



EXTERNAL REVIEW

LIVELIHOODS AND LANDSCAPE STRATEGY



Sabine Häusler, Amsterdam
John F. A. Krijnen, Geneva
27 October, 2009

The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

i. TABLE OF CONTENTS

i	Table of contents	ii
ii	Figures and tables	iii
iii	Acronyms	iii
iv	Acknowledgements	v
v	Executive summary	vi
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
1	LLS CONCEPT	1
1.1	Objectives	1
1.2	Operational Principles	1
1.3	Thematic Components	2
1.4	Strategic Outcomes	3
1.5	Organizational model	3
2	REVIEW OBJECTIVES	4
2.1	Commissioning Authority and Intended Users	4
2.2	Key areas of inquiry	4
2.3	Analytical process	5
2.4	Methodology	6
2.5	Country selection	7
<u>REVIEW OF KEY AREAS</u>		
3	CROSS-COUNTRY LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS	8
3.1	Introduction	8
3.2	Value addition	9
3.3	Implementation model	13
3.4	Capacity strengthening	14
3.5	Institutionalisation of landscape approach and implementation model	15
3.6	Programme management	16
3.7	Programme results	18
4	REVIEW AT A PROGRAMME LEVEL	23
4.1	Strategic design	23
4.2	Programme management	24
4.3	Programme evaluation	27
5	CONCLUSIONS	37
5.1	General conclusions	37
5.2	Country-specific conclusions	44
6	RECOMMENDATIONS	47

6.1	General Recommendations	47
6.2	Country-specific recommendations	51

7 LESSONS LEARNT 54

ANNEXES

1	Landscape analysis at country level	58
2	Value addition sheets	85
3	Landscape sheets	92
4	Persons interviewed	98
5	List of documents	103
6	Review matrix	109

ii. FIGURES, TABLES, BOXES AND PICTURES (F/T/B/P)

F1	Levels of external review	6
T1	Thematic emphasis in Asia	28
T2	Thematic emphasis in Africa	28
F2	Distribution over expenses per theme by continent (%)	31
F3	Distribution of expenses per budget category and continent	33
B1	Explanation to budget categories	33
P1	Access road to the Lorenz Park	65
P2	Processed for the local market	65

iii. LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABO	Association Burundaise pour la Protection des Oiseaux
AFP3	Asosiasi Fasilitator Perencanaan Partisipatif Pembangunan Papua
BFS	Beijing Forestry Society
BMBFP	Beijing Municipal Bureau of Forestry and Parks
CARPE	Central African Regional Programme for the Environment
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CC	Climate Change
CEFDHAC	Conférence sur les Ecosystèmes des Forêts Denses et Humides d’Afrique Centrale
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CORNACAM	Coordination Committee for Natural Resources and Development San Marcos (Guatemala)
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CREMA	Community Resources Management Area Programme
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DGIS	Directoraat Generaal voor Internationale Samenwerking
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EC	European Commission
ECBP	European Union - China Biodiversity Programme
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States

EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FCP	Forest Conservation Programme
FLEG	Forest Law Enforcement and Governance
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FLR	Forest Landscape Restoration
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FUNDALACHUA	Foundation of Lachua Area, Guatemala
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFP	Growing Forest Partnership
GPFLR	Global Partnership for Forest Landscape Restoration
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HQ	Head quarter
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agro-forestry
INAB	National Forest Institute (Guatemala)
INECN	Institut National de l'Environnement et la Conservation de la Nature
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JFM	Joint Forest Management
KM	Knowledge Management
KPH	Kesatuan Pemangkuan Hutan (Forest Stewardship Unit)
LLS	Livelihoods and Landscape Strategy
LMP	Landscape Management Programme
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MARP	Méthode accélérée de recherche participative (PRA)
MLA	Multidisciplinary Landscape Assessment
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSD	Multi-stakeholder Dialogue
MTR	Mid Term Review
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NTFP	Non-timber forest products
ODEB	Organisation pour la Défense de l'Environnement au Burundi
ORTPN	Office Rwandais du Tourisme et des Parcs Nationaux
PACO	Programme Afrique Centrale et Occidentale
PES	Payment for environmental services
PINFRUTA	Programa de Incentivos Frutales (Guatemala)
PINFOR	Forest Incentives Programme
PINPEB	Pequenos Poseedores de Tierras de Vocation Forestal o Agroforestal
PM&E	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
PPMA	Pemberdayaan Penguatan Masyarakat Adat Papua
PROFOR	Programme on Forests (World Bank)
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Centre (Bangkok)
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
REEIS	Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability
RRI	Rights and Resources Initiative

RTE	Rights an Tenure
SECO	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SFA	State Forestry Authority
SIBWS	Strategic importance, Innovative orientation, importance for Biodiversity, importance for Well-being and degree of Scalability
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
SNV	Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers
SO	Strategical Outcome
SVBC	Strengthening Voices for Better Choices
TNS	Trinational de la Sangha
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPA	Thematic Programme Area
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VPA	Voluntary Partnerships Agreement
WANI	Water and Nature Initiative
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wildlife Fund
YBAW	Yayasan Bina Adat Walesi

iv. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team would like to express its sincerest gratitude to the Direction of IUCN, FCP and LLS Coordinators and global and regional teams as well as regional LLS coordinators and national LLS focal point for providing valuable advice during briefing and debriefing sessions and technical, administrative and support staff for perfect logistics throughout the mission.

A very special word of appreciation is directed to members and partners, for being available whenever we needed their support and advice. The mission has been facilitated by the open-mindedness and self-critical attitude of field staff and beneficiaries. This has not only helped us to grasp a complex reality in a relatively short time, we are equally confident that your opinions transpire in our findings and recommendations.

Geneva, Amsterdam, 27 October 2009

John F. A. Krijnen

Sabine Häusler

v. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

LLS Concept

The long-term vision of the Livelihoods and Landscape Strategy is that “*the world will have more extensive, more diverse and higher quality forest landscapes. These will meet human needs and aspirations fairly, while conserving biological diversity and fulfilling the ecosystem functions necessary for all life on earth*”. Its goal is “*the effective implementation of national and local policies and programmes that leverage real and meaningful change in the lives of the rural poor, enhance long-term and equitable conservation of biodiversity and ensure the sustainable supply of forest-related goods and services in line with nationally-defined priorities*”.¹ It goes without saying that many policies and programmes shaping the use of forest lands may be part of other sectors.

The following mutually supportive operational principles are intended to guide decision making, priority setting and programme delivery through an adaptive management approach to learning and change management: leverage, learning, strategic focus, transparency, partnership and performance monitoring. The thematic components are poverty reduction, markets and incentives, governance, transforming landscapes, and facilitation of tree management in landscapes. Each thematic component has a strategic outcome, based on its own assumption.

The coordination and management structures of LLS are well designed, with an Independent Advisory Committee, an IUCN Forest Conservation Advisory Group, an Executive oversight Group, a Coordination Unit and an Implementation Team, with well described responsibilities and tasks, in which general overview and intra-institutional coherence, strategic and operational management are well defined and separated between secretariat and regional offices. In practice the Advisory Committee and Forest Conservation Advisory Group do not seem to be operational but the Coordination Unit and Implementation Team are.

Review Process

The analytical process of the present review consists of three levels: (1) understanding and assessments of landscape interventions within their context and of cross-cutting themes and thematic support; (2) cross-country landscape analysis pulling out the overarching issues across sites; and (3) analysis of the whole programme from an angle of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

As discussed in the April 2009 Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy (LLS) Implementation Team Meeting, six key areas for inquiry were identified. They follow the logic of implementation, starting from the field-level landscape process, the institutional arrangements and capacities, and the institutionalisation of the approach in IUCN and their partners. The project management and the outcome logic are additional areas which are the enablers for the first four. The six key areas and key questions are reflected in the herewith attached Review Matrix (annex 6).

Out of 23 countries in which LLS is implemented, 7 have been selected for field visits: Burundi, Rwanda, China, Indonesia, Ghana, Burkina Faso and Guatemala. A number of other countries were associated

¹ “Livelihoods and Landscapes, part 1 : Strategic Overview” p.7, Gland, 2006

during the field visit (Liberia to Ghana, Mali to Burkina Faso, Cambodia, India, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam during the regional external review workshop held in Bangkok, Thailand).

2. FINDINGS

Value addition

LLS as a concept and as a project has demonstrated that due to the inclusiveness, multi-level approach and flexibility that the programme provides to the LLS field teams, it is well underway in taking the national processes towards participatory forest governance a critical step further. Most stakeholders in the countries visited are well aware of this added value.

Possibly the greatest value added is that LLS is not just one more donor driven project, but that it is flexible enough to link into a large variety of policy processes going on at national and international levels and contributes to pushing them to take the next step further in the right direction.

Due to the fact that LLS is a facilitating, rather than an implementing project, it creates local ownership of a process. IUCN as an organization is very well suited to moderate these processes.

The value addition in the countries visited varies in function of (1) size of landscapes, (2) importance and state of biodiversity, (3) degree of dependence on forest-resources as a coping mechanism for livelihoods resilience, (4) quality of natural resources-related governance, (5) level of multi-stakeholder ownership and participation, (6) institutional presence of IUCN and its members, (7) degree of facilitation of landscape level planning, (8) the level of technical and process facilitation skills, (9) the already existing opportunities for value addition and (10) various interpretations of the LLS approach itself.

In principle LLS is designed to add value to already existing activities/projects. However, it has been observed that in certain countries this condition has not been respected and that with considerable input from regional and global teams participatory methodologies are put in practice to identify, plan and implement entirely new projects. This is taking considerable start up time and appears to go beyond the mandate of LLS. The mission ignores in how many countries out of the 23 this is the case, but from our own observations we conclude that we are probably talking about a limited number of countries only.

In most landscapes visited and in the ones regionally associated to the mission's visit, support by thematic advisors was generally appreciated but it was obvious that the offer is not commensurate with the need. Poverty assessment methodology, developed by the thematic lead, is innovative and provides an excellent analysis and baseline to address the crux of the conservation-development nexus, i.e. the dependency for livelihoods on forest-resources. The said methodology should be used as world-wide reference. Valuable support was also provided by the other thematic leads, who added value in fields like Payment of Environmental Services (PES), Marketing and Incentives (M&I), Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEG(T)), Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) and to the facilitation component. In about half of the countries analysed, the practice-policy loop is not yet functional because of the recent character of field activities, whereas in others the existing activities have already sufficiently matured for learning and policy dialogues.

With regards to the LLS operational principles, (1) the definition of leverage categories needs to be reviewed; (2) knowledge management should go beyond advocacy, first lessons need to be systematised, validated and fed into the information system; (3) with regards to performance monitoring, future M&E plans need to respect the recent Monitoring Protocol agreed between the IUCN and DGIS. That being said, one can argue about the necessity to report to the Netherlands Directorate General for International Cooperation (DGIS) at an output level.

With regards to LLS critical points, (1) the design of the Strategy is well done but expectations are very ambitious; (2) the value chain and operational principles provide valuable guidance for partner, activity and beneficiary selection; (3) support provided by the global thematic leads is of good quality, but is not commensurate with national needs; it is perceived by field staff as supply driven; (4) there is an opportunity to improve both the horizontal and vertical integration of multiple levels in terms of capacity building and learning; to this effect an integrated concept of knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and action learning needs to be developed and implemented; (5) the motivation of stakeholders was found strong; LLS management and staff cares and believes in the value of participatory processes and has been successful in carrying this message forward.

Implementation model

In theory, all LLS programmes are eligible to the same support systems. In practice, there appears to be a bias in favour of the Anglophone countries which needs to be adjusted. Work-plans and budgets are formulated in a concise and standardized format. The output-outcome chain has not been defined in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions for achieving higher level objectives as is done in logical frameworks (there is a subtle difference between achieving an objective and to contribute to its achievement). Therefore it is difficult to assess what specific contribution LLS will provide to an equitable conservation of biodiversity and what other complementary contributions are still needed.

Capacity strengthening

The (sub) regional offices are the hubs for programme development, monitoring and learning. The regional LLS coordinators play an inspiring and motivating role. LLS staff and partners are frequently exposed to workshops and seminars, in order to add value to their methodological skills in subjects like landscape monitoring, visualisation, advocacy, M&E, the use of the poverty toolkit, modelling and simulation tools and a variety of thematic subjects linked to FLR, PES, M&I and networking (e.g., Global Partnership for Forest Landscape Restoration - GPFLR). Technical and facilitation standards are high. There does not yet seem to be a policy to develop standardized approaches to landscape monitoring.

Institutionalization

The time of implementation is much too short to claim that an effective, efficient and sustainable approach, integrating the conservation of biodiversity and poverty reduction, has been successfully tested, proved working, been brought to scale and generally applied with a considerable impact. At this early stage in the project cycle learning across levels is still not fully developed. However, there is a huge potential for this not only within LLS, but also between LLS and other IUCN programmes. Synergy effects between ongoing IUCN programmes at national level –where they exist- are already well used by the field teams. The national stakeholders have already developed a good sense of ownership for the process and in some cases they have even stated that they would continue collective cross sector landscape monitoring, even if LLS was to finish today. LLS seems to also have succeeded in grasping the attention of the global conservation community as a learning ground. The GPFLR seems to be an excellent forum for global learning on the LLS approach.

The results of the LLS approach also have the potential to contribute to the fine-tuning of the Forest Conservation Programme's (FCP) thematic priorities and to further advance the IUCN overall management plan.

Programme management

The coordination and management structures are well designed and functional. Responsibilities and tasks are well defined across levels. Under the inspiring guidance of the global and regional coordinators, and the valuable support of the thematic advisors, national LLS programmes achieve interesting results and learn as they go along. However, at times, field staff appears to be somewhat alienated from head-quarter's decisions for example on M&E and knowledge management.

According to interviews with the global team, communication especially within the global team needs to be improved; extremely busy travel schedules are not conducive to regular staff meetings. The global team should assess the possibility to replace travel with other means of communication with the field teams (Skype, Microsoft Network Live Messenger (MSN), Yahoo Messenger) so as to reduce staff travel time and add to the time they have for programme management and conceptual integration of LLS. In the near future there is a need for closer coordination and fine tuning of the different levels and elements of the programme. Also, a more pronounced delegation of operational, administrative and financial decision powers to the regional offices and LLS coordinators should be considered.

A certain standardisation is needed in the application of essential management tools, thematic support and facilitation. However, these standard approaches need to leave enough room for national variety. Sets of manuals should be developed by the thematic leads that can then be used by regional and national advisors. After a thorough training by the thematic leads, follow up with these advisors can be done through any of the well-known above mentioned computer telephony software. This may contribute to less travel by thematic leads, reduction of costs for thematic advice and to more empowerment of regional/local advisors.

Until now, no lessons learnt have been compiled by LLS. It was recently decided that this deserves priority for the knowledge management (KM) officer. Monitoring has become mechanical and impossible to handle; M&E is too complex since it contains too many indicators. The relations between knowledge management, monitoring and action learning are blurred.. The recent Monitoring Protocol between the donor and IUCN-LLS needs to be adjusted. A detailed monitoring at an output level serves internal management of the implementing organization but not the accountability towards the donor which, according to our opinion, should remain strategically focussed on the achievement of country-wise sub-outcomes and global strategic outcomes.

Programme results

A myriad of activities has been developed which are expected to contribute to poverty reduction and income generation and simultaneously to conservation of biodiversity. The level of achievement of results on income and poverty alleviation for example depends in large measure on the ongoing programmes that LLS has built on in a particular country. Some are very well advanced while others have not even started. For the time being, first lessons can be learned from various field activities that yield promising results, even after such a short implementation period.

The domain of sustainable trade in forest products still needs substantial support along the entire chain of production and marketing. Markets and Incentives are huge opportunities but there is a considerable gap in capacity, knowledge, and experience. Well functioning markets for forest and agricultural products and services are a central element for the success of the LLS approach because only when and if local people have viable alternatives are they no longer forced to destroy the resources. Although still in its initial stages, the design of Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (REDD) and PES schemes is under development in a number of LLS landscapes.

Particularly in Asia and to a lesser degree in Africa, an increase in secure tenure in forest resources is pursued with the active support of the thematic lead Rights and Tenure (RTE). A good balance needs to be found between income generation activities and support to the tenure rights of indigenous peoples.

Facilitation of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance FLEG(T) related dialogues is undertaken in a majority of landscapes; in Ghana for example LLS has supported national stakeholder negotiations and policy dialogues on the Voluntary Partnership Agreement. Other activities contributing to FLEGT are for example training in national legislation in the fields of forestry and environment, as well as the preparation of guidelines for Chinese logging enterprises, operating overseas.

An increase in area for multi-functional land use is beginning to materialize. A lot of enthusiasm has been observed to joining the GPFLR from which interested countries expect to learn with regards to best FLR practices. There is an apparent opportunity that the GPFLR will support learning between landscapes and create a global community of practitioners.

Seen the relative short duration of programme implementation, effectiveness is reasonable and as much as one can expect. It is assumed that efficiency in terms of output is rather modest when we compare, on the one hand, salaries, overheads and travel with, on the other, the relatively modest magnitude of field activities and thereby modest tangible outputs. On the other hand, it is highly likely that the allocation of funds on the various budget items is likely to change as the programme gets established, systems are in place and more funds will be freed for output oriented activities.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of country-specific recommendations have been made for the countries visited. With regards to the general recommendations, hereunder follows a selection:

Value addition

The progress the LLS project made so far is good. The LLS concept is viable provided that there will be sufficient time, funds and human resources made available to reach the highly ambitious objectives. The team wholeheartedly recommends to extend the present phase with another one so that processes towards participatory forest governance can be given sufficient time to mature.

- Based on the present recommendations, the framework conditions for a possible Phase II may be agreed between IUCN and DGIS, and can serve as an input for three regional planning workshops, facilitated by a joint planning mission.
- The studies done in Ghana and in West-Papua by the thematic lead on poverty are warmly recommended as global references.

- LLS provides a welcome opportunity to clarify to what extent and under which conditions PES schemes can be accessed by the poor. The niche for LLS/ IUCN is to ensure that possible PES and REDD schemes will be particularly attentive to adverse effects on poor people.

Implementation model

- An important argument for financial leverage is the economical value of major ecosystem services within a context of integrated landscape management/restoration (e.g. hydrological retention capacity or soil fertility valued in terms of agricultural productivity). Therefore it is recommended to disseminate some basic understanding on valuation methods and tools to landscape managers.
- Although it is indispensable to involve local communities in decision making regarding the management of natural resources, the maintenance of biodiversity and the quality of ecosystem services are overarching prerogatives for society as a whole. The experience with national fund redistribution schemes like PINFOR in Guatemala should be promoted elsewhere too.
- A clear definition of what does and what does not count as leverage should be drafted by LLS HQ staff.
- LLS should look into possibilities for linking up with WANI field programmes in order to reap synergy effects.
- Depending on the potential trade off between livelihoods resilience and conservation in any particular landscape LLS might look into Integrated Landscape Management.

Capacity strengthening

- The magnitude of the programme is such that the pool of global thematic advisors needs to be extended with regional and local advisors. This recommendation is based on three considerations: (1) the need for advisors to be well familiar with regional conditions (including language ability in Spanish and French); (2) the relatively high costs of international expertise; and (3) the costs of local expertise that does not draw as much on relatively small national budgets.
- In the future, there must be an internal review by LLS of the thematic advice provided so far and a new policy for the use of local vs. international thematic support should be developed.

Institutionalization

- It should by all means be avoided that policy dialogues will be based on not or non-sufficiently tested assumptions and therefore a critical mass of field experiences is needed to which IUCN should closely associate itself.
- Validating the assumptions underlying the LLS Strategy is essential for formulating future standards and global policy guidelines for the IUCN in general and for the FCP in particular.
- LLS and WANI should collaborate more closely and systematically at several levels, ranging from the exchange of experiences in programme management at secretariat level to collaborating at a field level where both can mutually reinforce each other in a context of integrated ecosystem management (see also Integrated Landscape Management/Restoration).

Programme management

- LLS should review the experience gained in all countries so far and decide whether or not the work in some countries should be discontinued. This may be the case in countries where LLS has started out from scratch. Given that some countries are already very advanced, it may be better to use the scarce resources available and to concentrate on these countries and develop them to full-fledged LLS models in order to make the case.

- There are general complaints on slowness in the approval of work-plans and budgets causing unacceptable delays. As long as the LLS agreements and plans respect the frame-budget per landscape, decision power could be with the regional LLS coordinators. At the same time decision procedures can be staggered over the year in order to avoid bottlenecks.
- The centre piece of a programme of LLS is to optimize learning across levels and regions and to improve the permanently improve the programme accordingly. There is an apparent need to develop a system that integrates knowledge management action research, M&E, advocacy and institutional learning. Field experiences need to be systematically documented. Adequate staff time and resources must be allocated to the development and implementation of this concept. Field staff should actively participate in the process.
- Provided that funding is secured, GPFLR could support LLS in taking broad based learning beyond LLS.
- Progress Monitoring should be complemented with case studies on impact on both biodiversity/ecosystem improvements and poverty outcomes.
- The recent Monitoring Protocol, agreed between IUCN and DGIS, needs to be adjusted. The focus should be on the monitoring of outcomes and results, while the measurement at output level should be scrapped.
- The donor is advised to accommodate a long-term and flexible approach to LLS. IUCN itself equally needs to be realistic in approving planning horizons and corresponding budget requirements in line with the complexity of the programme itself and the framework conditions within which it works.
- Four years are a short time for a programme as ambitious as LLS. There should be a next phase with more funds. LLS could possibly reduce the number of sites and concentrate on the “low hanging fruits”.

Programme results

- It still appears too early to conclude on the effectiveness and efficiency of the LLS strategy because it should be measured against the achievement of tangible results. To obtain tangible results, time is needed to test the validity of the assumptions underlying the approach. Most of all, a critical mass of innovative models of pro-poor biodiversity conservation ought to be successfully field-tested, brought to scale, integrated into regulatory frameworks and generally applied, before one can speak about achieving strategic outcomes. A myriad of interesting activities are tried out everywhere, but it would be pretentious to claim a general impact, beyond the context in which the experience was gained.
- Especially in countries where there is only low potential for improved livelihoods from local forest and agriculture resources and ecosystem services LLS should consider other options for income generation and poverty reduction.