers has also extended into Category B sites, and work is expected to expand further into these collaborating sites in the coming years.

However, work in the 18 Category B sites in Lamjung and Kabhre districts as well as in the satellite districts have not commenced, partly because of the high transaction costs associated with working with so many individual communities, partly due to limitations in available human and financial resources and partly due to delays in getting approvals to commence community forestry interventions with CFUGs. It seems unlikely that this scaling up work, as originally proposed, can be undertaken in the current phase of the project. One possibility to facilitate some scaling up could be to re-establish the silvicultural demonstration trials in Kabhre Palanchok and Sindhu Palchok Districts that were established by the Nepal Australia Forestry Project during the 1980s and for which there is a solid data base available including several re-measures. The communities in these sites are familiar with working with projects to demonstrate silvicultural practices in community forests, thus reducing the transaction costs.

In the original project design it was envisaged that the UUL theme would operate in the six primary research sites (Category A sites). However, it has become evident that there is a wide diversity of approaches that are being taken by a diverse group of people to improve productivity of UUL. In order to sample this diversity it will be necessary to de-couple some of the UUL theme’s activities from the six primary research sites and extend them more widely. This theme has considerable potential to contribute to improving productivity of Nepal’s rural lands as the country moves ever faster from a subsistence-oriented agriculture to a market-linked one, and as land abandonment increases. The policy and practical ramifications from research into this theme could be very far reaching.

* 1. The project’s internal communication platform “Basecamp”

The “Basecamp” software package has been adopted as the main platform for collaboration and communication within the project. It is an electronic location to share files, have discussions, collaborate on documents, assign tasks, and check dates for meetings, deadlines, etc. Basecamp stores everything securely in the cloud and can be accessed at anytime from anywhere. The site is subdivided by sub projects and major activities, which makes it easy for people with different roles and responsibilities to communicate and work together.

Basecamp is a very decentralised and user driven platform. To facilitate effective management of the site, the project administrator initially invites individuals to join particular discussion threads, so not all researchers have access to all parts of the platform. However, individual researchers can initiate a discussion thread and invite others to participate.

It has proven to be an extremely useful and effective platform for communication, particularly given the large number of project partners scattered across many locations in several cities and countries. It has overcome the frequent problem associated with complex project structures where some individual researchers and groups feel that they are not fully informed about what is going on. Communication on Basecamp is open and transparent and stakeholders have access to all discussions and decisions that are relevant to their work. Although Basecamp is widely used by project researchers, not all the researchers are using it to record their conversations.

* 1. Linking of biophysical and social/institutional elements

Integration of biophysical and social aspects was seen as an important part of the project design. This did provide some challenges in the early stages of implementation when there were indications that these two threads might run in parallel without functional integration. This challenge was met with sensitive and effective leadership and recognition of the need to work together. Results from initial field activities and other research tasks are shared on Basecamp and there is ample opportunity for all partners to have input into the design and analysis of activities. This seems to have ensured that biophysical and social/institutional issues are well integrated into planning, action and analysis, although there will be an on-going need for sensitive management to ensure that these two aspect of the project are integrated effectively.

* 1. Consideration of the participatory action research methodology

The project adopted action research as an explicit operational modality, and this has played out in various ways. As reports have been drafted, they have been posted on Basecamp and made available for comment to all who have access to each theme. Basecamp has proven to be a useful vehicle for considered reflection and comment, leading to the next cycle of planning and action. It has been particularly useful given the geographically dispersed nature of the project partners. The regular planning meetings called by theme leaders and others are also used as platforms for explicit reflection and feedback on virtually all aspects of the project’s operations. It is fair to conclude that action research is well integrated into the operational thinking and action of the project, certainly at the level of the key project staff. It is less clear the extent to which this has applied with villagers in the project field sites.

* 1. Engagement of partners and key stakeholders in project activities

A major part of the project design was the involvement of 10 partners and collaborators in the project. They span three countries (Nepal, Indonesia and Australia) and multiple organisations. This initially proved difficult to manage in several ways, including overall coordination and budget allocation. The original design identified Dr Yam Malla (IUCN Country Representative) as the in-country project coordinator. Having a high level official from an international NGO to lead and coordinate activities was an appropriate strategy at the beginning of the project, particularly to regularly liaise with senior Nepal government officials to facilitate the recognition of the project within the government and obtain the various approvals needed for the project to become operational. Dr Malla performed these essential tasks admirably.

At the first annual meeting (in January 2014) it was recognised that coordinating project activities across three research themes with multiple Nepali partners required a much greater time commitment than Yam Malla was able to provide due to his significant non-ACIAR project responsibilities as IUCN Country Representative. The RPM and senior Australian researchers undertook a transparent selection process and, from three applicants from different partner organisations, appointed Dr Naya Paudel to the position. The process used for the selection ensured that the selected person had legitimacy and support from the key partners to undertake this important in-country coordination role. Yam Malla continues to provide strategic input to the project and IUCN continues to host the project in Nepal.

The appointment of Naya Paudel as National Project Leader (in-country coordinator) has gone a long way to resolving the overall coordination problems experienced once field activities got underway. Initial budgeting issues seem to have now largely resolved themselves since the partners have developed a greater appreciation of the collaborative nature of the ACIAR project and its mandate to support in-country research.

The intention of the design was to create a strong sense of ownership of the research agenda by the Nepali researchers. It is clear that this has indeed happened, and the National and Thematic Leaders have taken on dominant coordination and implementation roles. The project is essentially run from Nepal with oversight, guidance and some technical input from Australia.

* 1. Conducting activities within selected Community Forestry User Groups

At the beginning of the project it was assumed that approval of the project by the Director General of the Department of Forests and dialogue with the District Forest Officers (DFOs) in the two project districts would be sufficient to enable project staff to implement the project activities with the six CFUGs. However, due to a number of changes in the people who held these positions and a cumbersome bureaucracy the official approval (a letter from the Director General to the DFOs) to conduct participatory inventories and silvicultural trials took 18 months to achieve. In addition the Operational Plans for some of the selected CFUGs had expired and this required considerable consultation and dialogue by project staff to advance the process of renewing the Operational Plans. Without a valid Operational Plan the CFUGs have no legal basis to harvest products from their community forests. However, the District Forest Offices have very limited resources and funding to conduct the work necessary to renew the Operational Plans.

During the project the review team met with the Lamjung District Forest Officer (Mr Chandra Man Dangol) and the Kabhre District Forest Officer (Mr Ganesh Rai) who also attended the workshop on 21 January together with his AFO Krishna Thapa. The Lamjung DFO seems supportive of the project and has visited the project sites and supports the silvicultural trial planned for Jita/Taxar. At the review workshop, the Kabhre DFO indicated that he sees this project as an innovative model with forestry stakeholders working together that could be a model for other places in Nepal. He indicated that he supports increased harvesting by the CFUGs, as Kabhre district cannot meet the current demand for timber, but he is concerned that many of the CFUGs are protection oriented and don’t have a good understanding of “scientific” forest management. He wants the project to help establish 12 thinning and harvesting trials in the district. He is clearly very interested in working with the project in this area, something that the project team should capitalise on.

One of the selected study sites in Kabhre Palanchok (Chaubas) has a community sawmill that was established by the previous Australian forestry project in 1996, but it has not operated since 2011 because of a series of conflicts. The project staff and the Kabhre District Forest Office have put considerable effort into meetings with the relevant CFUGs and the sawmill management committee in order to resolve the conflicts and recommission the sawmill to enable commercial timber harvesting and processing to recommence in the Chaubas community forests. At the time of the mid-term review these issues had not been resolved. However there was very strong support from the Chief of Community Forestry Division and the DFO to work with the community to achieve this outcome.

1. ***Impact pathways for adoption of project outputs***

All three research themes have made substantial progress in tracking activities along impact pathways that were identified in the project design. Appendix 4 summarises progress and challenges from the perception of each theme as well as comments from the major institutional partners. Much of the past year was taken up with carrying out the four baseline surveys (one quantitative and three qualitative). The coming year should see a big increase in field activities, and the results of these should give a clearer indication of progress and likely impact.

The ultimate impact of results coming from the project’s field activities and uptake by farmers and CFUGs will depend to a large extent on effective collaboration with district level government officials, particularly the DFOs and their staff. Ideally, when project staff undertake field work, the district level government staff should be aware of what activities are to take place, and when practical, they should work in the field together. An example was noted where the Kabhre DFO (Mr Ganesh Rai) was unaware of the meetings associated with the mid-term review and had not received an invitation to attend when the review team met him six days before the workshop. Improved collaboration with district staff is essential to ensure smooth running of field activities and to enhance the project’s impact.

1. ***Mechanisms that support government level interactions and policy dialogue***

8.1 Project advisory committee

Interaction of the project with the Government of Nepal was formalised through the establishment of a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) during 2014, with clear terms of reference. Its main function is to act as a steering mechanism that helps to mainstream project activities into the Government of Nepal's plans and programmes, at both national and district levels.

The PAC is intended to be a permanent entity throughout the life of the project, with fixed members, including government officials, a FEOCFUN representative and project leaders. On occasions it may visit field sites and monitor the overall programme. The PAC is intended to meet twice each year. Two meetings have been held, one in August 2014, and one in December 2014. In addition, one field visit has been made, to the Chaubas sawmill, in January 2015.

8.2 District level coordination

Coordination of field activities in the project districts of Lamjung and Kabhre Palanchok has been assisted by the establishment of a District Level Coordination Committee (DLCC) in each district. The DLCCs have terms of reference, legitimise the project’s work in the districts and facilitate collaboration with key district officials from forestry, agriculture, livestock and environment departments. Membership also includes district FECOFUN officials and Forest Action.

The DLCCs are intended to meet quarterly, but this frequency has not yet occurred and may not be achievable. Since the project’s inception one meeting has been held in Kabhre and two in Lamjung. In addition, one monitoring visit was undertaken to Jita in Lamjung, and one is planned for Dhunkarka in Kabhre. While there have been fewer meetings of the DLCC than intended in the terms of reference, the important thing is for project staff to interact regularly with district officials so that the project’s activities can be readily understood and supported by government officials and, where possible, integrated into district programmes.

8.3 The EnLiFT Policy Lab approach

In Nepal’s land use sectors, research based knowledge has increased in recent years but, despite the existing plethora of policy forums, seminars and workshops, policy is frequently formulated with limited use of this knowledge and in isolation from key stakeholders. While the PAC and DLCC do provide opportunities for policy dialogue, their main functions are coordination, steering and mainstreaming project activities into government plans and programmes.

The EnLiFT policy team has reviewed a wide variety of research-policy practices, both in Nepal and elsewhere, and developed the “EnLiFT policy lab” concept. The policy lab seeks to enhance research-policy linkages by fostering a dialogue between researchers and policy actors around a specific theme or themes in a non-threatening, participatory environment and, in doing so, to bring policy-relevant research to the direct attention of policy actors. The policy lab creates a platform in which disenchanted community activists can engage in dialogue with key policy actors, in a setting in which research evidence becomes a basis for deliberation and negotiation.

Four outcomes are anticipated from the effective operation of EnLiFT policy labs, and these are:

1. a deeper understanding of selected policy problems related to land management (CF/AF/UUL) and food security;
2. identification of possible solutions to identified policy challenges;
3. identification of evidence and analytical gaps in relation to the priority policy challenges identified by the policy actors; and
4. fostering of research-policy links by engaging policy actors in the EnLiFT research process.

One policy lab has been conducted so far and Box 1 lists the characteristics of the process.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 1. Key characteristics of the first EnLiFT Policy Lab**   * The focus was limited to a theme and substantive discussion focused on previously identified issues including: Operational Plan back log, inventory and CF-DFO relations. * The number of participants was kept to an appropriate size, with a diversity of actors - government, researchers and civil society, including the FECOFUN chair. * Senior policy decision makers from the government participated (three joint secretaries and one National Planning Commission member) and they brought very diverse perspectives. * A relaxed atmosphere was created, with good use of humour and metaphors to break the ice. * Long presentations were avoided and policy problems were illustrated through field level insights and examples from the project’s activities. * There was open and frank contribution by all participants and actors with conflicting views were able to learn from each other, rather than just advocating their own predetermined positions. * There was a good balance of skills in the facilitation team – government service, research communication, field experience and note taking. |

Prior to the commencement of the policy lab, two to four specific policy challenges (crafted through multiple sources of hard evidence and quotes of actors experiencing challenges on the ground) were identified. During the lab, these challenges were presented to 7-10 participants representing diverse policy actors (seven different policy stakes have been identified - from high level government officials to community activists, representing multiple views and stakes). The policy actors were encouraged to creatively and constructively engage in finding solutions and indicate specific gaps for further research. Unlike other policy forums, where participants have a tendency to 'sell' or advocate their positions, a policy lab is designed to foster constructive problem solving by catalysing evidence-informed dialogue among policy actors. All participants in the first policy lab found it a useful experience and requested a continuation of this approach. The research team identified some deficiencies in the process used in the first policy lab and identified ways to improve the process.

1. ***Lessons Learned to Date (to assist with ACIAR’s design of other projects)***

* The scoping work undertaken before the project, particularly the preparation of the five background papers and the stakeholder workshop, enabled identification of the project partners, established the scope of the research, helped to establish national support for the project and built a good degree of ownership of the project by the partners.
* For a project of this complexity, and particularly where scientists from different partner agencies work together in teams undertaking thematic areas of research, the in-country coordinator needs to have a very high proportion of their time allocated to project activities to provide effective leadership and coordination of project activities.
* When a project’s in-country activities are largely implemented through scientists working for NGOs rather than government agencies, effort needs to be put into negotiating a common salary payment arrangement with output based payments linked to an agreed work plan.
* The frequent changes to senior personnel within the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (Secretary, Director General of the Department of Forests, Chief of Community Forestry Division and District Forest Officers in the two project districts) presents challenges, including maintaining the necessary understanding of the project and facilitating the necessary approvals for activities to be undertaken with Community Forest User Groups.
* The project’s internet- based communication system (Basecamp) is a very effective tool for enabling all partners to contribute to the design and analysis of activities, to facilitate reflective learning and to keep track of the contributions of different scientists.
* Many projects invest significant resources into baseline surveys. It is important that this investment is designed in a way that enables the identification of trends and that it provides a basis for evaluating the changes in selected indicators that result from project activities.
* The policy lab process being trialled by this project is an innovative way to try to influence policy outcomes that could have application in other ACIAR projects.

1. ***Overall findings of the Mid-Term Review***
2. While the project has experienced some challenges during the first 19 months, ACIAR considers that overall progress is satisfactory, that some very good achievements have been made and that the partners are committed to achieving the planned activities in the remaining three years. The Nepali researchers have a strong ownership of the research agenda and the National and Thematic Leaders have taken on dominant coordination and implementation roles.
3. The mid-term review provided a good mechanism to review progress in a participatory manner with the project team. The quality of the presentations was very high and most of them were delivered by lead scientists from Nepali partner organisations. The early timing of the mid-term review was appropriate for this project and, as a result of the review, the project team is recasting its work program under a number of integrated flagships with revised outputs for consideration by ACIAR.
4. There are already some good preliminary results emerging from project activities including the baseline survey reports, the modelling system, the framework for research into community forestry innovations and the initial agroforestry trials.
5. This is a complex project, with activities implemented by teams from 10 partner organisations. It is well led by Ian Nuberg from University of Adelaide and the project management team, particularly the country coordinator Naya Paudel. The review team recognises the significant efforts that have gone into dealing with challenges that were unforseen at the commencement of the project and establishing effective management arrangements. There is strong evidence of good collaboration across the project team and effective mechanisms for coordinating activities across the seven Nepali partners. While the partnerships are going quite well, there are some issues with some partners that could impact on the overall level of success of the project if they are not addressed.
6. There have been some logistical difficulties in implementing activities that require input from people in different organisations. Some partners and or collaborators have ill-defined roles and it is not clear what specific contributions they can make to the project. Addressing these issues will require careful discussion to ensure that the strengths of individual organisations can be harnessed to enhance their contributions to the project.
7. The overall project design is well structured and logical and the three objectives and six research questions in the original design were confirmed as appropriate by the project team. However, the large number of planned activities (and their associated 51 outputs), as well as the concept of satellite districts, were probably over-ambitious given the nature of community engagement activities required, the project budget (including challenges from the depreciating exchange rate) and time frame of the project.
8. Field trips to Lamjung and Kabhre/Sindhu/Dolakha districts indicated that Nepal is rapidly moving to a market-oriented economy with near subsistence agriculture being much less common than in the past. All of the small roadside villages of old have transformed into large urban centres with heavy demands for agricultural produce. The amount of trees in the landscape has increased dramatically in the past 30 years and these private and community forests could contribute much more towards enhanced livelihoods for rural communities. Larger private entrepreneurs are emerging as evidenced by the goat farm at Jitar Taxar and modern plywood mills at Charikot and Banepa. However, the market-focussed opportunities are not being fully realised within the project sites, due to a range of constraints including: knowledge and use of appropriate technologies; existence of entrepreneurs; and the prevailing policy and administrative arrangements. The project is in a good position to develop practical management arrangements and policy options to help improve this situation, but it must make sure that it is addressing tomorrow's issues and not those of yesterday.
9. The value chain activities under both Objective 1 and Objective 2 are behind schedule and it is not yet clear what activities will be undertaken to help improve the functioning of the selected value chains or to enhance the economic benefits that flow to the farmers and CFUGs. Strengthening the connection of these systems to the markets is an important part of the project, so greater progress is needed over the next six months to deliver Outputs 4 and 26, both of which are overdue.
10. While the project’s activities at the Chaubas site have required considerable resourcing, it is considered important and likely to generate both useful lessons on strengthening community institutions and substantial economic benefits to the participating CFUGs if the community sawmill is able to recommence and sustain its operations.
11. Project activities at the 18 Category B sites in Lamjung and Kabhre districts and in the satellite districts have not yet commenced, partly because of the high transaction costs associated with working with so many individual communities. While it may not be practical to achieve all the activities originally planned, this work remains an important part of the project design related to achieving an appropriate level of impact from the investment by ACIAR.
12. The location of sites considered to be Under Utilised Land (UUL), the wide diversity of approaches being taken to improve its productivity and the challenges of working with stakeholders who are not always present at these sites means that it is not logical to apply the same research design construct used for Objectives 1 and 2 to the research on UUL under Objective 3.
13. The quantitative and qualitative baseline survey reports contain a great deal of useful information, but the reports produced do not given any indication of the trends over time. Knowledge of trends is important to help ensure that the interventions chosen take account of the changing demographics within communities and focus on the emerging opportunities, rather than scientists’ perceptions of what might be appropriate. A subset of the baseline information should provide the basis against which the project can measure its impact.
14. The project design is based on integration of biophysical and social research using a participatory action research methodology. The review found that the biophysical and social/institutional issues are well integrated into planning, action and analysis and that action research is being used generally to guide the strategic and operational thinking and actions of the project team. It is less clear to what extent the action research philosophy is applied with villagers in the project field sites. On the basis of feedback received from a number of external stakeholders, the review team considers that the biophysical research, particularly the implementation of silvicultural trails in community forests, is important and needs to be progressed by the project team.
15. Effective engagement of Ministry and District Forest Office staff in project activities is fundamental to the success of activities related to enhancing benefits from community forests. The frequent changes to senior personnel within the Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation (Secretary, Director General of the Department of Forests, Chief of Community Forestry Division and District Forest Officers in the two project districts) presents a number of challenges, including maintaining the necessary support for the project and facilitating the necessary approvals to enable activities to be undertaken with Community Forest User Groups. However, at the time of the mid-term review strong support for the project’s activities was evident from the Chief of CFD and the DFOs.
16. The trialling of “policy labs,” is a potentially effective approach to enhance the effectiveness of policy dialogue and thereby the policy impact that the project achieves. Effective policy dialogue will require engagement with a wide range of stakeholders, some from outside the existing project stakeholder group, particularly when issues related to agriculture and land use policy are discussed. The policy labs complement but don’t replace the interactions that occur through the Project Advisory Committee and District Level Coordination Committees.
17. Considering the early stage of the project’s implementation, the project team has produced a large number of reports, many of which are of high quality, and overall these represent a substantial body of information. However, the quality of some important reports could be improved particularly in terms of the clarity of information and having good summaries. In some cases, this effort has been at the expense of preparing the scheduled output reports that are important to guide the implementation of the project (Outputs 12 and 28 are examples of these strategic reports).
18. The project has the basis for implementing effective Monitoring and Evaluation, provided the management team establishes the M&E framework soon and then tests it to prepare the preliminary impact analysis report for all project activities (Output 32) that is due Jan 2016.
19. While the major focus of the project is on research findings of direct relevance to Nepal, several of the outcomes have relevance for a wider audience. For example, many countries that have adopted community based forestry as a major forest management modality have put in place regulatory frameworks that are more constraining than enabling. This has resulted in a situation where communities are severely constrained from managing forests to maximise the benefits that they receive. The outcomes from the community forestry theme on research into operational plans, silviculture and markets will be of considerable relevance to many other countries and will provide useful input into global and regional policy debates.
20. ***Specific issues and recommendations***

*Issues that need consideration by the project management team:*

1. The project team should consider identifying a relatively small number of “flagship” high priority activities and associated outputs that are considered “must do” to answer the research questions and to achieve the most substantial outcomes from project activities.
2. A clearly articulated plan for the agroforestry research needs to be developed and communicated to ACIAR, so that it is clear what the interventions are at each site and what value chain activities will be conducted to support these interventions.
3. The planned participatory action research on community forestry and value chains for the six Category A research sites needs to be developed and communicated to ACIAR.
4. Enhanced effort is required on the value chain and market research under Objectives 1 and 2 to enhance the economic benefits that flow to the farmers and CFUGs.
5. A planned approach for activities at category C sites and in satellite districts needs to be developed and communicated to ACIAR, that considers available resources and balances community expectations with achieving appropriate levels of impact from both primary research sites and the additional sites to support scaling up goals.
6. Re-establishing the silvicultural demonstration trials established by the Nepal Australia Forestry Project during the 1980s in Kabhre Palanchok and Sindhu Palchok Districts would be a cost effective way of enhancing the scientific impact and scaling up of project outputs.
7. The project team should foster opportunities to strengthen collaboration with DFO staff, including ensuring they are fully aware of project activities taking place, when practical they should participate in field work and efforts should be made to support the Kabhre DFO’s request to establish 12 thinning and harvesting trials in the district.
8. For the research on Under Utilised Land, on the basis of the experience to date from project activities, the project team should revise the research design, planned activities and intended outputs for this Objective and submit these to ACIAR for approval. The project should aim for achievable results that can inform and stimulate debate and further research on this important topic.
9. The project should continue to trial innovative ways of enhancing policy dialogue consistent with the resources available in the project, develop a holistic plan for the EnLiFT policy labs and clarify the expected policy interactions that will occur in the Project Advisory Committee and the EnLiFT Policy Labs.
10. In implementing its activities, it is important for the project team to find ways to demonstrate its contributions to the new Australian aid policies, particularly empowering women and girls and engaging the private sector. Given the apparent emerging private sector opportunities in the project districts, the project should undertake a more systematic analysis of these opportunities and seek to find private sector businesses that are willing to collaborate with the project.
11. To enhance the scientific impacts from the project, the project team should develop a planned approach to the identification of topics for journal articles, develop a peer review process and establish a project website to facilitate wider dissemination of project reports. This should also include identifying opportunities to inform regional and global audiences of approaches to make regulatory regimes for community based forestry more enabling and less constraining, and so empower local communities to maximise their benefits.
12. The project team should ensure that it is gathering sufficient information to adequately document the impacts that will have arisen from the project activities in the final report. This needs to include the economic, social and policy benefits arising from project activities.

**Don Gilmour**

**External Reviewer**

**Tony Bartlett  
Forestry Research Program Manager**

22 February 2015

**Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for Mid Term Review FST/2011/076**

The Mid Term Review for ACIAR forestry project FST/2011/076 “Enhancing livelihoods and food security from agroforestry and community forestry in Nepal” will be conducted in Nepal in January 2015. The review will be conducted jointly by the ACIAR Forestry Research Program Manager, Mr Tony Bartlett, and an external reviewer, Dr Don Gilmour.

The underlying philosophy that ACIAR uses for mid-term reviews is that they will be undertaken in a way that facilitates collaborative reflection and learning rather than in a way that seeks to judge the effectiveness of the project’s activities. The mid-term review process involves the following components:

1. A stock take of how the project is going against the planned activities and milestones;
2. Reflection with the project team and other stakeholders on the project, its activities and achievements to date, the lessons so far (including on project design, technical and social outputs);
3. Consideration of what is most important to achieve within the remaining project timeframe with the available resources;
4. Consideration of what (if anything) needs to change in relation to project design (including activities, outputs, milestone dates, budget allocations etc)

The review will be conducted in five stages:

1. Consideration of project documents, including an updated table of progress against the planned activities and milestones, information on capacity building activities and any relevant output reports (done before the in-country review)
2. Field visit to Lamjung District to gain context of the implementation of project activities, views of user groups and farmers and District stakeholders;
3. Formal Mid-Term Review Workshop in Kathmandu, including an overview of the project’s progress, presentations of activities, interim results and any issues under each of the three Objectives, discussion of the project team’s reflections, agreement on desired achievements, recommendations on any changes and interim findings;
4. Preparation of a Mid-Term Review report (joint report from RPM and external reviewer);
5. Project team’s response to any recommendations from the Mid Term Review.

The RPM will be responsible for the following tasks in the mid-term review:

* Analysis of project context and progress over the first two years;
* Identification of key lessons learned (from an ACIAR perspective);
* Overall findings from the Mid-Term Review;
* Articulation of the recommendations from the Mid-Term Review.

The External Reviewer will be responsible for the following tasks in the mid-term review:

* Review and analysis of project reports and papers completed to date;
* Reflections on the appropriateness of the original project design and approaches;
* Consideration of the participatory action research methodology;
* Engagement of partners and key stakeholders in project activities;
* Reflection on the expected impact pathway for project activities;
* Consideration of the policy advisory committee and contributions to the National Community Forestry Workshop;
* Identification of approaches and systems used in this project that might have wider application within ACIAR projects.

**Appendix 2: Program for Mid-Term Review and**

**Action Research Planning Meeting #3**

Annotations in red are suggested for discussion:

* Activities, Outputs and Documents in MTR bundle

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Wednesday 21 Mid-Term Review**  **Venue:** | | **Chair & Speakers** |
| 9:00-9:20 | **Opening:**   * Welcome and introduction, Ian Nuberg * Purpose of MTR from Tony Bartlett * My role in MTR from Don Gilmour * preliminary reflections from field trips by DG & TB | Deepak D Tamang (MC for the day)  Ian Nuberg  Tony Bartlett  Don Gilmour |
| 9:20-10:50  10 minutes | **Progress: May 2013 - December 2014**  ***Project overview:*** The original proposed map of project activity and outputs, and our actual progress across this map. Summary of the main issues that emerged and how we dealt with them. | Tony Bartlett (chair)  Ian Nuberg |
| 10 minutes | **Community engagement and action research:** Report on action research processes for engagement with communities across all 6 sites and 3 research themes.  *Across all research activities*  *Outputs 2,19,39*  *MTR docs: 2* | Krishna Paudel |
| 10 minutes | **Baseline survey:** a brief synthesis of the Quantitative baseline work and the core useful knowledge generated by it.  *Activities 1.1, 2.1 & 3.1*  *Outputs 2,19,39*  *MTR docs: 3* | Deepak D Tamang |
| 30 minutes | **Action research in Agroforestry**  Qualitative baseline survey of farm households  Outline of the engagement with participating farmers. This will include the nursery work, training, and on-going & proposed AF trials and data collection.  *Activity 1.1, 1.5*  *Outputs:1, 3, 8, 12, 13, 14*  *MTR docs: 2, 3, 10, 12, 18, 19, 20, 21, 30, 38,* | Bishnu H Pandit |
| 10:45-12:30  30 minutes | **Action research in Community Forestry**  Qualitative baseline survey of CFUGs  Outline of the engagement with participating CFUGs & DFOs in the process of Activity 2.5. This report will present the agreements made with CFUGs and proposed on-ground activity such as the Silviculture trials and integration with the institutional work.  *Activity 2.1, 2.5*  *Outputs:19, 22, 31, 33, 39,*  *MTR docs: 5, 6, 11, 13, 25* | Naya S Paudel |
| 10:50-11:15 | **Morning tea break** |  |
| 11:15-12:30  30 minutes | **Action research in Under-Utilised Land**  Qualitative baseline survey of UUL leading to summary of current understanding on drivers and dynamics of land use. This includes the work on UUL case studies and GIS. This will lead to a discussion on possible action research implementation on UUL as part of Activity 3.4  *Activity 3.1, 3.2 & 3.4*  *Outputs: 39, 41, 43,*  *MTR Docs: 6, 32, 39, 43, 44,* | Yam Malla |
| 15 minutes | **Market analysis:** framework, methods and results of market analysis for both AF & CF products. Proposal for further work to complete this task in preparation for implementation.  *Activities 1.2, 1.5, 2.3 & 2.5*  *Outputs 4,12, 26*  *MTR Docs:8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 35, 36, 37,* | Bishnu H Pandit  &/or Aulia Perdana |
| 15 minutes | **Institutional & Policy analysis:** framework, methods and results of institutional analysis for both AF & CF systems. This includes the work on review of Operational Plans & working with Chaubas mill. Proposal for further work to complete this task in preparation for implementation of institutional innovations. Framework, methods and progress of the EnLiFT Policy Lab. Proposal for further work to complete this task.  *Activities 1.3, 2.2, & 2.4*  *Outputs: 22, 28, 30*  *MTR Docs: 11, 22, 23, 24, 40* | Krishna K Shrestha &/or Hemant Ohja |
| 15 minutes | **Forest-Farm modelling:** framework, methods and progress of the EnLiFT Model. Proposed work to complete this task including: integration with social research activities and data collection from field trials.  *Activity 1.4*  *Outputs: 7, 8, 9*  *MTR docs:7, 12, 17* | Edwin Cedamon  &/or Betha Lusiana |
| 12:30 – 13-15 | **LUNCH BREAK** |  |
| 13:15 -14:45  5 minutes each with 65 minutes discussion | **Research Leaders’ panel reflections**  Members of the Research Leaders’ forum will talk to the collated paper of individual reflections submitted to the Reviewers. This document is along these lines:  1. How has participatory action research has worked in practice?;  2. What are expected impacts and adoption pathways for project activities (using Adoption Pathways framework)?;  3. How appropriate is the original project design and approach?  Ian and/or Krishna will then present suggestions for changes to make project more efficient and effective: eg. Integrated Flagship activities; focus on active researchers.The Chair will lead a discussion that will contribute to preliminary recommendations. | Don Gilmour (chair) The panel:  Ian Nuberg  Krishna Shrestha  Yam Malla  Naya S Paudel  Bishnu H Pandit |
| 14:45-15:00 | **Afternoon tea** |  |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | **Review team feedback**  The Review Team will present their initial reactions to submitted documents, field trips, the research activity reports and the research leader panel’s reflections. | KK Shrestha (Chair)  Don Gilmour &  Tony Bartlett |
| 16:00-16:45 | Concluding remarks, thank-yous and arrangements | Naya S Paudel |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Thursday 22, Action Research Planning Meeting #3**  **Venue: ??** (smaller than Wednesday) | | **Chair & Speakers** |
| 9:00-9:15 | **Opening:**   * Introduction to program of the day * Expectations for outcome at end of day | Ian Nuberg |
| 9:15-9:45 | **Recapitulation of the MTR recommendations**  Summary of preliminary review feedback  Further thoughts following a good night’s sleep | Ian Nuberg (chair)  Krishna Shrestha  Don Gilmour & Tony Bartlett |
| 9:45-11:10  10 minutes  30 minutes  30 minutes  10 minutes | **Defining Flagship Activities**  Session introduction.  The objective of this session will be to re-structure the project so that:   * It is more efficient and effective; * Reflects the knowledge we have gained so far; * Responds to early feedback from MTR * Still meets the overarching goal and objectives as per the contract with ACIAR   Outline principles and criteria of flagships  There will be 2 steps:  Step 1]  , then breakout into 3 groups   * re-package the current list of activities into ***a small number of*** ***streamlined activities, or “flagships”*** that cross AF, CF and UUL * identify the key active researchers to participate in those activities   Groups present in plenary  Discussion and synthesis | Hemant Ojha (chair)  Krishna Shrestha  Ian Nuberg (facilitator)  Synthesis: Hemant Ojha |
| 11:10-11:30 | **Morning tea** |  |
| 11:30-12:55 | **Connecting outputs with flagships**  Step 2]  Session introduction  3 break out groups re-visit the 51 Outputs in the project proposal and to consider:   * What are core outputs? * Can they be framed better? * What is unnecessary? * What is missing?   Re-assign remaining outputs into the streamlined activities reached in step 1.   * Objective and outcome statements * Broad Gantt charts to reach the outputs that were allocated in the earlier session * Lists of active researchers and research leaders   Groups present in plenary  Discussion and synthesis | Krishna Shrestha (chair)  Hemant Ojha (facilitator)  Synthesis: Krishna Shrestha |
| 12:55-13:55 | **Lunch** |  |
| 13:55 – 14:55 | **Running the flagships**  The objective of this session is to gather some fundamental numbers that will be used to budget the research activity under the new flagship format.  Begin with general discussion on results from the morning sessions searching for consensus and confidence in results.  This will be followed by another break-out session where the teams attempt to make approximate work plans for pay periods 5 & 6 (ie 2015) with   * Persondays for each task * Specific field operating costs   Reporting back | Ian Nuberg (chair) |
| 14:55-15:10 | **Afternoon tea** |  |
| 15:10-16:40 | **Project management considerations**  As we are entering into the phase of intensive field-based action research, it is envisaged that there could be some small refinements in the way we work together and communicate.  The details of this session should become apparent from the MTR feedback | Ian Nuberg & Krishna Shrestha |
| 16:40-17:00 | **Concluding session** |  |

# Appendix 3: Project Progress at time of Mid-Term Review

**PART A: REPORT ON PROGRESS AGAINST PLANNED OUTPUTS**

Ian Nuberg - 6/02/2015

Black text = Annual report 7/06/2014

Red text = for Mid Term Review

## Objective 1: To improve the capacity of household based agroforestry systems to enhance livelihoods and food security

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Outputs/**  **Milestones** | **Planned**  **& *Actual***  **Completion Date** | **Comments** |
| **Activity 1.1:**  Identify baseline conditions and drivers of agroforestry practice and opportunities to improve productivity and increase income generation | O1: Workshop proceedings including a list of ‘best-bet’ innovations in agroforestry practice (e.g. tree species, tree-compatible commercial crops and management systems). (PC) | [Y1:Q1] | This ‘best-bet AF innovations” workshop was supposed to take place as part of Inception Workshop 12-17 May 2013 is reported in ref: 2013\_2. However, the team was not yet ready for that at the time. A preliminary document listing these is ref:2014\_21 . A complete document will be ready for ARP Meeting #2 (June 2014)  **Doc 1 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| O2: Report of baseline information for developing pilot sites for use in Activity 1.5. (PC) | [Y1:Q3]  *May 2014* | The baseline survey was undertake in 2013 / early 2014 and was split into a quantitative and qualitative components. There has been delay in delivery of the report due to the time taken to devise and collate the database. The draft reports for Qualitative baseline survey were delivered AF (2014\_38); CF (2014\_39) and UUL (2014\_40.  The report of the Quantitative Baseline Survey has also been delivered (2014-41), but more organised narrative reports is expected to presented at ARPM#2  **Docs 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| O3: Scientific publication describing drivers to farming systems, farmers existing agroforestry practice, and perceptions about limitations to their livelihoods across **6** distinct agro-ecological settings. (A) | [Y2:Q1]  *May 2014* | This is not ready yet because of the delay with the baseline survey. The report of the Quantitative Baseline Survey has also been delivered, but more organised narrative reports is expected to presented at ARPM#2 16) and 6th Community Forestry Workshop (see Table 5)  **Based on qualitative baseline data and review, one article has been published in Journal of Forest and Livelihood in Oct 2014. This can partly be claimed to be the achievement of this output. Doc 38 in MTR bundle**  **This is being developed from Doc 12 & 36 in MTR bundle. It will be further developed to submit as the 2014-15 KPI.** |
| **Activity 1.2:**  Analyse the markets and value-chains for products from agroforestry systems | O4: Report with short list of researchable existing and potential innovative market opportunities from both inside and outside Nepal that can be incorporated into agroforestry on private lands  (PC) | [Y1:Q4]  *Due April 2014, but late* | This activity group has not been working systematically to deliver this report. There are some working papers that need to be pulled together and discussed as part of ARP Meeting #2, before this report can be finalised  **Docs 8, 9, 10, 36 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| **Activity 1.3:**  Analyse policy, institutional and governance issues associated with improving livelihoods from agroforestry systems | O5: A policy discussion paper highlighting links between key governance variables and agroforestry contribution to livelihoods  (A leads, PC and ICRAF contribute) | [Y2:Q4]  *April 2015* | Not due  **Doc 36 in MTR bundle will be further developed to count as this output** |
| O6: A scientific paper demonstrating how prevailing policy, institutions and governance shape and determine the livelihoods and food security outcomes of agroforestry | [Y4:Q4]  *April 2017* | Not due |
| **Activity 1.4:**  Develop functioning models to inform improved interactions between farm and forest systems | O7: Report of model design workshop  (PC) | [Y1:Q1]  *July 2013* | This workshop was originally planned as part of Inception activities but the team was not ready. It was delayed until November 2013 for a special meeting in Bogor. The output is ref: 2013\_10 which was completed in December 2013.  **Doc 7 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| O8: Model of decision-making processes in land use  (A) | [Y1:Q4]  *Sep 2014* | This model requires more time to interrogate the information from the qualitative baseline study, so the expected delivery date has been delayed.  **While a specific ‘model of decision-making processes’ has not been built, the substantive value of this thinking is being written into the draft paper which is Doc 12 in MTR bundle**  **All the modelling attention has been directed to quantitative ENLIFT model. That model has been presented to the project’s social scientists to solicit their input on how to measure the impact of institutional and policy innovations. Developing a formal construct of farmer decision-making processes will become a part of that task.**  **The final result will be part of Outputs 10, 11, 17 and 18** |
| O9: Model of nutrient and energy flows in farm-forest system  (A) | [Y3:Q2]  *Oct 2015* | Well on track to achieve this  **Current status described in Doc 17 in MTR bundle**  **The model evolved from a ‘nutrient-energy flow’ model to a model of an ‘index of food security’ so that it can more effectively integrate with other research streams in the project.** |
| O10: Scientific publication quantifying nutrient and energy flows through the farm-forest system. (A) | pY3:Q3]  *Jan 2016* | Not due  **Doc 17 in MTR bundle is an outline of the model concept. Delivery of the publication will occur in 2016, but not by January** |
| O11: Scientific publication establishing the biophysical basis for sustainable agroforestry innovations  (A & PC) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |
| **Activity 1.5:**  Plan, implement and evaluate participatory action research of innovative agroforestry systems and market opportunities at 6 sites | O12: Report of proposed participative research designs and value-chain enhancements | [Y2:Q2]  *Dec 2014* | There has not been enough community engagement yet. So the due date has been set back to December 2014  **Docs 8, 9, 10 & 18 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| O13: 6 pilot sites of improved commercial agroforestry systems for demonstration purposes (PC) | [Y3:Q4]  *Apr 2016* | Not due  **Doc 18 in MTR bundle**  **Docs, 19, 20 & 21 outline demonstration trials being undertaken as part of this activity** |
| O14: Publication of appropriate agroforestry options for 6 agro-ecological zones(A) | [Y4:Q1]  *Jul 2016* | Not due  **Doc 45 provides some underpinning information that will go into the final publication.** |
| O15: A resource book and other extension products for farmers interested in new agroforestry and market opportunities  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y5:Q2]  *Oct 2017* | Not due.  However, SM Amatya & I Nuberg & Edwin Cedamon are currently writing an agroforestry textbook for the new university curriculum. This will be completed by end of 2014.  **Team worked on book for a week in November 2014, completion date now seen to be June 2015** |
| O16: Farmer-to-Farmer training of improved agroforestry systems (PC) | [Y5:Q3]  *Jan 2018* | Not due |
| O17: Recommendations for institutional and policy arrangements to enhance livelihoods through agroforestry (PC) | [Y5:Q3]  *Jan 2018* | Not due |
| O18: Recommendations for service provision to further the enhancement of livelihoods and food security from agroforestry (PC) | [Y5:Q3]  *Jan 2018* | Not due |

PC = partner country, A = Australia

# Objective 2: To improve the functioning of community forestry systems to enhance equitable livelihoods and food security of CFUG members.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Outputs/**  **Milestones** | **Completion Date** | **Comments** |
| **Activity 2.1:**  Analyse the status of community forestry systems and constraints to improving livelihoods and equitable benefit flows. | O19: Report of baseline information for developing pilot sites for use in Activity 2.5  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y1:Q4]  *Apr 2014* | In addition to baseline assessment, researchers are reviewing the literature both grey and scientific; collecting qualitative and quantitative data, undertaking preliminary analysis of findings and presenting in the conferences. These have enriched the baseline analysis report.  A draft qualitative baseline report has been produced and shared among the project team members (May 31st). After comments from reviewers, the report will be finalised.  **Docs 3 & 5 in MTR bundle** |
| O20: Discussion paper outlining progressive and regressive links between a) critical community level dynamics and b) resource management, access and utilization  (PC lead, A and ICRAF contribute) | [Y2:Q4]  *Apr 2015* | Not due |
| O21: A scientific paper highlighting key patterns of livelihood outomes from community forestry in the study sites  (A lead, PC and ICRAF contribute) | [Y3:Q4]  *Apr 2016* | Not due |
| **Activity 2.2:**  Identify innovative community forestry institutions and management practices | O22: Report summarising the innovative options for improved community forestry management for presented by three altitudinal zones  (PC lead, A and ICRAF contribute) | Y1:Q4  *Apr 2014* | This has not been completed yet.  CF team collecting data from project districts as well as from the national level. A report on CF innovations will be shared before the next ARP meeting (8-9 July).  **Doc 11 in MTR bundle submitted as this output** |
| O23: Workshop proceedings with recommendations for researchable forest management institution and practices, and indications for research to lessen constraints on best practice forest management  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y3:Q4]  *Apr 2016* | Not due |
| O24: A scientific paper identifying patterns of institutional innovations in community forestry systems  (A lead, PC and ICRAF contributes) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |
| O25: Capacity building seminars  (PC and A jointly) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |
| **Activity 2.3:**  Analyse markets and value-chains for products from community forests. | O26: Report with a short list of researchable market opportunities that can be incorporated into community forestry (PC) | [Y2:Q1]  *Jul 2014* | It is intended that this report will be ready after ARPM #2  The report will also identify regulatory and policy barriers and opportunities for intervention.  **Docs 13, 14, 15 & 37 in MTR bundle, with some details of market opportunities are still under active discussion.** |
| O27: Publication of institutional innovations in CF systems (A) | [Y2:Q3]  *Jan 2015* | Not due  **Not completed but could be developed from material in Doc 11 & 35 in MTR bundle** |
| **Activity 2.4:**  Analyse policy, access, tenurial and institutional limitations of community forestry | O28: A research report detailing the policy, access, tenurial and institutional limitations of, and innovation opportunities in, community forestry  (A lead, PC and ICRAF contribute) | [Y2:Q3]  *Jan 2015* | Not due  **Docs 22, 23 & 24 in MTR bundle detail research activity still in progress** |
| O29: A policy brief recommending policy changes for improving livelihoods and equitable benefit flows from community forestry  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y3:Q4]  *Apr 2016* | Not due |
| O30: A scientific paper analysing the critical policy and institutional constraints to food security in community forestry innovation systems (A lead, PC and ICRAF contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due  **Doc 34 is a preparatory discussion for this output.** |
| **Activity 2.5:**  Design, implement and evaluate participatory community forestry action research trials | O31: Report outlining research designs and agreements made with up to 6 CFUGs (PC) | [Y2:Q2]  *Oct 2014* | Priority researchable areas have been identified through the joint meetings of the CFUG executive committees and the Local Research Groups (LRGs). A draft for the MOU with the CFUGs have been developed. These will form the basis for further action research in the six priority CFUGs  **Doc 25 outlines the CF silviculture trials in progress. Final report by Rahul Karki outlining agreements put on Basecamp on 26/01/15** |
| O32: Report on a survey of the early impact of the project in the Middle Hills (PC, A contributes) | [Y3:Q3]  *Jan 2016* | Not due  **Perhaps we were too optimistic assume there would be impact on CF by this stage. Doc 10 is an evaluation of impact within the AF theme; we now need a parallel activity to monitor impact of the CF work** |
| O33: Report of results of silviculture trials in community forests | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due  **Doc 47 provides the baseline descriptions of the proposed trial CFs using rapid silvicultural appraisal technique.** |
| O34: 6 pilot sites with functioning models of community forestry practice for demonstration purposes  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| O35: A resource book and other extension products for community forest user group (CFUGs) members on best practice forest management, commercial and institutional arrangements that increase the level and equitable access to benefits from community forests  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| O36: A practitioner’s guidebook to facilitate adaptive action research in community forestry systems  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| O37: Scientific paper describing the refined adaptive action research approach to facilitate community forestry innovation including its challenges, (A lead, PC contribute) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |
| O38: Scientific paper analyzing the links between contexts, processes, and outcomes of adaptive action research on food security and equitable livelihoods (A lead, PC contribute) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |

PC = partner country, A = Australia

# Objective 3: To improve the productivity of, and equitable access to, underutilised and abandoned agricultural land

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities** | **Outputs/**  **Milestones** | **Completion Date** | **Comments** |
| **Activity 3.1:**  Conduct key informant survey at district and village levels to identify the status of abandoned and under-utilised land in the study districts and sites complimented by GIS based information | O39: Preliminary key informant survey supported by GIS-generated maps of land use, tenure and access of 6 study sites with a focus on under-utilised and abandoned agricultural land (PC) | [Y2:Q2]  *Oct 2014* | This survey is currently underway and requires more time to analyses and deliver the report. Expected delivery is in October 2014  **Docs 3 & 6 in MTR bundle** |
| O40: Report on Training opportunity for Institute of Forestry students (PC) | [Y2:Q2]  *Dec 2014* | Preliminary discussions are underway to develop an integrated study of Lapsi by Bachelors and Masters student projects at IOF. This will be developed further as part of ARP meeting #2  **This activity stalled when we realised that there were not enough funds in pay period 4 to fund IOF student projects** |
| **Activity 3.2:**  Generate in-depth case studies (8 different household / farm level cases) of land abandonment and underutilization to understand how multiple drivers cause underutilization and abandonment | O41: Report describing the drivers and dynamics of land use in the Middle Hills (PC) | [Y1:Q4]  *Jul 2014* | This essentially completed in the form of the conference paper by K. Paudel et al (ref: 2014\_13). The paper is now being refined for the submission to a peer reviewed journal publication  **Docs 32 & 43 in MTR bundle lays the groundwork for this output.**  **Doc 39 is the penultimate draft to be submitted as this output.** |
| O42: Household case studies of land access, use and abandonment (PC) | [Y1:Q4]  *Dec 2014* | Delivery date revised to December because of delays in the baseline survey work.  **Doc 26 & 27 in MTR bundle describes progress to achieving this output** |
| O43: A scientific paper explaining genesis of under-utilised agricultural land  (A lead, ICRAF and PC contribute) | [Y2:Q2]  *Dec 2014* | A journal article has been submitted to the Journal of Forests and Livelihoods. This is at the final stage of publication  **Doc 44 provides a partial explanation focussing on feminisation of agriculture** |
| **Activity 3.3:**  Analyse institutional, policy and legal issues associated with accessing under-utilised and abandoned land. | O44: Report on policy and legal environment of land access with particular reference to the 6 study sites, along with the identification of opportunities for action research innovations (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y3:Q4]  *Apr 2016* | Not due |
| O45: Report analysing the policy and legal implications of the action research innovations coming out of 3.4 (to be conducted in year 5)  (A lead, ICRAF and PC contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| O46: Policy brief with recommendations on how to encourage the productive use of under-utilised and abandonned land, and how the benefits of this use is equitably distributed  (A lead, ICRAF and PC contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| O47: A scientific paper explaining on how and why policy and institutional regimes produce (or do not produce) fallow land (A lead, PC & ICRAF) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |
| **Activity 3.4:**  Plan, implement and test management options to bring under-utilised and abandoned land back into production & equitable use | O48: Workshop proceedings with a short-list of feasible options for under-utilised and abandoned land  (PC lead, A contribute) | [Y2:Q4]  *Apr 2015* | Not due |
|  | O49: Report outlining specific action research threads along with agreements on planned land management and institutional experiments (PC lead, A & ICRAF) | [Y2:Q4]  *Apr 2015* | Not due |
|  | O50: Report of the success of integrated land management options (PC lead, ICRAF contribute) | [Y5:Q4]  *Apr 2018* | Not due |
|  | O51: A scientific paper analysing the context, process, and outcomes of the innovations (A lead, ICRAF and PC contribute) | [Y4:Q4]  *Apr 2017* | Not due |

**PART B: BUNDLE OFDOCUMENTS REFERRED TO IN OUTUTS TABLE**

Types of documents in this bundle:

1. Documents constituting or contributing to formal project outputs
2. Current status of research activities
3. Conference and scientific publications

Documents are listed in sequence of program logic rather than deliver date.

\* (…) denotes documents that lead to or underpin the final scheduled output

🡪 denotes draft leading to final scheduled output

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Doc #**  **&**  **Date** | **Title of document**  **Authors/Compilers** | **Description and status.**  ***Filename*** | **Output no.**  **\*** | **In**  **printedbundle** |
| **Scheduled Project Outputs** | | | | |
| 1  27/07/14 | **Survey of Agroforestry Systems of Kavre and Lamjung Districts of Nepal**  Authors: SA Amatya, BH Pandit, I Nuberg, E Cedamon & YR Subedi, | A 2 page survey of existing agroforestry systems that show promise for development in project districts.  *1\_Survey Agroforestry Systems\_140728.doc* | 1 | ✓ |
| 2  1/09/14 | **Research site selection report**  Authors: K.Paudel, YR Subedi, S.Tamang | A 62-page report describing the process involved in the selection of villages and Community forest user groups as sites for the EnLiFT Project  *2\_Research\_Site\_Selection\_Report\_ 140901.pdf* | 2,19,39 | ✓ |
| 3  10/11/14 | **Quantitative Baseline Household Survey Report**  Compiler: Deepak Tamang | This 114 page survey of 600 respondents over the 6 research sites comes in the form of a 9 page narrative and 3 appendices of: Descriptive results tables (in Excel), Dataset tables (in SPSS), and a Survey code Book (in Excel)  *3\_Final Baseline (DDT) Household Survey Report Final (10 Nov, 2014).pdf* | 2,19,39 | ✓ |
| 4  19/06/14 | **Qualitative Baseline Report**: **Agroforestry**  Coordinator: Bishnu Hari Pandit | A 77-page report qualitative understanding of the status of agroforestry across the 6 research sites including market, policy and institutional issues. Based on key informant interviews, group discussion, expert consultations and direct observations.  Contributors: Contributors:B Pandit,D Gautam, R Niraula, SM Amatya, SS Bhattarai, YR Subedi  *4\_Final draft-AF Qualitative Baseline report 140619-revised.pdf* | 2 | ✓ |
| 5  11/08/14 | **State of art in linking community forestry with food security in the Nepalese hills: Cases of Kavre and Lamjung districts**  **(=Qualitative Baseline Report**: **Community Forestry)**  Coordinator: Naya S Paudel, | A 123 page final report of current state of art in areas of community forest-food security link before the project intervention so that change can be measured at the end of the project period. The report also identifies priority research areas at the site level and therefore guides priorities in research intervention.  Contributors: Rahul Karki, Govinda Paudel, Madan Bashyal, Ajay Bhandari  *5\_CF\_QLBSL\_11082014-2.docx* | 19 | ✓ |
| 6 30/05/14 | **Qualitative Baseline report**: **Under Utilised Land**  Coordinator: Yam Malla | A 47-page draft report of qualitative understanding of status of under-utilised lands across the 6 research sites. Current draft has annotations by HR Ojha.  *6\_UUL Qualitative Baseline 140903.docx* | 39 | ✓ |
| 7  1/12/13 | **EnLiFT Modelling workshop report**  **Bogor 25-29/11/13**  Compiled by: Reny Juita, Avniar N. Karlan, Lisa Tanika and Betha Lusiana | Proceedings of Model Design Workshop: Developing functioning models to inform improved interactions between farm and forest systems in Nepal. 51pp  With contributions from: I Nuberg, E Cedamon, B Lusiana, R Neupane, D Gautam, YR Subedi, N Khasanah and R Mulia  7\_*ModelDesignWorkshopProceeding\_Final.* | 7 | ✓ |
| 8  11/04/12 | **Value Chain in Lamjung District**  Coordinator: BH Pandit | This 16-page document reports the training conducted in Lamjung District on Agroforestry Nursery Establishment and Market Value Chain using Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach.  *8\_Training Report- Lamjung-bhp-Apr11.pdf* | 4,12 | ✓ |
| 9  12/04/14 | **Value Chain in Kabhrepalanchok District**  Coordinator: BH Pandit | This 16-page document reports the training conducted in Kavrepalanchok District on Agroforestry Nursery Establishment and Market Value Chain using Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach.  *9\_Training Report -Kabhre-revised-April 12.pdf* | 4,12 | ✓ |
| 10  13/12/14 | **Agroforestry Nursery and Value Chain Training**  **at Bode and Saraswoti**  Authors: MR Joshi, SS Neupane & BH Pandit | The title of this 46 page document belies its full value to the project. It also describes the participative process with farmers and Local Resource Persons leading to final results identifying 10 products as priority, potential AF innovations in six EnLiFT action research sites  *10\_Nursery and value chain training report-20141214.pdf* | 4,12 | ✓ |
| 11  15/12/14 | **Community Forestry innovations Report**  Authors: NS Paudel, R Karki, G Paudel, D Khatri | A 41 page report explaining: analytical framework for research in CF innovations; description of the existing innovations in Nepal’s CF; major drivers of innovation; livelihoods and food security outcomes of the innovation; lessons from the study.  *11\_CF Innovations revised\_15122014.docx* | 22 | ✓ |
| 12  24/11/14 | **Profile and Typology of households in Nepal Mid-hills for food security though Agroforestry and Community Forestry**  Coordinator: E.Cedamon, I.Nuberg, D.Tamang et al | Early draft paper describing drivers to farming systems, farmers existing agroforestry practice, and perceptions about limitations to their livelihoods across 6 distinct agro-ecological settings.  *12\_Household Typology and Profile 20141124.docx* | 🡪3,8 | ✓ |
| 13  20/10/14 | **Stand characteristics of household of and silvicultural priorities for community forests in Nepal Mid-hills**  Authors: E.Cedamon, I.Nuberg, G.Paudel, M.Basyal, NS Paudel | Early draft paper describing results of silvicultural appraisals of selected CF stands and focus group discussion with CFUGS on their priorities for CF use.  *13\_CF RSA Paper 141124.docx* | 🡪33 | ✓ |
| 14  4/12/14 | **Prospects in Marketing of Timber and NTFPs from Community Forestry in Nepal: List of Researchable Community Forest Tree Species**  DD Tamang; SL Shrestha, BDS Dangol, DS Tamang | This 25 page document is based on a paper delivered at 6th National CF Conference. It is presented as the penultimate draft as there are continuing discussions on its content  *14\_Prospects in marketing of timber NTFPs\_141204.doc* | 🡪26 | ✓ |
| 15  4/12/14 | **Researchable List of Trees Species in Community Forestry: Final Timber and Fuel-Wood Tree Preference Ranking**  Author:DD Tamang | 2 page document with lists of preferred timber species across the 6 research sites based on 3 rounds of focused group discussions held July-December 2014. Contents still under discussion  *15\_Final Timber Ranking Community Forsts\_141204.docx* | 🡪26 | ✓ |
| 16  15/12/14 | **Alternative Furniture**  Author:DD Tamang | This is a 4-page summary of discussion with Mr Tash Lama, Alternative Furniture Industry, on the potential of bringing CF timber into high-end value chain.  *16\_AlternativeFurniture\_141215.docx* | (26) | ✓ |
| **Research in progress** | | | | |
| 17  29/10/14 | **EnLiFT Modelling Concept**  Authors: R.Mulia & B.Lusiana | A 6-page working document describing the modelling concept of EnLiFT version 1.0: a model to simulate food security at household level. (It is also being developed at a landscape level, but not detailed in this document)  *17\_EnLiFT modeling concept\_141029.docx* | (9) | ✓ |
| 18  13/12/14 | **Monitoring and Evaluation of Agroforestry Nursery and Seedling Distribution as Part of Action Research Activity1.5- Outputs 12 and 13**  Authors: R.Niraula & BH Pandit | This is a 13-page report of the monitoring of participating farmers in AF innovations. It assesses: 1] the performance of home nursery farmers and their AF plantation activities; 2] the changes in people's perceptions in agroforestry; 3] livelihood changes if any after nursery and plantation activities; 4] and analyzes the people's expectations and recommendations for ways forward  *18\_Monitoring report of Nursery and seedling distribution-20141213.docx* | (13) | ✓ |
| 19  21/12/14 | **Fodder Lopping Trial protocol**  Authors: SM Amatya, ED Cedamon, BH Pandit, I Nuberg | A 7-page protocol of proposed fodder lopping trials. .  *19\_Fodder Lopping Trials\_141222.docx* | (14) | ✓ |
| 20  21/12/14 | **Loth Salla Harvesting demonstration**  Authors: ED Cedamon, SM Amatya, BH Pandit, I Nuberg | A 3-page protocol of proposed Loth Salla harvesting demonstration. .  *20\_Loth Salla harvesting demonstration\_141222.docx* | (14) | ✓ |
| 21  15/12/14 | **Fodder Hedgerow trial**  Author: ED Cedamon | 1-page statement of rationale and method  *21\_21\_Hedgerow trial\_141215.docx* | (14) |  |
| 22  16/12/14 | **Supportive document for MTR from CF research group: 1 - Research on CF Operational Plan (CFOP)**  Author: R.Karki | An update of work on CF Operational Plans. 9 pages including: rationale and methods; actions, experimentation and engagement; potential outcomes; schematic of dimensions of CF research; status and expected deliverables.  *22\_Updates on CF OP Research\_16122014.docx* | (28) | ✓ |
| 23  12/12/14 | **Action Research on Chaubas community forestry enterprise: A draft progress report**  Compiler: H.Ojha | A 56-page progress report of activity with Chaubas sawmill. It includes reflections on: achievements, challenges, methodological issues, possible innovations and outcomes  *23\_Chaubas Comprehensive reprot Dec 12-2014.docx* | (28) | ✓ |
| 24  21/12/14 | **EnLiFT Policy Lab: A tool for linking research with policy processes**  Authors: HR Ojha, KK Shrestha, SM Amatya, NS Paudel and U Regmi, and A Zwi | This 23-page document describe the objectives & principles; design guidelines, outcomes and action plan of the EnLiFT Policy Lab  *24\_Deliberative Policy Lab\_141221.docx* | (28) | ✓ |
| 25  15/12/14 | **Silviculture demonstrations trial**  Authors: ED Cedamon, et al | A 13-page update of CF silviculture trials outlining: rationale & method; current status; planned outputs; with an annex of ‘Conceptual and Operational Framework for EnLiFT Project Silviculture Demonstrations’.  *24\_Silviculture Trial Update Report 20141215.docx* | (31,  33) | ✓ |
| 26  23/12/14 | **Update of GIS activity**  Authors: Binod Heyojoo | Concise 1-page update of GIS activity with list of GIS outputs and current status, scope of GIS across UUL, AF and CF domains of project; issues and challenges.  *26\_Concise Report on GIS Activities in EnLIFT Project\_141223\_BPH.docx* | 39,42,43 | ✓ |
| 27  22/12/14 | **Under-Utilised Land Thematic Report**  Author: Racchya Shah | 5 page update of UUL research groups activities.  *27\_UUL Update 2013\_2014\_141222.docx* | (40) | ✓ |
| **Project dissemination and Conferences** | | | |  |
| 28  30/05/14 | **EnLiFT project flyer**  Coordinator: Racchya Shah | A 2-page colour flyer outlining project aims and partners printed in both English and Nepali. It has revised organogram and new logo and EnLiFT acronym.  *28\_Nepali Introductory Leaflet Draft\_140530* |  | ✓ |
| 29  21/05/14 | **EnLiFT public document**  Coordinator: Racchya Shah | A 27-page document which is based on the original project proposal but updated and prepared for general public distribution.  *29\_ Working Doc ACIAR-Nepal-Public 140521* |  | ✓ |
| 30  10-13 /02/14 | **The business of Nepalese agroforestry: applying science to improve livelihoods**  Authors: S.Amatya, I.Nuberg, R.Neupane, B, Pandit | World Congress on Agroforestry: compendium  *30\_Amatya et al\_20140315\_The business of Nepalese agroforestry.pdf* | (1, 3) | ✓ |
| 31  10-13/02/14 | **Agroforestry response to water stress: Comparative insights from Australia, India and Nepal**  Authors: H.Ojha, K.Shrestha, A Koirala | World Congress on Agroforestry: poster  *31\_Ojha et al water stress and AF- WAC 2013.pdf* |  | ✓ |
| 32  10-13/02/14 | **Transforming land and livelihoods: Analysis of agriculture land abandonment in the mid hills of Nepal**  Authors: K.Paudel, S.Tamang, K.Shrestha, R.Shah | World Congress on Agroforestry: paper  *32\_Paudel\_20140112\_Transforming lands and livelihood.pdf* | (41) | ✓ |
| 33  24-26 /11/14 | **The forest-food paradox: Rethinking Community Forestry in Nepal**  Authors: KK Shrestha, HR Ojha, R Karki, B Bhattarai, R. Karki, I Nuberg and NS Paudel | Agrifood XXI: 24-26 Nov 2014, Sydney  Food, People, Planet  *33\_ The forest food paradox\_26.11.2014.pdf* |  | ✓ |
| 34  16-18 /06/14 | **Reframing the farm –forest interface: How can community forestry better address food security and livelihoods in Nepal?**  NS Paudel, R Karki, G Paudel, H Ohja, KK Shrestha | 6th National Community Forestry Workshop  Babarmahal, Kathmandu 16-18 June 2014  16 pages  *34\_Paudel N Forest-Farm linkage.docx* | (30) | ✓ |
| 35  16-18 /06/14 | **Revenue and employment opportunities from timber management in Nepal's community forests**  GP P Paudel, NS Paudel, DB Khatri | 6th National Community Forestry Workshop  Babarmahal, Kathmandu 16-18 June 2014  15 pages  *35\_Paudel G Timber mgt.docx* | (27) | ✓ |
| 36  16-18 /06/14 | **Why cannot local communities do forestry business? Analysis of barriers in the value chain of private forestry products in Nepal**  BH Pandit, KK Shrestha, HR Ojha, I Nuberg | 6th National Community Forestry Workshop  Babarmahal, Kathmandu 16-18 June 2014  19 pages. This covers part of 3, 4, and 5 outputs  *36\_Pandit et al 2014 – market.docx* | (3, 4, 5) | ✓ |
| 37  16-18 /06/14 | **Prospects in Marketing of Timber and Non-Timber Forest Products from Community Forestry in Nepal**  DD Tamang; SL Shrestha, BDS Dangol, DS Tamang | 6th National Community Forestry Workshop  Babarmahal, Kathmandu 16-18 June 2014  24 pages  *37\_Tamanag D marketing.docx* | 26 | ✓ |
| Documents made available subsequent to initial dispatch of MTR bundle | | | | |
| 38  30/10/14 | **Sustainable local livelihoods through enhancing**  **agroforestry systems in Nepal**  Authors: B. Hari Pandit, K. Shrestha, S. Bhattarai | Article published in Journal of Forest and Livelihoods *12 (1) Oct, 2014* | 3 |  |
| 39  23/12/14 | **Report on Drivers and Dynamics of Under-Utilised Lands (UUL) in the Middle Hills of Nepal**  Authors: KP Paudel, YR Subedi, S Tamang, U Acharya | Penultimate draft version 42 pages  *Drivers & Dynamics of UUL(1st Draft)-2014-12-23.doc* | 41 | ✓ |
| 40  10-13/02/14 | **Why has community forestry made limited contribution to agroforestry in Nepal? : institutional constraints for fodder and grazing in community forestry**  Authors: D.Khatri, N.Sharma, K.Shrestha, H.Ojha, G.Paudel | World Congress on Agroforestry: paper  *Khatri et al WCA conference-CF and food security - final.pdf* | (30) | ✓ |
| 41  10-13/  02/14 | **Conservation and livelihood impacts of agroforestry system: A case study of Kavrepalanchok district of Nepal**  Authors: B.Pandit, , K.Shrestha & S.Bhattarai | World Congress on Agroforestry: paper  *Bishnu\_20140211\_AF for conservation and livelihood- paper.pdf* | (3) | ✓ |
| 42  10-13  /02/14 | **Barriers to integrating forestry into agricultural system: Analysis of forest legislation and policy in Nepal**  Authors: B.Pandit, H.Ojha, K.Shrestha | World Congress on Agroforestry: poster  *Bishnu\_20140223\_barriers to AF cultivation.jpg* | (4, 5) | ✓ |
| 43  10-13  /02/14 | **In search of Dynamic Linkages between Agroforestry and Ecosystem based Adaptation:  A Case Study of Rural Mid Hills of Nepal**  Authors: R.Shah, A. Adhikari and R. Khanal | World Congress on Agroforestry: paper  *Shah etal\_20140220 Agroforestry Presentation.pdf* | (41) | ✓ |
| 44  10-13  //02/14 | **Agricultural (in) justices: Investigating feminization of agriculture and its implications to food security in Nepal**  Authors: S.Tamang, K.Paudel & K K Shrestha | World Congress on Agroforestry: paper  *Sujata\_20140211\_Feminization of agriculture and its impact on FS.pdf* | (43) | ✓ |
| 45  10-13  /02/14 | **Trees on Farmland: composition, abundance and role of trees on farmland in rural communities**  Authors: L.Puri & H.Meilby | World Congress on Agroforestry: poster  *Poster\_WCA2014-020\_Lila Puri.jpg* | (14) | ✓ |
| 46  10-13  /02/14 | **Enhancing livelihoods and food security from agroforestry and community forestry through action research in Nepal**  Authors: I.Nuberg, K.Shrestha, H.Ojha, E.Cedamon | World Congress on Agroforestry: poster  *Nuberg etal\_140208\_Project intro poster.pdf* |  | ✓ |
| 47  7/11/14 | **Stand Characteristics and Silviculture Priorities for**  **Community Forests in Nepal Mid--hills: Managing to Enhance Food Security**  Authors: E.Cedamon & I.Nuberg, | School Agriculture, Food & Wine Research Day: poster  *Cedamon Nuberg Poster 20141103.pdf* | (33) | ✓ |
| 48  01-07/2014 | **Mature Forests, Naïve Policies: exploring policy engagement for transforming community forestry governance in Nepal**  Author: Hemant Ojha | Paper presented at National Conference of Institute of Australian Geographers, Melbourne, 30 June – 2 July 2014 |  | ✓ |
| 49  08-10/2014 | **An Alternative Framework of Forest Sector Strategy, Nepal**  Author: Hemant Ojha | Inputs provided to Forest Sector Strategy Drafting team |  | ✓ |
| 50  01-07/2014 | **Reframing local institutions:  Linking justice & sustainability for food security in Nepal**  Author: Krishna Shrestha | Paper presented at National Conference of Institute of Australian Geographers, Melbourne, 30 June – 2 July 2014 |  | ✓ |
| 51  18/09/ 2014 | **The Nepali diaspora and the feminisation of agriculture**  Author: Krishna Shrestha | Invited Paper presented at ‘Thinking Space”, University of Sydney |  | ✓ |
| 52  26-11/2014 | **The forest-food paradox: Rethinking Nepalese community forestry**  **in the face of food insecurity**  Author: Krishna Shrestha | Paper presented at Agrifood XXI: *FOOD PEOPLE PLANET,* 24-26 Nov 2014, Sydney, |  | ✓ |
| 53  01-07/2014 | **The Forest –Food Paradox-advancing science-policy interface in community forestry in Nepal**  Author: Hemant Ojha | Paper presented at Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University Enclave, India, 2 December 2014 |  | ✓ |

**Appendix 4. Adoption pathways in the project--Progress, problems and suggestions for modifications based on experience to date**

Modified from Table 2 in the project document

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1: To improve the capacity of household based agroforestry systems to enhance livelihoods and food security** | | |
| **Adoptable outputs** | **Principal adoption pathways** | **Progress, problems and suggestions for modifications based on experience to date** |
| **Innovative agroforestry systems with market opportunities** | There will be 6 demonstration sites at the 2 districts as well as additional satellite demonstration sites; Farmer-to-Farmer training; Farmer manuals; Direct engagement with FECOFUN which will promulgate innovations through Nepal; Direct engagement with District Forestry and Agriculture Offices; Direct engagement with MEDEP and other similar institutions involved in private sector to promulgate market innovations. | **UADL:** What defines “innovation”? The practices being promoted haven’t been generated from within, but are good practices that work elsewhere and are being presented here for people to try for themselves.  This activity has been very successful in terms of the number of farmers engaged and quantity of planting material disseminated. We are still in process of monitoring the success of establishment and uptake.  Currently we have 30 farmers in each site; the goal is to have 50 /site   * NAF has some AF training material from previous work that has yet to be developed for this project. * No substantive engagement with MEDEP: Ramji Neupane is now National Officer for MEDEP and we have 2 MEDEP project officers on Basecamp, but nothing has begun in terms of MEDEP supporting AF market innovations yet. We should put stronger focus on this possibility with MEDEP * No direct engagement with FECOFUN as yet (really their interest will be with CF not AF & UUL), or DFOs, DAOs   **UNSW:** We have not clearly distinguished ‘innovative’ from non-innovative, with the risk of reintroducing the existing practices.  **AF theme**: Fodder demonstrations and goat raising have been successful in Jita taxar, which is associated with partial support of District Livestock Support Office. Banana marketing is planned to be linked with District Agriculture Development Office through use of existing common facility center (CFC) at Chakratirtha VDC next to Dhamilikuwa. Cardamom processing has been supported through MEDEP at Phagarkhola CFUG of Chaubas. Despite these successes, a local institutional set up for marketing of AF products has not been established. |
| **Policy, institutional, and governance to improve agroforestry** | Policy seminars, discussion papers and briefs to policy makers and other policy shapers. Generation of peer-reviewed publications to enhance the impact of evidence on policy. At the local level, adoption of improved institutional arrangement and governance practices (in relation to production, utilisation and equity) by participating and satellite social and government institutions involved in agroforestry. Policy recommendations to remove regulatory and administrative barriers. | **UADL:** The policy institutional engagements with AF has not really begun yet.  Institutions team focusing on CF first, and while Bishnu HP has written on AF policy (for private forestry) no further engagement. The EnLiFT Policy Lab will in time get to AF policy, currently getting started on CF policy.  **UNSW:** Substantial analysis of policy and regulatory constraints related to CF, private forestry generated. The main challenge is that irrespective of the kind and quality of new evidence, analysis and knowledge we generate, research has historically has had limited impact on the policy system. We have provided several specific policy recommendations but with limited change in actual policy outcomes.  **AF theme**: Policy recommendations to remove policy barriers were made through preparation of policy discussion paper and presentation at 6th national community forestry workshop. The proceeding paper is in the press. At the local level there is however a challenge for AF landholders to adopt improved institutional arrangement and governance practice. In the next one or two quarter, this needs to be emphasized. |
| **Models to inform improved interactions between farm and forest** | Through direct engagement with Nepalese research community and forestry and agriculture sectors in government, community groups and other local service providers; scientific publications | **UADL:** We intend that combination of the ENLIFT Model and several AF Demonstrations will provide good basis for later engagement with research community, most likely beginning in Year 4  **AF theme**: Efforts are underway to inform research communities across forest and agriculture sectors through AF model using six household typologies. The concept on modeling needs to be cleared among researchers and then to collaborating institutions. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2: To improve the functioning of community forestry systems to enhance the livelihoods and food security of CFUG members FAN : I would suggest to have following 4 major areas of research focus (which can also be identified as flagship activities; see in left column)** | | |
| **Adoptable outputs** | **Principal adoption pathways** | **Progress, problems and suggestions for modifications based on experience to date** |
| **Innovative community forestry management practices with market opportunities**  **FAN:**  **Restructuring/reorientation of CF institutions to better deal with the market** | There will be 3 action research sites in each of the 2 districts as well as an additional 3 satellite sites for research dissemination in 2 other districts; Resource book for CFUG members; Practitioners Guidebook; Training of CFUGs on forest silviculture, management, sustainable harvesting and utilization, governance; Direct Engagement with FECOFUN which will promulgate innovations through Nepal; | **UADL:** Engagement with CFUGs is good and we have good agreements on silviculture trials, but need to get the integration with institutional work. This is urgent.  The work on CF market opportunities has been slow. So far it has only identified preferred species, but hasn’t yet identified innovations beyond selling logs from the stump. There are some value-adding options we are looking into (eg finger-boarding) but this is not ready.  Despite many meetings with FECOFUN we still have not established what specific function / service they can provide to promulgate innovations thru Nepal. So I wonder if we have time to get to satellite sites. Can and advocacy agency services as an extension agency? If not, then we might need to find another partner for this function.  UNSW: Innovative practices can emerge through the completion of PAR cycle on three aspects – OP, silvicultural practices and market-oriented institutions. To achieve this, we need much better coordinated efforts than we have at present. This includes for example – focusing specific actions in specific sites – such as timber marketing in Chaubas, fodder in Dhungkharka etc  **FAN:** We do not have specific lessons yet. But the institutional analysis will bring some concrete lessons especially regarding CF institutions and forest based enterprise and trade. |
| **Policy, institutional, and governance to improve community forestry**  **FAN:**  **research-policy innovations for deliberative policy process** | Policy seminars, discussion papers, briefs to policy makers as well as other policy players in the civil society and the research community. Generation of peer-reviewed publication to enhance the impact of evidence on policy. Adoption of improved institutional arrangement and governance practices by participating and satellite community forestry institutions. Policy recommendations to remove regulatory and administrative barriers. | **UADL:** Involvement in 6th National Community Forest Workshop (June 2014) was very good opportunity to get ENLiFT good profile.  **UNSW:** Policy team has recognized that producing more research will not automatically improve policy. What is important is to undertake research in a way that engages policy actors in an ongoing basis – in terms of providing inputs to PAR as well as linking PAR outomes to policy system. We have developed EnLIFT Policy Lab framework to do this and it can emerge as an important new innovation in strengthening science-policy interface.  **FAN:** Forest and food security link is increasingly accepted as a legitimate agenda. Initially there was a strong resistance. We were able to bring this as one of the 4 key thematic areas for Sixth National CF Conference. There will be several policy lessons from this research and those will be critical for future management of CF, especially linking with food security |
| **Development and demonstration of functioning innovative models of community forestry systems**  **FAN:**  **Innovative silvicultural technologies developed, piloted, communicated** | Through direct engagement with CFUGs and experimentation of best practices (silviculture, forest management, sustainable harvesting and utilization), documentation of process and developing guidelines to catalyse innovations; scientific publication; Direct Engagement with CFD and with FECOFUN which will catalyse innovations through Nepal. | **UADL:** This is slow. We are investing quite a bit of energy in understanding the Chaubas Sawmill conflict. We are not there to facilitate conflict resolution without actually getting any research outcome. The potential research outcome is not clear to me; less so the likelihood that it will be achieved.  **UNSW:** The three PAR cycles as mentioned above have the potential to develop such models on the ground, but this requires much more coordinated efforts.  **FAN:** Policy environment for silvicultural operation is becoming supportive. For a long, there was clear resistance against any initiatives. But now, both the national policy environment and our specific efforts have changed the environment. We will be conducting new resource assessment, forest management planning and starting some piloting especially in Chaubas and Jita. This will have large impacts across the CFs in Nepal |
| **FAN:** I**nclusive planning of CF to ensure equity and access** |  | **FAN:** There have been attempts for inclusive and participatory planning through workshops, trainings backstopping during CFOP research activities etc. This is also related to our objective of enhancing food security of poor and women. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3: To improve the productivity of, and equitable access to, under-utilised and abandoned agricultural land** | | |
| **Adoptable outputs** | **Principal adoption pathways** | **Progress, problems and suggestions for modifications based on experience to date** |
| **Household or farm level cases and evidence of land abandonment** | Analytical summary of household cases shared with policy makers and stakeholders as a discussion paper. | **UADL:** The ‘drivers & dynamics’ output (K Paudel etal) is only a marginal improvement on knowledge that was already presented as background paper for project design workshjop (Y Malla 2012). The output quantifies levels of UUL in the 6 sites but doesn’t really explain differences in terms of socio-economics. It gives contradictory recommendations: eg “improved subsistence agriculture “ and “entrepreneurial agriculture” and is difficult to see link to any analysis.  The case study output is very overdue and does not look like it will be ready for the workshop that decides which options we follow on UUL.  Nevertheless, while we might not have all the required information on paper to logically lead to best-bet options, I feel there is enough common-sense knowledge in the minds of the research group to get there.  IUCN: Qualitative and Quantitative Baseline Survey Completed  Case Study field work in all six sites completed, Draft ready |
| **Maps and knowledge of drivers of under-utilised and abandoned land** | Dissemination through government, academic, private sector and civil society involved with land use; Training of forestry students. | **UADL:** GIS maps are a great tool for integrating biophysical and social layers across a landscape and still has such potential in this project. A considerable degree of GIS work has been done, at great cost, but the purpose for which it was written into the project has not yet been realized. I’m not sure why this has happened whether it is: lack of general coordination in UUL team; lack of appreciation of non-GIS members of UUL team for the value of GIS; or lack of proactive communication of the value of GIS from IOF. It is a vexed issue.  The training of IOF students was conceived in the project proposal as a cost-effective way generating GIS material and providing capacity building. However, this activity has not yet begun because: 1] others in project team feel that training opportunities should not be restricted to GIS, so we entertained the possibility of funding other projects, eg. on Lapsi; 2] when Nuberg presented the opportunity to IOF students the uptake was not great and none of the student-project ideas were close enough to EnLiFT that warranted support in pay period when the budget was over-stretched as it was. So no student projects were funded.  Further with respect to training: Amatya, Nuberg & Cedamon are writing an Agroforestry Text book, and when that is completed we will also write an updated edition of Amatya’s Forest Training Manual.  Cedamon has also offered to provide specialist training to IOF students on silvicultural mensuration & management; but nothing has been taken up yet.  **IUCN:** Drivers and Dynamics report completed  Activity related to the Training of IOF Students was agreed to be Postponed until next planning period  GIS field work in two research sites completed, analysis in progress |
| **Innovative options for use of under-utilised and abandoned land** | Options for productive use of land owned e.g: low-labour, perennial production systems; engaging absentee landowners consent in share-cropping; community management. | **UADL:** the workshop that will discuss and determine these options is scheduled for this quarter. There seems to be a mindset among some project members that this will be problematic because of the issue of “tillers rights”. While it might take a lot of negotiation and legal work to make absent owners comfortable with other people sharecropping or leasing their UUL, it doesn’t mean we shouldn’t try.Also we mustn’t forget the “low hanging fruit” in this area is to get owners of UUL exciting about low-labour-input, high-value-output options for their UUL. We should work on this first before we get too distracted about tillers rights.  **IUCN:** In the next plan period |
| **Policy, institutional, and governance options for managing under-utilised land** | Through direct engagement with policy makers by seminars; policy briefs and other policy oriented publications. Adoption of improved institutional arrangement and governance practices by participating and satellite agroforestry and community forestry institutions at multiple layers. Policy recommendations to remove regulatory and administrative barriers. | **UADL:** this is something that will be achieved thru the EPL process.  **IUCN:** In the next plan period |
| UNSW overarching comment to table:  Again, I can see important new evidence emerging from CF theme – around OP, forest inventory, distribution, participation, community dynamics, resource use and underutilization, enterprise activities and so on. Under AF theme, analysis of private forestry policy issues have been evolving well. UUL can generate data on dynamics of underutulizaiton of land that can be of help. | | |