The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) is a leading international forestry research organisation established in 1993 in response to global concerns about the social, environmental, and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR is dedicated to developing policies and technologies for sustainable use and management of forests, and for enhancing the well-being of people in developing countries who rely on tropical forests for their livelihoods. CIFOR is one of the 15 Future Harvest centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). With headquarters in Bogor, Indonesia, CIFOR has regional offices in Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Zimbabwe, and it works in over 30 other countries around the world.
Our Mission

CIFOR’s mission is to improve the well-being of forest-dependent people, reduce poverty and ensure the survival of the world’s tropical forests through high-quality research.

- CIFOR’s research seeks to reduce poverty among the hundreds of millions of people who rely on forests for their livelihoods. In this way, CIFOR believes it can help developing countries achieve the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals of halving extreme poverty by 2015, and reversing the process of forest loss.
- CIFOR is committed to alleviating rural poverty by helping poor people retain access to forest resources, create new resources and earn more from those they have.
- CIFOR’s research encourages the sustainable use of forests and the protection of biodiversity.
- CIFOR is committed to strengthening the capabilities of developing country scientists, governments, civil society organisations and local communities so they can develop and promote their own solutions to forest problems.
- CIFOR is a learning organisation that constantly seeks to expand its own institutional frontiers by fostering new ideas and practices.
- As a ‘centre without walls’, CIFOR is committed to collaborative research that makes a real difference to people’s lives and the health of the forests.
Foreword

Forests would get more serious attention if people realised how important they are for addressing extreme poverty and illness, violent conflict, corruption, climate change and lack of clean drinking water. Research can provide evidence for that and help shape policy agendas.

Forest policies could benefit poor families, women and ethnic minorities much more if those groups’ voices were heard and policy-makers understood the impacts of their actions. Research can facilitate both those things.

Most forestry and conservation projects lack clear objectives, strategies and systems for monitoring and learning from their results. Research can provide information that would enable project managers to become more efficient and effective.

Small-scale forest enterprises and communities need more information about markets and technologies to be competitive and sustainable. Research can help provide that.

For a dozen years now CIFOR and its partners have been doing precisely those sorts of research, and there is more and more evidence we are getting results. Whether it is in Cameroon or Burkina Faso, Nepal or the Philippines, Brazil or Nicaragua, governments, aid agencies, NGOs, researchers, journalists, companies and communities have been using information and tools from CIFOR to improve what they do. This Annual Report tells a few of those stories, but it does not do much more than scratch the surface.

Perhaps the example that best symbolises what this effort was all about in 2005 is Liberia’s international workshop on community forestry, held outside Monrovia. After years of darkness and destruction in that heavily forest-dependent country, the workshop provided a ray of hope that forests could benefit communities, instead of fueling further violence. It was the first major event ever held in Liberia to discuss how forests could improve the lives of local people, and pretty much all the groups concerned with forests showed up to share experiences, learn from other countries and debate what should happen in the future. CIFOR was proud to be a part of that discussion.

2005 was also the last full year that the two of us will serve as CIFOR’s Director General and Board Chair, and we both feel honoured to have had that opportunity. We would like to use this occasion to thank all the many partners, staff members and supporters who have helped make CIFOR such an effective organisation over these past twelve years, and made our own lives a little easier and more enjoyable. You are the ones that made all this possible. As we pass the baton to our successors, Frances Seymour and Andrew Bennett, we are confident that they will make CIFOR even better, and that CIFOR’s research will continue to make a difference for people and forests.

David Kaimowitz
Director General

Angela Cropper
Chair, Board of Trustees
The confluence of the Mamberamo and Wiri Rivers, near Kwerba, Papua, Indonesia. (Photo by Miriam Van Heist)
When the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) announced that CIFOR would undergo an External Program and Management Review, beginning in late 2005, it seemed like a good time to reflect on what the organisation had achieved since the last review, some seven years earlier. ‘We looked at everything we’d done during that period and in many ways we were surprised by how much we’d achieved,’ recalls David Kaimowitz, CIFOR’s Director General. The results of this self-assessment are described in Achievements of the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) 1998–2005. Here are just a few of the highlights.

Much of CIFOR’s work has focused on how forests can help to improve the livelihoods of the 200 million people, many among the poorest in the world, who live in forested regions in developing countries. CIFOR has raised awareness among policy-makers and opinion leaders about the importance of forests for rural livelihoods, and its research has improved understanding of the links between forests and poverty.

One of CIFOR’s largest research programmes analysed the harvesting, use and sale of 61 non-timber forests products (NTFPs). This was a classic example of CIFOR acting as a ‘centre without walls’, with the project bringing together 60 scientists from 47 institutions in 27 countries. This and other research on NTFPs has provided information of real practical benefit to development agencies and local people. For example, over four-fifths of the forest traders in Cameroon who CIFOR provided with data on markets prices said they had increased their incomes as a result.

The world’s tropical forests have tangibly benefited from CIFOR’s research too. For example, the Forest Stewardship Council used research on Criteria and Indicators (C&I) of sustainable forest management, conducted by CIFOR and its partners, in the design of its standards. These have been used to certify almost 6 million hectares of tropical forest, and this has undoubtedly improved the management of these forests.

Meanwhile, research in Indonesia has highlighted the way in which false assumptions about wood supply from plantations encouraged financial institutions to invest billions of dollars in pulp and paper mills that have been responsible for massive destruction of natural forests. The research also highlighted the fact that Indonesia’s debt-restructuring programme would award a huge subsidy to financially risky businesses, and at the same time cause further forest loss. As a result of this research, the two largest pulp and paper mills have begun to improve their forest management practices, and some financial institutions have adopted more prudent lending policies.

At a very practical level, research by CIFOR and its partners has helped plantation companies as far afield as South Africa and China to improve soil management and increase their yields. Research into ‘reduced
impact logging’ has been widely used to improve the harvesting practices in Indonesia and Brazil, and CIFOR’s research on secondary forests has influenced the design of Peru’s new forestry laws.

CIFOR is a relatively small research institute. It can’t hope to influence the way forests are used by working in isolation. That’s why it has sought to get its research used by the organisations and policy-making processes that largely define the global forestry agenda. It seems to have succeeded. Most policy document on forest-related subjects produced by organisations like the World Bank, the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation and the Convention on Biodiversity cite CIFOR research.

CIFOR has adopted a range of strategies to influence policy-makers and opinion leaders. One of the ways it has done this is through POLEX, the Forestry Policy Experts Listserv. These succinct summaries of recent forest-related research, written by David Kaimowitz, are regularly sent to 17,000 individuals. Surveys have confirmed that these have made a significant contribution to forest policy dialogue. CIFOR also has one of the most active communications departments within the CGIAR, the number of media stories related to its research increasing from just a few in 2001 to over 500 by 2005.
Tropical forests provide food, building materials, medicines and much else for tens of millions of people. A Punan hunter-gatherer harvests sago palm, one of the many edible products found in the forests of East Kalimantan, Indonesia. (Photo by Edmond Dounias)
Almost a quarter of a billion people live in or near tropical forests, and their well-being depends on them. Forests provide building materials, food, land on which to grow crops and many other things. Two billion people – a third of the world’s population – use fuelwood and charcoal, most harvested in the forests. Two billion people rely on traditional medicines, many of which come from forests.

Forest-dependent people tend to be politically weak and economically marginalised, and they are among the poorest in the world. CIFOR’s Forest and Livelihoods Programme seeks to bring about improvements in their livelihoods by helping governments, conservation organisations and development agencies work out how to handle the trade-offs between livelihood enhancement and forest conservation, and how to take advantage of synergies between the two, where they exist. The research also aims to help raise the living standards of forest-dwelling people by providing information about markets, by improving forest management, by creating viable partnerships between industry and local communities, and by enhancing poverty-reduction policies.

One of the highlights of the year was a restitution workshop at which CIFOR scientists shared the results of a three-year research project on health and indigenous people. A comparative study of forest-dwelling communities and their urbanised relatives provided important insights into the complex relationship between health and forests. The workshop, held in Malinau, East Kalimantan, helped establish new links of communication between Punan hunter-gatherers and government officials.

The Non-timber Forest Product (NTFP) Case Comparison project, described in previous years’ annual reports, continued to spawn important publications. New editions of riches of the Forest were published for Mexico and Indonesia, and Carving out a Future drew heavily on the research of scientists involved in the Case Comparison project. This book provided the most detailed description to date of the remarkable richness of the woodcarving trade. It assesses the impact the trade has on resource sustainability and livelihoods, and suggests how policy-makers and consumers could act as a force for the good.
These are difficult times for many indigenous, forest-dwelling communities. Over much of the tropical world, forests are under threat from logging, mining, road-building and other activities. While contact with the outside world has undoubtedly brought some benefits to remote communities, the changes which are occurring are frequently rapid and often destructive. But how precisely does this affect the livelihoods of forest dwellers such as the Punan of Borneo?

To find out, CIFOR scientists, seconded from the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), conducted a comparative study of two very different Punan communities. Over a three-year period they compared the health, diet and livelihoods of a remote community which still practises hunter-gathering in the Upper Tubu Valley in East Kalimantan, with settled Punan living in Respen Sembuak, a suburb of the district capital, which is well-served by medical facilities, schools and markets.

The research team analysed over 1200 individual food dishes in the Upper Tubu, assessing the quality of diet and seasonal fluctuations. They also measured the weight, stature and fat condition of over 800 people, and analysed blood, urine and faeces. This enabled them to build up a detailed profile of each individual’s health. Similar research, measuring the same parameters, was undertaken in Respen.

‘With their higher incomes, better education and lower child and infant mortality, the downstream Punan in Respen would appear to be much better off than their cousins in the forest,’ explains agro-economist Patrice Levang. ‘However, the situation is much more complex than it seems.’ The research revealed that for most of the year, and contrary to expectations, remote villagers have a healthier diet than urban Punan and are better nourished.

But there is a downside to living in isolated communities. From time to time epidemics lead to significantly higher death rates in the Upper Tubu, especially among children. For example, during a two-month period in 2002, 28 children in two small villages – almost half the children there – died during an epidemic. Punan living in remote communities have recently come into contact with diseases, such as measles, to which they have little or no immunity. In contrast, Punan who have been living downstream for some time have greater immunity to these diseases, as well as access to health care.

The findings of the study were presented to a ‘restitution workshop’ in Malinau, the district capital, in April 2005. The research was well received by the local authorities, and the scientists believe the workshop discussions and follow-up meetings are helping to change their views. ‘The local authorities have always assumed the best way to help the Punan is to get them out of the forests and turn them into farmers,’ explains ethnobotanist Edmond Dounias. ‘However, our research suggests this isn’t necessarily the best solution.’

Dounias and Levang believe that the experience of another remote – but accessible
settlement provides a telling example of how Punan can survive, and survive well, far from places like Malinau. The village of Sule Pipe has an airstrip. It also has a health dispensary and a permanent school. The Upper Tubu has none of these, and it shows. Sule Pipe has levels of infant mortality similar to Respen, but a third of those of the Upper Tubu. The children of Sule Pipe are much better educated than those of the Upper Tubu, and household incomes are three times higher. ‘Supplying remote communities with an airstrip provides access to urban facilities, such as health care, without opening up the area to excessive exploitation by outsiders,’ says Dounias.

In the meantime, strenuous efforts are being made to improve the health of the Punan living in the Upper Tubu. In 2005, a memorandum of understanding was signed between CIFOR, the local health authority in Malinau and Médecins du Monde, which has recently begun work among remote and seriously disadvantaged communities in Indonesia. Doctors from Médecins du Monde have made lengthy visits to the Upper Tubu, accompanied by CIFOR researchers, and five young Punan have been trained as health assistants. The individual health profiles provided by the research team have provided the doctors and health assistants with valuable background information.

Forest dwellers have always had to adapt to changes in forest ecosystems, but the changes they face today are much more dramatic than those of the past. Now they must cope with the cash economy, deforestation and other changes, including their own shift from a nomadic to sedentary lifestyle. Survival requires new strategies and a new way of thinking. ‘We believe our research can help forest dwellers evaluate the choices open to them, so that they can make decisions which not only satisfy their immediate needs, but those of future generations,’ says Dounias.

Sharing the research findings

All too often, scientists fail to share their findings with the people who have done most to help them – the individuals and communities which have been the objects of their study. Not surprisingly, this frequently leads to resentment. From the outset, the researchers from CIFOR/IRD pledged that they would share their results with the local community. This they did at a restitution workshop, held in Malinau and Respen in April 2005. The workshop was attended by members of the Punan communities, government officials, international donors and conservation groups. It received widespread coverage in the local and international media.

‘Our main goal was to give the research results back to the Punan and the local authorities,’ explains Edmond Dounias. The researchers were able to show the Punan of the Upper Tubu that in many ways they were better off than they believed. ‘We also had a clear message for the local authorities,’ says Dounias. ‘We wanted to show them that the Punan are not savages, and that if local government wants to help them, they can do so without forcing them to leave the forest.’

Besides presenting local communities with the findings of the research, the workshop helped to establish new lines of communication between the local authorities and the Punan. The researchers believe that this heralds a new era of better communication. Haryanto, a Punan from the Upper Tubu, spoke for many when he said that the Punan and the local authorities needed to work together. ‘The poor education in the Upper Tubu is not something we can tackle on our own,’ he said. ‘I propose that the local government should provide buildings and maintenance costs, but we should find the teachers from our own community.’ Likewise, the Punan at the workshop recognised that health-care provision needs to be a joint venture between community and local government.

A workshop to share research findings was held in Malinau and Respen in April 2005. (Photo by Misha Kishi)
Scour the galleries and craft shops of virtually any city in Europe or North America, and you’ll find woodcarvings from as far afield as Bali and Bolivia, Mexico and Madagascar. Some will cost you just a few dollars; others might set you back the equivalent of a month’s wages, and occasionally more. Some will come from places where woodcarving has enriched local livelihoods and made good use of forest resources. Others will come from areas where woodcarving is an occupation of last resort for the poor, and where the demand for raw material – wood – has caused significant damage to forests.

‘Woodcarving provides us with many examples of non-timber forest projects that have good scope for improving livelihoods, but where various factors often prevent this from happening,’ explains CIFOR scientist Brian Belcher, co-editor with Anthony Cunningham and Bruce Campbell of Carving out a Future: Forests, Livelihoods and the International Woodcarving Trade. ‘What we wanted to do in the book was look at a whole range of different products and establish what factors influenced their impact on livelihoods and the environment.’

Many of the book’s authors were also involved in CIFOR’s Non-timber Forest Product Case Comparison Project, and the stories told here present an insight into the remarkable richness of the woodcarving trade. Certain common elements link the various traditions. For example, virtually all woodcarvers are men, and the basic carving tools – saw, axe, chisel and knife – are the same wherever you go. Historically, the greatest diversity of items comes from settled farming communities, rather than from pastoralists or hunter-gatherers, and woodcarvers have tended to make use of relatively few species of plants. Tourism and globalisation have meant that the trade has become increasingly commercialised over recent years.

The contrast between successful woodcarving industries and those which provide relatively few benefits to local livelihoods is stark. ‘If you look at somewhere like Bali, and contrast it with Zimbabwe,’ explains Belcher, ‘you get a good idea about which factors make for a successful woodcarving industry.’ In Bali, a combination of factors – highly skilled and well-organised woodcarvers, enlightened entrepreneurs who have been willing to seek out export markets, and supportive government policies – has created an industry which is not only highly profitable, but environmentally sustainable. There are now 24,000 woodcarvers in Bali, most making a good living from their trade. In Zimbabwe, in contrast, large numbers of woodcarvers produce large quantities of relatively low-quality, low-value carvings from an open-access resource. The result is over-exploitation of some of the country’s forests and widespread poverty among producers.

‘It’s essential that woodcarvers don’t flood the market with the same product, and that they make the best use of sustainably harvested wood by going for quality, rather than quantity,’ explains Anthony Cunningham, director of the People and Plants Initiative.

He illustrates his case with the example of Spirostachys venenifera, commonly known as African sandalwood, which is used by woodcarvers in Kenya. At present, Spirostachys, a tree restricted to certain clay soils, is frequently used to make cheap items such as salad bowls. ‘It’s an exceptionally high-value wood, and it’s also used to make very beautiful sculptures,’ explains Cunningham. ‘Using it to make salad bowls is a waste of a valuable resource.’ There are many other woods that could make just as good salad bowls, and Cunningham believes it would make sense if Spirostachys was simply used for high-value carving.

The authors of Carving out a Future stress that woodcarving industries will only thrive if they make sustainable use of resources. In some situations, this will imply switching from one sort of wood to another. For
example, in a pilot project in Kenya, woodcarvers are being encouraged to use neem, a tree in plentiful supply which can be used for a variety of purposes. And in Bali, the Ministry of Forestry provided local people with seedlings to plant on marginal land. Again, the species chosen, *Paraserianthes falcataria*, was not only suitable for woodcarving, but provided fodder for livestock and fuel for humans.

The book suggests that importers can play a role in improving the sustainability of the woodcarving trade. A good example of what can be done is provided by the US-based Mennonite Central Committee, which for the past 20 years has been running the Ten Thousand Villages job-creation programme in Kenya. The programme purchases handicrafts at a fair price for producers, and these are sold in some 200 stores in North America. Recently, the programme has begun purchasing sustainably produced ‘good wood’ products, and it has been funding carving co-operatives to establish tree nurseries and reforestation programmes.

*Carving out a Future* also provides guidance for policy-makers. ‘All too often, the typical response of government is to look at the rows of woodcarvers and sellers sitting beside the road, decide that conditions are deplorable and pay for a new building where they can sell their goods,’ says Belcher. ‘But this doesn’t solve anything’. It makes much more sense, he suggests, for policy-makers to encourage woodcarvers to organise themselves into associations so that they end up working with each other, rather than against. ‘The associations which thrive will be the ones that can distinguish their product from the rest of the market, and guarantee high quality and fair returns for producers,’ says Belcher. ‘Just like Sunkist did for the orange growers in California.’

The book has a clear message for consumers. It suggests that tourists visiting developing countries with woodcarving industries, and those buying imported goods at home, should be prepared to pay a good price for good-quality carvings. By doing so, they will be encouraging industries which support local livelihoods and sustain healthy forests.
Sharing science with the people in Mexico

All too often, scientists rely heavily on rural communities to gather information for their research, but fail to share their findings with them. This may be because they have got what they want, and feel no strong obligations to those who assisted them. But just as frequently, it is because they simply don’t know how to package their research in a way which is accessible to a non-scientific audience. This means there is plenty of good – and potentially useful – scientific research that never reaches the public domain.

The Non-timber Forest Products (NTFP) Case Comparison project, described in last year’s annual report, produced three books under the title *Riches of the Forest*, one for Asia, one for Africa and one for Latin America. Attractively illustrated and written in layman’s language, these told the life histories of some 60 different NTFPs, from edible invertebrates in west Africa to fibres and resins in Asia and fruits and waxes in Latin America. ‘We wanted to make the knowledge about the commercial potential and cultural significance of NTFPs as widely available as possible,’ explains CIFOR ethnobotanist Citlalli Lopez, one of the co-editors.

The success of the Latin American book prompted two government departments in Mexico – the Programme for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Forest Resources (PROCYMAF) and the Center for Environmental Education and Capacity Building for Sustainable Development (CECADESU) – to suggest to CIFOR that a new edition, specially tailored to Mexico, should be produced with their support.

‘These departments publish lots of technical and educational materials,’ explains Lopez, ‘but they’d rarely produced anything with such broad appeal as *Riches of the Forest*. They decided this would be the ideal way to inspire people across the country.’ CIFOR and its government partners, who paid for the printing and distribution of 10,000 copies, hoped that *La riqueza de los bosques mexicanos: más allá de la madera* – ‘The Riches of the Mexican Forests’ – would spread the NTFP message far and wide. Mexico is a huge country and people at one end often don’t know what’s happening at the other.

The book includes stories about eight Mexican NTFPs which featured in the Latin American version of *Riches of the Forest*, but there are 11 new cases as well. The stories are told not just by experts, as they were in the first series of books, but by local people involved in the harvesting, cultivation and processing of NTFPs.

Take, for example, mezcal, the strong liquor produced in the drier regions of Mexico from several species of the maguey plant. The book describes the cultivation and harvesting of the plant, how it is baked in underground pits, and how it is bottled and blended. It describes the status of the plants, the growing demand for mezcal and the significance of the trade for local livelihoods and local culture. The chapter is a collaborative effort, written by a researcher from a Mexican NGO and by members of a farmers’ group. It thus blends hard science with local knowledge.

Painting wooden figures in Oaxaca, Mexico. Wood carving has provided a dramatic boost in income for many families. (Photo by Silvia Purata)
La riqueza de los bosques mexicanos was launched in September 2005 in Mexico City. Among the 200 people who attended were government officials, people who collaborated on the book and the local press. ‘This wonderful book is an original work full of deep commitment to the conservation of forest ecosystems and the communities who live in the forests,’ said Leticia Merino of the Institute of Social Research, the Autonomous University of Mexico. She told the audience that the book was far more than a compendium of information about different forest species for which there is a use. It gave a detailed account of traditions that stretch back many generations and of the cultural importance of many non-timber forest products. It also highlighted the challenges which rural communities, and the Mexican government, face if the trade in NTFPs is to prosper in the future.

‘The Mexican book provides a template for the sort of publications other countries could produce about non-timber forest products, drawing on the Riches of the Forest series and adding case studies of their own,’ explains Citlalli Lopez. In the meantime, Indonesia decided to go ahead with a direct translation of The Riches of the Forest: Food, Spices, Crafts and Resins of Asia from English into the local language. This has been produced by one of the country’s leading commercial publishers, Gramedia, with the support of the Department for International Development’s (DFID) Multistakeholder Forestry Programme and BP.

Amazon fruit book gets its just deserts

In last year’s annual report, we described the launch of Frutíferas e Plantas Uteis na Vida Amazonica – ‘Fruit Trees and Useful Plants in the Lives of Amazonians’ – by CIFOR ethnobotanists Patricia Shanley and Gabriel Medina. It was an astonishing event, attracting over 400 people to Governor’s House in Belém. The culmination of a dozen years of research, involving scores of scientists, the Fruit Book, as it is known, combines rigorous scientific research with traditional knowledge to describe 30 trees and palms whose fruits, nuts, fibres and resins are widely used in Amazonia. Its use of illustrations, cartoons and popular songs make it accessible to rural people with minimal literacy skills.

But that was just part of the story. Further launches were held in 2005. The one in Brasília, the capital, was opened by the executive director of the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA) and it attracted large numbers of politicians and civil servants. The Minister of the Environment, Marina Silva, was so enthused by the Fruit Book that she declared: ‘Had I read this book earlier in my life, I would have become a researcher of non-timber forest products, not a politician.’

One of the great strengths of the book is that it appeals to a wide range of people, as was apparent when it was launched, for the fourth time, in the Amazonian city of Santarém in June 2005. Large numbers of local forest-dwelling women turned up for the launch, some coming from far away. ‘The fact that these rural women, many of whom have had little formal education, responded so enthusiastically to the book was a major endorsement,’ says Patricia Shanley.

The launch was timed to coincide with a meeting of some 30 World Bank representatives who were in town to study local knowledge networks. They were as enthusiastic about the Fruit Book as the forest women. Kevin Cleaver, the Bank’s Director of Agriculture and Rural Development, suggested that the book deserved to be ‘scaled up to other regions’.

Shanley’s great talent for making serious science accessible was recognised by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) when she received the Science Award for Outstanding Communications. ‘It is very difficult to take complex messages and make them intelligible,’ said one of the experts on the award panel, Latifa Akharbar, Director of the Institut Supérieur de l’Information et de la Communication in Tunis. ‘This book does exactly that!’ She even recommended that the Fruit Book should be translated into Arabic for use in communications curricula.
Unlocking the secret of good forestry partnerships

Establishing plantations is often a tricky business, even in countries which have plentiful supplies of land and the ideal climate and growing conditions. Take, for example, Indonesia, where just 2 million hectares of plantations have been established since 1985, instead of the 6 million hectares originally planned. This dramatic shortfall was partly a result of conflict between companies and local communities, with the former frequently taking over land the latter considered theirs by right. When you’re planting vast numbers of trees, you need to make sure the locals are on your side.

Since 1998, some Indonesian companies have sought to defuse conflict by establishing partnerships with local communities. These have mostly taken the form of outgrower schemes, and they involve smallholders and communities growing and supplying timber to pulp mills and other users in return for a share of the benefits. Sometimes, the plantations are established on company land; sometimes they are established on land owned by the growers themselves. Either way, such schemes provide an income for local communities and a supply of timber for the companies. The precise nature of the company/community partnerships varies from one place to another, and some have been more successful than others, although the reasons for this are often poorly understood.

“There is an urgent need for research which will provide communities, companies and governments with better information about the sort of arrangements that work best for both companies and communities,” explains CIFOR economist Ani Adiwinata Nawir. A three-year research programme, funded by the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), led by Indonesia’s Forest Research and Development Agency (FORDA) and launched in Bogor in 2005, will provide new insights into the factors which favour fair and sustainable partnerships. The project members – FORDA, Australia’s Charles Stuart University (CSU), WWF Indonesia’s Nusa Tenggara programme and CIFOR – are now working with a wide range of farmer groups, government agencies and companies in eastern Indonesia and south-east Australia.

In terms of their ecology and social systems, eastern Indonesia and south-east Australia are worlds apart, but they do have one thing in common: historically, farmers and village communities have not played an active role in commercial forestry. “This project is looking at ways in which forestry activities can be established beyond the areas where commercial forestry has traditionally been located,” explains project leader Digby Race of CSU. “We believe that company/community partnerships could play an important role in expanding forestry activities into new areas, involving farmers as partners in commercial forestry.”

The Indonesian research is focusing on Bulukumba district in Sulawesi and Sumbawa district in Nusa Tenggara. In Bulukumba, the research team is assessing three existing small-scale company/community partnerships. In Sumbawa, the project partners are working with local farmers to explore how current partnerships operate, and investigating marketing opportunities for timber grown by smallholders. ‘We have also carried out a profit-sharing study,’ explains...
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Nawir, ‘and we have fed the results into a new district regulation on community-based forest management in Sumbawa.’ Among other things, the regulation will provide guidelines for sharing profits between companies and communities.

The variety of partnership arrangements is much greater in Indonesia than in Australia. Company/community partnerships in the Green Triangle region, the focus for the Australian research, usually involve annual payments to growers for forestry companies to lease their land. However, this arrangement is unlikely to suit all landholders and Race believes there is the potential to attract far greater numbers by using different partnership arrangements which provide a range of incentives for growers. ‘Indonesia is a very rich source of information for us,’ explains Race, ‘and the experiences there could provide us with valuable information about the sorts of arrangements that could be applied here.’

At present, companies, government, communities and smallholders are often uncertain how to share the profits fairly, and how to share the risks. The researchers hope that this project will provide them with the analytical tools they need to work out what sort of partnerships work best in particular situations. The project is already building the research capacity of partner organisations such as FORDA and WWF, as well as that of District Forestry Service staff. Ultimately, it could lead to an increase in partnership schemes, and an increase in the area under plantations in regions where commercial forestry has previously made only a small contribution to rural livelihoods.

Since 2000, CIFOR has established good working relationships with a range of Indonesian companies that have entered into partnership schemes with local communities. CIFOR’s research has focused in particular on how company/community partnerships can improve local livelihoods.

In January 2005, CIFOR hosted a communications forum which brought together private companies and representatives from the Ministry of Forestry, including the Social Forestry Working Group. At the meeting, the companies shared their experiences and identified the challenges they faced to make partnerships work more effectively. The meeting also led to the creation of a new communications forum, the Company Community Forest Link, or ComForLink. Members include major companies such as Riau Andalan Pulp and Paper (RAPP), Wirakarya Sakti (WKS), Arara Abadi and Finnantara Intiga.

During the course of the year, ComForLink met on eight occasions, mostly in Jakarta. ComForLink has provided a detailed analysis of the impact which government regulations have had on company/community partnerships, and regular meetings have been held with officials from the Ministry of Forestry. ComForLink has provided significant input into the formulation of two ministerial decrees, one concerning community industrial forestry plantations, the other utilisation rights on community forest lands.

‘We’re hoping that ComForLink will encourage the government to create a regulatory framework which is more conducive to establishing successful company/community partnerships,’ explains Ani Adiwiratna Nawir, who has facilitated the activities of the new forum. ComForLink has undoubtedly raised awareness about this important issue within the Ministry.

Creating partnerships which benefit both companies and communities is one of the aims of the new plantations communication forum, ComForLink. A WKS staff interacts with community members in Jambi, Indonesia. (Photo by Hari Witono, WKS)

Indonesia’s new forestry network
Pristine landscapes like this provide a range of environmental services. Danau Sentarum National Park, Indonesia. (Photo by Yayan Indriatmoko)
Promoting wise use

Tropical forests support over half of all terrestrial plant and animal species. They supply us with timber, food, fuel and fibre. They also provide a range of environmental services. For example, they soak up the greenhouse gases which cause global warming, recycle nutrients and stabilise soils. If we lose the forests, we lose far more than the trees, yet each year an area of forest the size of Greece is destroyed or converted to other land uses. Most of the losses are occurring in the developing world.

CIFOR’s Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests programme aims to improve the way we use forests, both natural and planted, and provide the knowledge needed to ensure that forests deliver a range of goods and services. The programme works at many levels, from the local to the global, from the village farm to the city boardroom. The beneficiaries range from governments and development agencies to corporations involved in industrial timber production and small farmers who grow a few hectares of trees to sell to their local pulp mill.

2005 saw the launch of a major new project on climate change. CIFOR scientists and their partners are now working in countries around the tropics, exploring the way in which climate change affects forests. The research will enable governments to develop policies to help them adapt to climate change. CIFOR scientists continued to explore the ways in which forests can be used to reduce the levels of carbon dioxide, and at the same time improve livelihoods. Major publications included Carbon Forestry – Who Will Benefit? and Tropical Forests and Adaptation to Climate Change.

Using market forces to achieve environmental goals by providing payments for environmental services (PES) – for example, by planting forests which sequester carbon – has received much attention in recent years. By drawing on research projects in Vietnam, Bolivia and elsewhere, CIFOR scientists have been able to provide an objective analysis of the role which such payments could play as incentives for conservation.

It is frequently claimed that logging and deforestation are a significant cause of disastrous floods. *Forests and floods – drowning in fiction or thriving on facts?*, which was jointly published by CIFOR and the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), poured cold water on this theory. Marshalling all the available scientific evidence, it showed that there is no direct link between deforestation and large-scale floods. This myth-busting review received widespread media coverage around the world.
Forests, floods and misleading headlines

Scarcely a year passes without a headline-grabbing flood wreaking havoc somewhere in the developing world. In 1998, for example, floods on the Yangtze River in China killed thousands and caused $30 billion of damage. Six years later, 46 million people in China were affected by floods. In between, there were dramatic floods in Honduras, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Vietnam, Philippines and many other countries – all causing significant loss of life and massive damage to property and farmland.

No matter where the floods were, the headlines were nearly always the same, with the media blaming the floods partly or entirely on deforestation and logging in the upper reaches of the affected watersheds. There is only one problem with this seemingly neat argument: it is probably wrong. This was the major finding of a review published in 2005 by CIFOR and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), and endorsed by the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) and the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD).

‘There is no scientific evidence at all of any significant relationship between logging and deforestation, on the one hand, and large-scale floods on the other,’ explains CIFOR Director General David Kaimowitz, one of many contributors to the report, Forests and Floods – Drowning in Fiction or Thriving on Facts? It is, however, true that logging and deforestation can lead to small-scale floods, landslides and an increase in erosion. But that is another matter.

The widely held perception that forest loss is responsible for major floods has resulted in some activities which have undoubtedly been beneficial, most obviously the planting of trees on degraded land. So does it matter if there is confusion between fact and fiction? Patrick Durst, FAO senior forestry officer for Asia and the Pacific, believes it does. ‘Government decision-makers, international aid groups and the media often blame flooding on deforestation caused by small farmers and loggers,’ he says. ‘The conclusion is not only scientifically wrong. It has frequently prompted governments to make life harder for poor farmers by driving them off the land and away from the forests, while
doing nothing to prevent future flooding.’

Major floods tend to occur after prolonged periods of very heavy rain, when forest soils are already saturated. When this occurs, the water simply runs along the soil surface. This is why many of the worst floods happen towards the end of rainy seasons. ‘In situations such as this, when there is massive and prolonged rainfall,’ reflects Kaimowitz, ‘there are going to be floods, regardless of whether or not the land is forested.’

There is no denying that the economic damage done by floods, and the loss of life caused by them, is much greater now than ever before. This is not because there has been an increase in floods – in fact, the frequency of major flooding has remained much the same for over a hundred years – but because the areas affected by floods are now much more densely settled and intensively used than they were in the past. Population growth and poverty have pushed more and more people into vulnerable situations. That is why the damage is so much worse.

The damage – in human terms – has been made worse still by governments and aid agencies that have formulated policies on the basis of the erroneous belief that catastrophic floods have been caused by deforestation. Nowhere is this more evident than in China, which introduced a ban on the logging of natural forests in 1 following the flooding of the Yangtze River. The logging ban is thought to have put a million people out of work. It also led to a dramatic increase in Chinese timber imports, and Chinese demand can be directly linked to illegal logging in countries such as Papua New Guinea and the Russian Federation, and to human rights abuses in Myanmar and elsewhere.

So what’s to be done? According to the report, there are no easy solutions. The authors suggest that effective watershed and floodplain management is a complex process which requires the identification and assessment of a wide range of techniques and strategies to improve land-use planning and reduce the impact of floods in flood-prone areas. The report draws on case studies to show that significant progress has been made in some parts of the world. It also stresses that reforestation projects in the uplands are not a solution.

The report received as much media coverage as most large-scale floods. Over a hundred different outlets, including heavyweights such as the Economist, the Guardian and the Washington Post, ran stories related to the report. Most were at pains to point out that the report made a clear distinction between the causes of large-scale and small-scale floods. Its findings, however, caused consternation among some environmental groups. The Environmental Investigation Agency, for example, feared that the report might be misused by politicians and logging companies eager to reverse protectionist policies in upland areas.

This is precisely what happened in the Philippines. Shortly after the report was published, the San Jose Timber Corporation took out a one-page advertisement in the Philippine Sun which made mischievous use of the report. The company, it seemed, was eager to open up an area of primary forest in a protected area, and it tried to use the report as justification. CIFOR immediately issued a response. It suggested that industrial logging in this particular area could cause small floods and lead to loss of biodiversity. There was also the possibility that it would be economically unsustainable and fail to create local jobs. However, CIFOR made it clear that this in no way invalidated its belief that logging does not cause large-scale floods. CIFOR’s response was published in the local press and used in the Filipino Senate during deliberations on the issue.
Tackling climate change

During 2005, CIFOR increased the scale of its research on climate change. There are now two distinct strands. One is devoted to exploring the ways governments and communities can adapt to climate change. The other focuses on how forests and trees can be used to reduce the levels of atmospheric carbon and at the same time improve the livelihoods of the rural poor.

Climate change may suit some people – for example, farmers in temperate regions could benefit from longer growing seasons – but prove disastrous for others. The poor in tropical countries are likely to be among the worst affected, according to Markku Kanninen, director of CIFOR’s Environmental Services programme and co-editor of *Tropical Forests and Adaptation to Climate Change*. ‘One of the clear messages to come out of the book is that climate change is already happening, it’s going to cause severe disruption, and the poor in developing countries are going to suffer most.’

CIFOR scientists are now developing a set of robust, innovative methodologies to assess vulnerability to climate change and to mainstream adaptation to climate change into development agendas. When assessing vulnerability to change, there will be a strong focus on patches of forest within the wider landscape. Adaptation strategies will take into account the way in which diverse landscapes provide many environmental goods and services, and satisfy the needs of a wide range of stakeholders.

The poor frequently make their living on steep hillsides, on low-lying land and beside the sea – in areas prone to droughts, landslides, floods and tidal waves. Climate change increases the vulnerability of the poor in two ways: first, by exposing them to more frequently occurring climate-related natural events, such as droughts and floods; and second, by affecting the long-term productivity of the land on which they depend by gradual changes in, for example, precipitation patterns.

*Tropical Forests and Adaptation to Climate Change*, a collection of papers from a workshop organised by CIFOR, the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE) and Intercooperation, provides a series of case studies which show that adapting to climate change will require an interdisciplinary approach involving policymakers, scientists and natural resource managers. This strategy should combine advances in science as well as systematisation of local and traditional knowledge and the promotion of institutional development.

In some situations, suggests Kanninen, there are ‘no regrets’ measures which can be taken immediately. For example, better recovery of wood waste in sawmills and its use as a substitute for fossil fuels when drying wood not only reduces global warming, but saves money. But adaptation to climate change will often be a complex and contentious issue. For example, it might make sense for governments to prevent the development of flood-prone areas, but these areas might also be highly productive in agricultural terms. Keeping people out of flood plains will be no simple matter.

Adaptation to climate change is the central theme of a four-year research programme launched by CIFOR and CATIE in 2005, and funded by the European Commission. ‘The research will help us to get a better understanding of how climate change affects tropical forests, and the impact this will have on development,’ explains Claudio Forner, a CIFOR climate-change specialist.

The precise focus of the research will vary from place to place. For example, in Burkina Faso, where 90 per cent the population use fuelwood for cooking, the research will assess the impact of climate change on timber productivity, and its implications for energy supply. In Costa Rica, forests have an important role to play in regulating the hydrological cycle, so the researchers will analyse the impact of climate change on forests and water supply. All of this will enable governments to develop policies which will help them adapt to climate change.
Trapping carbon; improving livelihoods

The Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement whose aim is to reduce global warming and at the same time encourage sustainable development, finally came into force on 16 February 2005. To mark the occasion, CIFOR and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) held a workshop on ‘Carbon Sequestration and Sustainable Livelihoods’. The workshop proceedings – Carbon Forestry: Who Will Benefit? – provides insights into the ways in which projects designed to trap atmospheric carbon can benefit rural communities.

‘Some of the workshop case studies show that carbon sequestration projects can reduce global warming, and at the same time improve local livelihoods,’ explains Daniel Murdiyarso, a CIFOR climate scientist. For example, the rehabilitation of degraded peatlands in Kalimantan has not only increased their carbon storage capacity, but led to higher fish yields and closed down transport routes formerly used by illegal loggers. However, other projects – such as the vast pulpwood plantations in Sumatra – may be good at sucking carbon out of the atmosphere, but they have proved detrimental to local people.

‘Designing carbon projects carefully is absolutely crucial if they are to benefit both the environment and the rural poor,’ explains Murdiyarso. At the international level, CIFOR researchers have been involved in designing afforestation and reforestation projects and providing technical assistance about the Kyoto Protocol’s Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). The CDM enables industrialised countries to meet some of their greenhouse gas emission targets by financing carbon-sequestering schemes in developing countries. One of the eligible measures involves planting trees on land that does not have forests. ‘CIFOR scientists played a significant role in promoting a system of rules that makes the CDM smallholder-friendly,’ says Claudio Forner, who worked on forestry-related CDM rules at the UNFCCC secretariat before coming to CIFOR.

CIFOR has also been working on issues related to the Kyoto regulations at the national level. In 2005, the Asian Development Bank launched a project to help Indonesia establish pilot sites which will earn emission reduction credits under the Clean Development Mechanism. The project is being managed by Winrock International, with technical assistance from CIFOR and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF). ‘This is very much a learning process for the government and for communities involved in carbon forestry,’ explains Murdiyarso. ‘One of the key stumbling blocks to establishing CDM sites is the methodology, and we hope this project will provide the Government of Indonesia with the skills and technical knowledge necessary to choose, set up and apply for CDM sites.’

Carbon forestry on the web

For anyone interested in research on carbon forestry, CIFOR’s new website, CarboFor, should be one of their first ports of call. The website – www.cifor.cgiar.org/carbofor – has been developed as a service for scientists working on the technical aspects of carbon forestry, and on issues related to regulations governing land-use change and forestry activities under the Kyoto Protocol. The website lists recent publications, describes projects conducted by CIFOR and its partners, and provides tools and methodologies that can be used to develop and monitor carbon forestry projects. This is not an ivory tower for CIFOR scientists, but an open-access site that encourages others to contribute their ideas and data.
Over the past decade, farmers in the lower reaches of the Los Negros River in Bolivia have noticed that the water level has been steadily decreasing, especially in the dry season. As the local economy is based on irrigated agriculture, this represents a serious threat to their livelihoods. The farmers have attributed the declining water flows to the clearance of cloud forest and an increase in irrigation higher up the valley.

You will hear stories such as this across the mountainous tropics. But this story doesn’t end there. Four years ago negotiations began between the lowland and upland farmers. A local organisation, Fundación Natura Bolivia, helped to broker a deal which seeks to create a system whereby some of the former make annual payments to some of the latter. In return, the upland farmers have agreed conservation contracts that cover over 1000 hectares. The deal is designed to help ensure a steady supply of water in the future, and it is a classic example of what is known as ‘payments for environmental services’; or PES.

As human pressures on natural ecosystems become greater, and the services they traditionally provide free of charge – clean water, biodiversity and so on – become scarcer, schemes such as this are likely to become more widespread. ‘Our deforestation research over the past 10 years has shown that landowners normally clear forests because it’s profitable to do so,’ explains CIFOR economist Sven Wunder. ‘If you want to conserve the forests and maintain the environmental services they provide, you need to work out ways of compensating landowners for the loss of income they incur. One way of doing this is through payments for environmental services.’ It is not, however, a simple matter, as research by CIFOR and its partners has revealed.

In the Occasional Paper, Payments for Environmental Services: Some Nuts and Bolts, Wunder defines a PES scheme as a voluntary transaction with at least one seller, one buyer and a well-defined environmental service. Payment should be conditional on delivery of the service. Most schemes focus on four services: carbon sequestration, watershed protection, biodiversity conservation, and tourism based on fine landscapes and wildlife.

By examining schemes in Vietnam, Bolivia and elsewhere, Wunder and his colleagues...
have gained valuable insights into the factors which determine why they succeed or fail. In Vietnam, they found that the command and control economy is so strong that PES-like schemes remain relatively ineffectual. It is strong law enforcement, rather than payments to provide environment services, which dictates what farmers do, even in areas where some form of payment is made. However, the outlook in Bolivia is far more encouraging.

‘I think the existence of many of the Bolivian initiatives owes much to the innovative environmental legislation that was introduced in the 1990s,’ says Nina Robertson, co-author with Wunder of *Fresh Tracks in the Forest*, which analyses the experiences of 17 PES-like initiatives. ‘We were continually impressed by how dynamic the process was and how the organisations involved – the villagers, NGOs and funders – were eager to experiment with different models to make the schemes work.’

Experience around the world suggests that payment schemes related to the provision of water have a relatively good chance of success. People who depend on water, either for drinking or irrigation, are unlikely to balk at having to pay, say, an extra 10 per cent on their water bills if it means that they are guaranteed secure, high-quality supplies. For poor farmers in the uplands, and households or farmers in the lowlands, the benefits are easily understood: cash for the former, and reduced risk of water shortages for the latter.

The same cannot be said for biodiversity conservation schemes, which can prove much more difficult to finance. ‘For one thing,’ explains Wunder, ‘it’s not a question of making a one-off payment, or setting up a conservation project that takes X amount of time – after which the problem will be solved.’ In most cases, the buyers need to keep on paying year after year, and that means they have to set up something like a trust fund which will yield continuous returns.

Conservation can also be a very expensive business when looked at in terms of opportunity costs. Studies in the Brazilian Amazon suggest that the payments that would need to be made to encourage a farmer not to clear forest to grow, say, soya beans would be prohibitively high. However, on marginal lands where the opportunity costs of forsaking agricultural activities are modest, PES schemes may offer a feasible conservation strategy. Here, a relatively small annual payment could tip the balance in favour of conservation.

Eco-tourism schemes have proved particularly successful in Bolivia. For example, the creation of Chalalán Ecocamp in the Bolivian Amazon has significantly improved local incomes by providing rotational employment opportunities for some 60 people. It has also helped to stem the migration of young people to distant cities. The scheme has strengthened community organisation and encouraged villagers to protect an area which is outstanding for its scenic beauty and wildlife. It has also had a knock-on effect, stimulating others to set up small eco-tourism operations in the area.

Using market forces to achieve environmental goals is an attractive idea. But will PES schemes ever take off in a big way? ‘I think it’ll take time to demonstrate that this is a workable proposition, and that’s not going to happen until there are more schemes, which means getting more buyers involved,’ explains Wunder. He believes it is essential to get marketing people involved in PES research and development so that a good business case can be made to attract the private sector. Development agencies should also consider using PES schemes as a way of supporting biodiversity projects. Nina Robertson emphasises that it is essential to build trust among stakeholders and address local concerns about PES schemes. ‘If local people feel that the schemes are being imposed from outside,’ she says, ‘then they won’t develop successfully.’

Besides publishing an Occasional Paper, an Infobrief and two books on payments for environmental services during 2005, CIFOR co-hosted, with the University of Bonn, a high-level international workshop on the subject at Titisee, Germany, in June 2005.
Influencing plantation policy in China

Research by CIFOR scientists Christian Cossalter and Chris Barr, described in last year’s annual report, examined China’s ambitious programme to develop a plantations-based wood-pulp industry. The researchers found that although the Chinese government was encouraging the development of some 6 million hectares of fast-growing pulpwod plantations, there would be significant shortfalls in domestic supply for some time to come. This meant China was likely to continue importing wood fibre, possibly harvested from natural forests in countries like Indonesia.

In 2005, the researchers were invited by the World Bank to conduct a more detailed analysis of plantation development and industrial wood demand in just one province, the Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region. The research, a collaborative effort between CIFOR, the Guangxi Provincial Forestry Bureau and the Guangxi Forest Survey and Design Institute, has had a significant influence on a major World Bank loan for plantation development.

‘During recent years, the province has seen a rapid expansion in its production of both fibreboard and paper, mirroring the trends throughout China as a whole,’ explains Cossalter. Since the mid-1990s, China’s production of medium-density fibreboard, or MDF, has risen some 30-fold, and Guangxi is now one of the largest producers. China has also dramatically increased its pulp and paper production; once again, Guangxi has been a significant player.

‘On paper, you might expect the fibreboard and wood-pulp industries to be competing for the same wood supply,’ says Cossalter, ‘but our research showed that they are tapping into different resources.’ This is because some 90 per cent of the MDF is manufactured for the local market, where price matters more than quality. MDF manufacturers use small, low-quality products that come from wood waste and from thinning pine plantations. In contrast, producing high-quality paper requires high-quality pulp produced from larger diameter eucalyptus logs. So there is little overlap in demand.

The worrying news for the MDF industry, highlighted by the research, is that the rapid growth of a modern paper industry in Guangxi is leading to a rapid expansion in eucalyptus plantations, and these are frequently being established on wasteland and old pine forests – the very resource on which the MDF industry depends.

These and other findings of the research have encouraged the World Bank to revise the specifications for its US$100 million loan to the Guangxi Forestry Bureau. Originally, the intention was to use most of the loan to establish new eucalyptus plantations. ‘As a result of the research, the focus has now changed,’ explains Cossalter. ‘The amount of land which will be devoted to eucalyptus has been cut by half, and the new plantations will not only serve the pulp and paper industry, but other sectors, such as the MDF manufacturers, as well.’

The Guangxi Forestry Bureau had originally planned to spend most of the loan on state farms, but there will now be a much stronger focus on providing assistance for farmers and village groups to establish new plantations. This will be of considerable benefit to local livelihoods in some of the poorer rural areas. This is a good example of research that really makes a difference.
Mention tropical rainforest to most people and they’ll probably think of lush vegetation dripping with moisture. The last thing that’s likely to come to mind is drought. Yet droughts do occur in some tropical rainforests, and they can cause immense damage. This was the key finding of research conducted in Borneo by Douglas Sheil, a CIFOR biologist, and Mark van Nieuwstadt. The research was published in the *Journal of Ecology* in 2005, and it immediately attracted the attention of *Science*, the prestigious American journal, which nominated it as one of the highlights of recent scientific research in ‘Editors’ Choice’.

Scientists have always found it difficult to disaggregate the effects of fire and drought in tropical forests, as fires rarely happen without a drought first. Subsequent changes are then blamed on the fire, but what about the impacts of the drought? ‘In the past, most people overlooked the impact of drought on tropical forests, and assumed that fire does more damage,’ explains Sheil. ‘But we’ve shown that’s not what happens.’

The researchers worked on adjacent sites in East Kalimantan, one exposed to a severe drought, the other to fire. They discovered that drought had a much more pronounced impact on large, mature trees than fire, killing almost half of those with a diameter of over 80 cm. Fire, in contrast, caused relatively little damage to large trees, but killed far greater numbers of small saplings than drought. The good news is that significant quantities of biodiversity appear to survive both fire and drought. ‘Those who argue that fire- or drought-stricken forests should be cleared for agriculture or other uses should think twice,’ says Sheil. ‘Given time, they will recover.’

This wasn’t the only Sheil research project to capture the attention of the scientific world in 2005. Before he joined CIFOR, Sheil worked in Uganda in an area which had been cleared of elephants in the 1960s. He wondered whether the absence of elephants had influenced the nature of the vegetation, and he set up a project to observe their impact on the flora of a protected area where they were still plentiful.

With the help of Agus Salim, a CIFOR statistician, Sheil was able to make sense of the perplexing data he had gathered. This showed that different trees possess different strategies and responses to elephants, and it proved conclusively that elephants have a significant impact on forest structure and species composition. This is of more than academic interest. It means that areas which are now devoid of elephants are probably undergoing significant botanical changes, while the vegetation in protected areas with unnaturally high elephant populations may also be subject to profound change.

The research paper ‘Forest tree persistence, elephants, and stems scars’ was published in the journal *Biotropica* in 2004. The following year, Sheil and Salim received the 2005 Biotropica Award for Excellence in Tropical Biology and Conservation. This award recognises outstanding contributions in the field of natural history research in tropical regions.
Consultant Patricia Miranda describes the objectives of a CIFOR project in Bolivia. (Photo by Kristen Evans)
Forests and Governance

Improving the way we make decisions

Forests are used – and misused – by a remarkably diverse array of different interests. They range from logging companies to hunter-gatherers, from government forestry departments to conservation groups, from swidden cultivators to fuelwood collectors. Some wield great influence and power; others have little or none at all. At present, the decision-making agenda in most countries is dominated by state agencies, private companies, donor organisations and conservation bodies. All too often, the people who live in the forests have the least influence.

Research conducted under CIFOR’s Forests and Governance programme promotes good forest governance. Good governance means that decisions are made in a manner that is just and fair to all stakeholders; that the decision-making processes are transparent; and that decision-makers are held to account. The research seeks to enhance the capacity of forest-dependent communities and excluded groups to participate in the decision-making process. It promotes greater social and environmental corporate responsibility in the forest sector. And it supports the strengthening and transformation of national and local government policies so that they promote more effective and equitable forest management.

The news from Africa is often bleak, but workshops organised by CIFOR and its partners in Mali and Burkina Faso in 2005 on the theme of Nature, Wealth and Power suggest there is room for optimism too. Nature, Wealth and Power provides a new framework for evaluating rural development and progress towards reducing poverty. The framework has caught the imagination of governments and development workers, and CIFOR will continue to use it in the future.

During recent years CIFOR has helped to raise awareness about the significance of violent conflict in forested areas. CIFOR’s Director General wrote the key chapter on forests and conflict for FAO’s 2005 State of the World’s Forests report and guest-edited a special edition on the subject for the European Tropical Forest Research Network News. These publications, and a workshop held in Brussels, suggest measures that governments could take to defuse conflict in forested areas.

CIFOR scientists continued to play a prominent role on discussions about Indonesia’s timber industry. CIFOR collaborated on a report which suggests that if Indonesia is to establish a sustainable timber industry, and reduce illegal logging, it needs to dramatically increase its plantations and reduce processing capacity. An Occasional Paper on money-laundering and the timber business highlighted the important role that banks have to play in the battle against illegal logging.

Illegal logging is one of the most obvious manifestations of poor governance. Illegally harvested timber is loaded on to a truck in Jambi, Indonesia. (Photo by Carol J.P. Colfer)
Over the past 20 years, some 30 armed conflicts have occurred in and around forested areas. Civil wars in Colombia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Myanmar, Nepal and Rwanda – to name but a few of the better-known conflicts – have led to the displacement and death of forest-dwelling people on a massive scale. Other conflicts, such as those in Suriname and the Solomon Islands, have scarcely troubled the headline writers, but they have still caused considerable suffering and disruption.

The relationship between forests and conflict was one of the key themes of FAO’s State of the World’s Forests report for 2005. ‘Forestry people need to recognise the importance of this issue, because their behaviour can make things either worse or better,’ explains CIFOR Director General David Kaimowitz, who contributed the chapter on ‘Forests and war, forests and peace.’ ‘And people working outside the forestry sector also need to pay more attention to this issue, because forests, for one reason or another, are frequently linked to violent conflict.’

As FAO’s Assistant Director General of Forestry, Hosny El-Lakany, points out, forests often make the ideal setting for war. ‘It’s in the forest that one often finds poor, isolated populations who are either ignored or mistreated, and they often need little encouragement to take up arms,’ he says. Forests often contain valuable timber, minerals and other resources which people are prepared to fight over. Besides which, forests also provide the perfect refuge for those engaged in an armed struggle.

The report suggests that governments need to take bold steps to recognise the rights of ethnic minorities and others living in forested regions, before their grievances lead to conflict. Forest-dependent people also need to be better integrated into the wider economy. Kaimowitz believes that when wars do break out, forest issues can offer a path to peace. He cites the case of Colombia. There, forestry and environmental issues featured prominently in the peace talks between the government and rebel forces, although the negotiations ultimately broke down.

These issues were explored in greater depth in a special issue published by the European Tropical Forest Research Network (ETFRN) and guest-edited by Kaimowitz. There was so much material that ETFRN decided to make it a double issue, and such was the interest generated that extra copies had to be printed. ‘It has now become clear to us that this is an issue that requires a lot more attention,’ explains ETFRN coordinator Willemine Brinkman. She believes that CIFOR, through the work of Kaimowitz, has been a key player in raising awareness about the issue.

Liberia is one of many forested countries which have experienced violent conflict. The civil war is now over, and UN forces help to keep the peace. (Photo by UN Photo/Eric Kanalstein)

As profits from Liberian timber were used to buy arms, the United Nations banned their export. After sanctions were introduced, logs like these were simply abandoned. The Monrovia Declaration, if put into practice, will usher in a new era of sustainable forest management. (Photo by Yemi Katarere)
Hope for Liberia’s forests

In 2000, scientists from CIFOR and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) had to use armoured vehicles when venturing into the field on a research trip in Liberia. The civil war had come to an end, but there was still sporadic fighting. ‘Since then, there has been a dramatic transformation in Liberia,’ explains Ravi Prabhu, who led the research team. ‘The country recently elected Africa’s first female president, and people are enthusiastically embracing democracy.’ Nowhere has this been more apparent than in the forestry sector.

On two separate research trips, the second of which was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Prabhu and his colleagues explored the way in which local communities were using the country’s forestry resources. ‘What we found,’ says Prabhu, ‘is that local people had made use of forests in the past, but not been able to exploit the timber commercially. Government forest policy had been all about two “C”s – concessions and conservation – but the third “C” – communities – had never featured on the agenda.’ One of the biggest handicaps to community forestry, the researchers found, was the lack of formal tenure for rural communities.

This is an issue of great importance, not just for rural communities, who have historically benefited so little from the country’s natural resources, but for Liberia’s economic future. This is because the United Nations’ sanctions on timber exports will only be lifted when Liberia can demonstrate that timber profits will not be used to fuel violent conflict, as they were in the past; and – just as importantly – that exploitation of the country’s timber will benefit local communities.

How to get communities involved in Liberian forestry was the key theme of an international workshop, co-organised by CIFOR and held in Monrovia in December 2005. The event brought together a wide range of stakeholders, from logging companies to local communities, from NGOs to government departments. This was the first major event ever held on community forestry in Liberia. The researchers from CIFOR and ICRAF were able to present their findings, and four days of vigorous debate concluded with the adoption of the ‘Monrovia Declaration’. This emphasises the need to harness Liberia’s forest wealth – the country has 42 per cent of the remaining Upper Guinea Forest – for the benefit of all Liberians by ensuring that community interests and industrial exploitation are closely aligned.

‘We must literally kick inequalities out of natural resource management,’ Wilbur Thomas, Director of USAID in Liberia, told the workshop. ‘As we all know, one of the central dilemmas throughout Liberia’s history has been that Liberia’s rich natural resources benefited only a small number of people.’ The Monrovia Declaration, if put into practice, will put an end to this era of inequitable resource management. The Declaration calls on the government to recognise customary rights to the land and to reform the Forestry Development Authority so that it can provide effective support for community forestry. The Declaration recognises that local communities, civil society and the international community also have an important role to play in this process.
A fresh approach to rural development

Good news doesn’t sell newspapers, so it’s probably not surprising that most of the press coverage about rural Africa tells a harrowing story of poverty, conflict, widespread disease and faltering economic growth. In many places, this is indeed the reality. But there is another side of Africa that attracts less attention, and this was the Africa which a range of development and research agencies – led by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and including CIFOR – were keen to highlight when they launched Nature, Wealth and Power: Emerging Best Practice for Revitalising Rural Africa at the 2002 Earth Summit, held in Johannesburg.

‘We were concerned that some of the good lessons coming out about rural development were being ignored, and we wanted to get away from all the Afro-pessimism,’ recalls Jon Anderson, a policy adviser to USAID. Nature, Wealth and Power provided a new framework for evaluating rural development and progress towards achieving such pressing goals as the alleviation of poverty. It also highlighted some telling examples of rural communities improving their livelihoods and restoring the environment.

During the years since the Earth Summit, this framework has been used to analyse rural development problems and formulate strategies for the future in Uganda, Senegal and Madagascar. Now it is helping to change the way people think about development in Mali and Burkina Faso, largely as a result of a series of workshops co-organised by CIFOR and USAID. The Mali workshop was held in Bamako in February 2004; the Burkina workshops in Ouagadougou and Bobo-Dioulasso in February 2004 and June 2005 respectively.

‘People often look at the issues of environment, economy and governance in isolation, but we need to look at all three together if we are to solve the problems that face rural communities in Africa,’ says Daniel Tiveau, CIFOR’s regional coordinator for west Africa. ‘Nature, Wealth and Power has proved to be an excellent tool for doing that.’

Over 70 per cent of Africans depend for their livelihoods and survival on natural resources. A young girl watches over the family’s cattle in Burkina Faso. (Photo by Daniel Tiveau)
In Africa, over 70 per cent of the population depend for their livelihoods and survival on natural resources, which provide them with food, grazing, building materials and much else. Natural resources are also a major source of wealth for governments and business. However, poverty in rural Africa remains widespread, largely because resources are frequently mismanaged and rural people remain disenfranchised. Alleviating poverty depends, crucially, on better and fairer resource management. This will only happen when there is better governance. For people living in rural Africa, that means improved access to, and control of, natural resources.

At both workshops, separate meetings were held with different constituencies. For example, in Burkina there were meetings for government technical staff, for NGOs, for researchers, for farmers’ organisations, and for development agencies. Tiveau believes that at this stage it was important to keep these groups separate. ‘If we’d had them all mixed together the more powerful constituencies would have dominated,’ he says. ‘Some of the most vibrant meetings involved the farmers. By doing it this way, they were able to make their voices heard – something which is rare.’ Afterwards the organisers were able to transmit the views of the farmers to the other constituencies. The workshop also helped to initiate better communications between government ministries, among whom there is frequently little consultation.

Tiveau hopes that the Nature, Wealth and Power dialogue will make a positive contribution to the decentralisation process currently underway in Burkina. ‘We are trying to influence people involved in transferring power over natural resource use to the local level,’ explains Tiveau. ‘It’s important that the mistakes made by central government aren’t repeated.’

In Mali, the Nature, Wealth and Power process has had a significant impact. For example, around 200 communes in which USAID has a democracy programme have been using the framework to evaluate how natural resources are used and shared, and to plan for the future. CIFOR also organised a Nature, Wealth and Power workshop in Cameroon to raise awareness among decision-makers.

According to Anderson, the conceptual framework provided by Nature, Wealth and Power has influenced USAID’s strategies for agriculture and rural development. It has also had an impact elsewhere. For example, a major policy document, *The Wealth of the Poor*, a collaboration between the World Resources Institute, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme, leans heavily on Nature, Wealth and Power for its conceptual foundation.

Nature, Wealth and Power is clearly an idea whose time has come. It may have started off as an African dialogue, but it is set to spread further afield. ‘We’ve had lots of feedback from people working in places like Guatemala, Nepal and Cyprus saying that this resonates with them, and wanting to know if we’re thinking of expanding our range,’ explains Anderson. The plan now is to produce a new global version of Nature, Wealth and Power, building on the African experience. Meanwhile, CIFOR and USAID will continue to promote Nature, Wealth and Power in Africa. More workshops were planned for Burkina Faso and Guinea in 2006.
In 1998, a team of CIFOR researchers concluded a lengthy research project developing and testing Criteria and Indicators (C&I) for sustainable forest management. They had good reason to be pleased: the research helped to give a more precise meaning to the term ‘sustainability’, and provided some tools to measure it. But the satisfaction was tempered by the knowledge that C&I would do nothing, in themselves, to address the problems faced by forest-dwelling communities. What was needed, they realised, was a fresh approach to forest management.

Since 1998, some 90 researchers, working at 30 sites in 11 countries around the world, have pioneered a new process known as Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM). This involves communities, local governments, non-government organisations and other forest users managing forests collaboratively, and analysing the process, reflecting on it, and adapting it to suit changing needs and circumstances. The results of this research are synthesised in The Complex Forest – Communities, Uncertainty, and Adaptive Collaborative Management, written by CIFOR anthropologist Carol Colfer.

So what has the ACM research achieved? ‘At some sites, and in some countries, the impact has been immediate and obvious,’ says Colfer. ‘For example, in the communities where we worked in Nepal, the lower castes and women now have a much greater say in decision-making processes which affect forests than they had in the past. The same is true in our Zimbabwe sites.’ In study villages in Indonesia, ACM has improved local people’s ability to negotiate successfully with policy-makers for better control and access to forest land, and in sites in Cameroon and Bolivia ACM has played an important role in reducing conflict in and around forests.

When the project was established, the research team identified seven conditions or issues which they thought might have a bearing on the success of the ACM approach. Contrary to expectations, they discovered that ACM seemed to work most effectively in sites where there was no formal process of devolving powers, for example for forest management, away from central government to the local level. One of the most thought-provoking observations was that ACM seemed to work best in the most difficult and chaotic settings – for example, in places where there were high levels of national and local conflict.

But other factors proved even more crucial than the seven conditions examined. Colfer found that many of the differences in impact between sites could be explained by such things as the motivation and skill of individual facilitators, and their integration into the wider team, or ‘community of practice’. Indeed, if she has any regrets, it is that not enough time was spent training facilitators in some countries and strengthening their ties to the larger team.

The Complex Forest suggests that researchers have succeeded in coming up with a process that can be used anywhere in the world to help communities and others work together to achieve common goals. Furthermore, the flexibility of ACM means that it can be used in many different situations. ‘There is no reason why you couldn’t apply ACM to any natural resource,’ says Colfer.

This is a book which should appeal to development specialists, academics and anybody who wishes to work in a collaborative way with local communities. As Choice, the journal of reviews for academic libraries in the United States, put it: ‘This outstanding book addresses a growing global human-resource conflict through the application of adaptive collaborative management techniques, bureaucratic flexibility, and local-level problem-solving.’
Forging new partnerships in Cameroon

When funding for Cameroon’s adaptive collaborative management (ACM) project came to an end in 2003, CIFOR researchers were determined to continue working in a similar, participatory vein on forest management issues. ‘We came across the concept of model forests,’ explains Chimère Diaw, CIFOR’s programme coordinator for forest governance in central Africa, ‘and the more we looked at it, the more attractive it seemed.’

It is easy to see why the concept chimed with Diaw and his colleagues. Partnerships are at the heart of ACM. They are also central to the success of model forests. The model forest approach was originally designed in Canada, and since it was brought to the world’s attention at the 1992 Earth Summit, some 40 model forests have been established under the umbrella of the International Model Forest Network Secretariat (IMFNS). ‘Model forests are about creating voluntary partnerships to help plan and manage large-scale, multi-functional landscapes,’ explains Diaw. ‘They are not about setting aside beautiful bits of forest for conservation.’

In 2003, CIFOR and IMFNS arranged a series of workshops in Cameroon and Canada. A range of organisations, including IMFNS, the Commission des forêts d’Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC), the Cameroon Ministry of Forestry, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN), agreed to work together to plan for the development of model forests in the Congo Basin. Meetings were chaired by Cameroon’s Ministry of Forestry with CIFOR acting as facilitator.

It was agreed that a competition would be developed to choose a model forest in Cameroon that could serve as a pilot site for the Congo Basin. Ten sites were invited to a workshop discussing how the pilot sites should be selected. Field visits were made to the three which produced the most impressive dossiers.

A change of government at the end of 2004 delayed the process of choosing a site, but CIFOR and its partners pressed ahead by holding meetings and workshops in potential pilot sites in Campo Ma’an, in the south west, and in Dja and Mpomo, in the east. In June 2005, CIFOR’s Assistant Director General, Yemi Katerere, visited the Prime Minister of Cameroon, Inoni Ephraim, who expressed his support for the model forest approach. In August, the government decided to choose both sites, rather than just one, and the Minister of Forests officially requested that the IMFNS accept Cameroon as a full member of the network.

There has been widespread enthusiasm for this new approach to land management, and meetings have attracted every possible interest group, from logging companies to the managers of protected areas; from local NGOs and organisations representing Bantu and pygmy communities to national politicians. ‘This is not the first time in Cameroon that all the different stakeholders involved in forest and land management have agreed to plan and act in a collaborative way,’ reflects Chimère Diaw, ‘but this is the first time it’s happened on such a scale. People are still pursuing their own goals, but they respect the views of those who have a different perspective.’ There is now widespread acceptance that collaboration lies at the heart of good management. As Vincent Ovono, a Bagyeli pygmy who spoke at one of the meetings, put it: ‘Protecting the forests is something we have to do together.’

‘The uptake of the model forest concept at both sites, and at the national level, has been very strong,’ says Peter Besseau, Executive Director of IMFNS. ‘Our partnership with CIFOR as a lead facilitator in Cameroon has turned out to be a really effective pairing of skills, mandates and creative energy, and I see these two model forests as a dynamic way to anchor a process that is highly relevant to resource management issues in Cameroon and the Congo Basin.’
Forests and Governance

Indonesia’s forests are disappearing at an alarming rate. Every year, timber-related industries consume the equivalent of some 50–60 million cubic metres of round wood. Yet the sustainable yield from natural forests earmarked for production is around 8–9 million cubic metres a year, while plantations currently yield less than that. Another 7 million or so cubic metres are probably harvested legally – but not sustainably – from land cleared for new plantations. This still leaves an enormous gap between demand and legal supply. The result is rampant illegal logging, significant loss of income for government and the destruction of resources used by local communities.

In 2005, Indonesia’s Ministry of Forestry, CIFOR and the UK Department for International Development’s Multistakeholder Forestry Programme (MFP) collaborated on a report on industrial revitalisation – one of the five priorities identified by the Ministry for the period 2004–2009. ‘Three significant studies had already been undertaken during the previous year, related to timber supply and the need to restructure the country’s timber industries,’ explains CIFOR policy scientist Chris Barr, ‘and senior managers at the Ministry of Forestry asked us to provide a synthesis of their findings and recommendations.’

Working closely with FORDA, the Ministry’s research branch, CIFOR gathered together analysts who had been involved in the three studies and hired economist Timothy Brown to co-ordinate the work of the synthesis team. The team decided to present its findings in the form of future scenarios. ‘Researchers have been telling policy-makers for years that the country is losing 2 million hectares of forest a year, but this hasn’t had great impact,’ explains Brown. ‘We decided to look forward and use economic arguments to show what the implications of these losses will be in 10 or 20 years – for the industry, employment, tax revenues and the landscape.’

The synthesis team came up with three contrasting scenarios. The first of these – business-as-usual – shows that if current trends continue, illegal logging, forest degradation and declining industrial output are inevitable. The second scenario envisages an increase in plantations and imports. This is an improvement on the business-as-usual scenario, but even with a strong plantations programme and a significant increase in imports, illegal logging will continue to be a major problem for at least another 15 years.

The third scenario – favoured by the authors – envisages an increase in both plantations and imports, accompanied, crucially, by significant restructuring of the industry’s processing capacity. This shows that illegal logging can be brought under control within a reasonably short period of time, but that will only happen if timber-dependent industries reduce their production.

When the report was presented by FORDA to Minister M.S. Kaban in September 2005, it was warmly received. According to David Brown, an economist with MFP, the Minister recognised that the report represented a credible, quantitative assessment of Indonesia’s timber industry, and the need to restructure it.

At the meeting it was agreed that CIFOR, FORDA and MFP would organise a national seminar on forest-industry restructuring. This was held in Jakarta in December 2005, and among those who attended were representatives from the Ministries of Forestry, Industry and Trade, as well as key individuals from five provincial forestry offices, various industry groups, civil society organisations and donor agencies.

A future for Indonesia’s forests?

Unless Indonesia’s timber industry significantly reduces processing capacity, the country will continue to lose its forests at an alarming rate.

Training in timber tracking in Berau, East Kalimantan. (Photo by Agung Prasetyo)
A new approach to fighting forest crime

Illegal loggers, like drug smugglers, need to launder their profits through compliant banks. While there has been a concerted effort, both nationally and internationally, to clamp down on drug smuggling, those peddling illegally harvested timber have tended to get away with their crimes. But this is beginning to change, and illegal loggers, like drug smugglers, would be well advised to watch their backs in future.

In 2003, Indonesia introduced a law classifying forestry crimes as ‘predicate offences’ for money laundering. This was a direct response to the collaborative research undertaken by CIFOR financial analyst Bambang Setiono and the government’s Reporting and Financial Transaction Analysis Centre (PPATK). The following year, the Asia Pacific Group on Money Laundering invited PPATK to organise a special working group on illegal logging, following a presentation by Setiono and PPATK director, Yunus Husein, at a workshop in Brunei.

During 2005, CIFOR continued to lead the debate on money laundering and illegal logging. In an Occasional Paper – Fighting forest crime and promoting prudent banking for sustainable forest management – Setiono and Husein laid out a comprehensive new approach to tackling illegal logging by using anti-money laundering legislation.

‘Forestry laws alone are insufficient,’ explains Setiono. ‘They tend to catch the small people in the villages, while the big players – the cukong – escape. If we’re going to stop their activities, then we need to make sure they are apprehended when they try to move their profits through the banking system.’ At present it is estimated that 90 per cent of the profits made from illegal logging in Indonesia end up abroad.

The approach advocated by CIFOR and PPATK is having a significant influence on a wide range of organisations, including the World Bank, which funded a high-level workshop on money laundering and illegal logging in Jakarta in November 2005.

Organised by the Ministry of Forestry and PPATK, this brought together policy chiefs from heavily forested provinces in Indonesia.

According to Setiono, police in some provinces are now beginning to use the new laws to tackle illegal logging. The banks, too, are asking for help to identify those who are using them as a conduit to channel their illegal logging profits into other (frequently) legal activities. Indonesia is taking the lead when it comes to using anti-money-laundering laws to curb illegal logging. If it succeeds, Setiono believes other countries will follow suit.

It’s not all the foreigners’ fault

If you believe what you read in the newspapers, you probably reckon that the smuggling of timber from Indonesia to neighbouring countries, and Malaysia in particular, is a major driver of illegal logging. And it’s not just the mass media that peddles this view, but Indonesian forestry officials, the local timber industry and many non-governmental organisations. ‘You get the impression that if we stopped the timber smuggling, it would dramatically reduce the problem of illegal logging,’ says CIFOR researcher Krystof Obidzinski. ‘But that’s simply not the case.’

In 2005, Obidzinski and colleagues in CIFOR’s Forests and Governance Programme made the first comprehensive analysis of timber-smuggling activities between Indonesian Borneo and Sarawak and Sabah, in Malaysian Borneo. They discovered that the level of illegally traded timber had fallen dramatically over the past two years, largely as a result of a government clampdown on illegal logging. ‘Not long ago 3–4 million cubic metres of illegal timber were smuggled out of Indonesia into Malaysia each year,’ says Obidzinski. ‘In 2005, this had dropped to a million cubic metres.’

A number of measures could be taken to reduce further the cross-border trade in illegal timber – including the elimination of red tape, the streamlining of export licensing and closer collaboration between forestry officials, police and customs – but even at present levels, the trade is relatively insignificant when seen in the context of illegal logging throughout Indonesia. Illegal logging to supply domestic timber industries is far more significant than cross-border smuggling. Clamping down on this should be seen as the priority.

Most of the illegal timber harvested in Indonesia is used domestically. (Photo by Krystof Obidzinski)
An Amazonian forest dweller peruses the *Frutíferas* book by Patricia Shanley and Gabriel Medina at a book launch. The book helps farmers to weigh up the costs and benefits of selling or retaining their forests. (Photo by Chris Barr)
How We Work

Collaboration and outreach

CIFOR is committed to strengthening the capabilities of developing country scientists, governments, civil society organisations and communities. The ultimate aim is to help them develop and promote their own solutions to a wide range of forestry problems. CIFOR does this through collaborative research, and by providing high-quality, unbiased and timely information to everyone from policy-makers to local communities, from forest-related industries to research scientists.

During 2005, CIFOR scientists played a prominent part in the 12th World Congress of the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), and many contributed to a major new IUFRO publication, *Forest in the Global Balance*. CIFOR scientists played a leading role in the Crawford Fund conference in Canberra on ‘Forests, Wood and Livelihoods’, and two members of CIFOR’s board of trustees and a programme director served on the 15-member panel responsible for overseeing the technical work of the UN’s Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, whose key findings were published in 2005.

CIFOR continued to encourage networking among research institutes. CIFOR’s West Africa team played a leading role in establishing a new network for scientists working on the productivity of arid woodlands – vital for fuelwood and livestock grazing – in countries like Mali and Burkina Faso.

The Information Services Group had another busy year. Besides publishing over 40 Occasional Papers, reports and books, it continued to seek a wide audience for CIFOR’s research findings by using the international and national media. During 2005, over 500 separate stories appeared in newspapers and on the internet, radio and television, either about CIFOR’s research or quoting CIFOR scientists.

Eko Prianto, from CIFOR’s communications team, interviews villagers in Respen Sembuak, Malinau, East Kalimantan about the effectiveness of CIFOR’s communication work in the district. (Photo by Yani Saloh)
2005 witnessed the completion of the most ambitious audit ever undertaken of our impact on Planet Earth. Launched in 2001 by the United Nations’ Secretary General, Kofi Annan, the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment provides an exhaustive analysis of how humans have affected the ability of ecosystems to provide us with goods and services, such as fresh water to drink, timber for building and food to eat. Much of the 2500-page assessment makes bleak reading, but it is by no means all doom and gloom, and the report offers a range of responses which could help us to overcome some of the most pressing problems we face.

Over 1300 scientists from 95 countries were involved in the assessment. The 15-member Assessment Panel, which was responsible for overseeing the technical work, was co-chaired by Angela Cropper, chair of CIFOR’s Board of Trustees. Panel members included Doris Capistrano, Director of CIFOR’s governance programme, and Christian Samper, Director of the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History and a member of CIFOR’s Board of Trustees. All three were closely involved in the writing process. A number of other CIFOR staff also served as authors and reviewers of different chapters.

The assessment has already had a significant impact on various international processes, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, and it has been widely used by governments, especially of those countries in which sub-global assessments were carried out, for example in the Caribbean, South Africa and China.

A Samburu woman from the acacia woodlands in Kenya (Koen Kusters); CIFOR collaborators in Jharkland, India (Brian Belcher); primary forest in Papua, Indonesia (Miriam Van Heist); collecting rubber in Liberia (Daniel Tiveau); catching fish in East Kalimantan, Indonesia (Yani Saloh); rice paddies in China (Christian Cossalter). (clockwise, from top left)
Royal accolade for CIFOR scientist

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II presented Ravi Prabhu, CIFOR’s regional coordinator for southern and eastern Africa, with the Queen’s Award for Forestry on 2 February 2005 at a ceremony in Buckingham Palace. Prabhu was awarded the prize in recognition of his outstanding contribution to work on sustainable forest management, and especially his work on criteria and indicators (C&I). A forester by training, Prabhu joined CIFOR in 1994. He has played a leading role in CIFOR’s Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) research. He recently served on the Task Force on Environmental Sustainability for the United Nations Millennium Project, established by Kofi Annan and led by Jeffrey Sachs.

Prabhu is the fourth person associated with CIFOR to win this prestigious award. The others were John Turnbull, Jerry Vanclay and Yemi Katerere, currently CIFOR’s Assistant Director General.

Paving the way in Papua

The media frenzy which greeted the announcement, on 7 February 2005, that a team of scientists had discovered a veritable Noah’s Ark of hitherto unknown species in a remote part of Indonesia was to be expected. Stories like this don’t come round very often. The media concentrated on the stars of the story – 20 new species of frogs, four new butterflies, five new palms, the magnificently coloured Berlepsch’s six-wired bird of paradise, and of course the scientists, funded by Conservation International (CI), who penetrated the Foja Mountains in Papua to discover ‘a lost world’.

CIFOR also played a minor, though significant, role in this story. The year before the expedition, CIFOR scientists had been hired by CI to work in two villages in the Foja Mountains. ‘CI realised that they couldn’t operate in remote areas of Papua unless they worked closely with local people,’ explains CIFOR ethnobotanist Manuel Boissière, who has spent many years working in Papua. ‘If you go into these areas and fail to co-operate with the local people, you’ll have a serious problem. They have a very strong notion of ownership, and they can be very physical with outsiders if they’re unhappy.’

CIFOR scientists trained 16 students, lecturers and civil servants from Papua, together with two CI staff, how to conduct multidisciplinary landscape assessments, a technique which acknowledges the central role local people play in the management of nature and land. Local people had had trouble with outsiders in the past, and at first they viewed the newcomers with suspicion. However, by the time Boissière and his colleagues left, the villagers and Conservation International had forged a good understanding. Without this understanding, the now famous expedition might never have happened.

As soon as the new discoveries were announced, there were calls from conservationists for the Foja Mountains to be designated a protected area. However, this shouldn’t mean we lose sight of the people who live there. In a letter published in Nature, responding to an article about the new discoveries, Douglas Sheil and Manuel Boissière pointed out that the villagers they had recently worked with had been solely responsible for protecting the Foja in the past, and it was they who made the recent expedition possible. ‘Local communities must not be viewed as a problem, but as central to the solution,’ they wrote.

Berlepsch’s six-wired bird of paradise, Parotia berlepschi, was one of several new species discovered by Conservation International scientists in the Foja Mountains, Papua, in November 2005. (Photo by © Conservation International)
Networking in the Sahel

For people who live in the dry savannas of west Africa, firewood and charcoal are among life’s essentials. They supply about 80 per cent of domestic energy requirements in Burkina Faso and Mali. Such is the demand that many people are forced to travel long distances in search of wood fuel. If the resource is to be managed sustainably, there needs to be a balance between supply and demand. And if that’s to happen, we need to know precisely how much wood the savannas produce, and how much people use.

Right now, there is much uncertainty about savanna productivity, which is why CIFOR, the Centre International de Recherches Agronomiques pour le Développement (CIRAD) and Mali’s Institut d’Economie Rurale brought together about two dozen researchers to explore the subject in Bamako in October 2005. The workshop gave the researchers the opportunity to present their work and share their data with representatives of organisations concerned with conservation, forest management and energy production.

‘There have been plenty of inventories measuring biomass productivity in arid areas in the Sahel,’ explains CIFOR’s Daniel Tiveau, ‘but the data has often been inconsistently analysed, which makes comparative studies difficult.’ At the workshop, CIRAD statistician Nicolas Picard provided the researchers with guidance. In future, this should lead to greater consistency of data collection and analysis.

According to CIRAD scientist Denis Gautier, the workshop provided some important guidance for policy-makers. ‘The bad news for them is that a lot more research is needed before we have a clear understanding about the productivity of the savannas,’ he says. ‘But the good news is that the workshop has shown precisely what kind of research should be supported in future.’

Gautier believes the workshop, which led to the creation of a savanna productivity network, Savafor, provides an excellent example of regional collaboration between different research institutes. ‘In the past, researchers in the region have worked very much in isolation,’ he says. ‘The workshop helped to bring them together, and provided us with common aims for future research.’

If you want to know what’s happening to the world’s forests, and you’d like an insight into the latest thinking in forestry research, then you could do no better than consult Forests in the Global Balance – Changing Paradigms, one of whose editors was Markku Kanninen, director of CIFOR’s Environmental Services programme. The book was launched at the 12th World Congress of the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), held in Brisbane in August 2005. Over 20 CIFOR scientists attended the Congress, and many had contributed to the book. The book launch was just one of many activities to which CIFOR scientists contributed, or organized, at Brisbane.

Forest in the Global Balance is the main output of IUFRO’s Special Project on World Forests, Society and Environment (WSFE), whose mission is to provide a critical analysis of existing knowledge about the state of the world’s forests and the way they are used. The project is supported by a core group of ten organisations, including CIFOR. The book is already being used as a reference work at Yale University, the Australian National University, CATIE in Costa Rica, the University of Helsinki and other academic and research institutes.

‘The book is mainly addressed to researchers and specialists in forestry and related fields,’ explains Gerardo Mery, the IUFRO-WFSE coordinator, ‘but we were also determined to get the messages across to policy-makers.’ The same editorial team launched a policy brief, Forests for the New Millennium – Making Forests Work for People and Nature, at the 5th Session of the United Nations Forum on Forests, held in New York in May 2005. Written in plain, jargon-free language, the policy brief provides a consensual view of the sort of policies which are needed if forested land is to be managed more sustainably, for the benefit of both people and nature.
Every year the Crawford Fund holds an annual conference in Canberra to discuss and debate an important research and development issue related to agriculture and natural resource management. The Fund was established in 1987 in memory of Sir John Crawford, one of the pioneers of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

In 2005, the theme was 'Forests, Wood and Livelihoods: Finding a Future for All'. You can gauge just how important these events are by the list of those who attend them. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Forestry, the Shadow Minister of Forestry, several heads of industry and 30 Australian parliamentarians joined key thinkers in the world of forestry research for the one-day event at New Parliament House. The conference was widely reported in the media.

Australia has made a significant contribution to forestry research, as Alexander Downer, Australia’s Foreign Affairs Minister, stressed when he opened the conference. ‘Australia contributes to international sustainable forestry efforts because we recognise the critical and multidimensional role forests play in developing countries, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region,’ he said. He pointed out that for many people in developing countries, forests provide life’s essentials: food, shelter, fuel, medicines and a source of income.

The keynote speech was delivered by David Kaimowitz, CIFOR’s Director General. ‘When it comes to forests and forestry, the region needs Australia, and Australia needs the peace and prosperity that good forest management can bring,’ said Kaimowitz. Another CIFOR scientist to contribute to the meeting was Brian Belcher, who urged policymakers to include forests in their global efforts to reduce poverty. ‘Government and donor budgets are increasingly targeted at poverty alleviation,’ he said, ‘and yet forestry and forestry resources have received very little attention in most poverty-reduction strategy papers.’

Kaimowitz praised the work of the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR), an organisation which played a key role in the founding of CIFOR in 1993. ‘Their researchers have had great successes with eucalyptus plantations in southern China, and they are tackling crucial issues such as how to make decentralisation work in Indonesia, and how to get farmers more money from timber in Papua New Guinea,’ he explained.

Before the conference, Neil Andrew, chairman of Crawford Fund, pointed out that the debate about how to use the world’s forests is often highly emotional. ‘I hope that this year’s annual conference will get beyond the emotion by highlighting the significant role of international forestry research in finding a balance between the competing demands for forest products and services, and the ability of natural and plantation forests to supply them,’ he said. Judged by these terms, the conference was undoubtedly a success.
Getting the most out of Annual Meetings

Annual meetings can be very predictable affairs, with their large plenary sessions and rigid agendas. But in September 2005, CIFOR decided to do things differently. ‘We’re going to give you space and opportunity to talk about the things that really concern you, that worry you, that excite you,’ explained Director General David Kaimowitz in his welcoming speech at CIFOR’s HQ in Bogor.

The objectives of the five-day meeting –Working Together to Make a Difference– were to improve understanding about CIFOR’s future, provide a range of forums for discussion and interaction, and increase understanding of CIFOR’s global programmes and regional strategies. This was achieved by adopting a radical new knowledge-sharing approach, already piloted at several other centres supported by the Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research (CGIAR) with help from the CGIAR Knowledge Sharing Project.

The meeting began with a ‘Knowledge Fair’ featuring workshops, presentations, poster displays and videos related to research conducted by CIFOR and its partners. Most of the next two days was devoted to Open Space, during which the rhetoric of institutional democracy was made a reality. There were six different Open Space sessions, with the topics for debate being chosen by participants. The third innovative approach was Peer Assist, which enabled small groups to come together to share experiences and solve problems. The week concluded with ‘Fiesta Friday’, a dinner-dance with a Latin-American theme.

‘The meeting exceeded all my expectations in terms of creating a renewed sense of excitement about CIFOR and the work we do,’ says Michael Hailu, Director of CIFOR’s Information Services Group. His enthusiasm was reflected in a survey conducted at the end of the week. The vast majority of participants welcomed the new approach, which they considered more enjoyable and inclusive than the standard annual meeting. The main conclusion was: Let’s have more of the same in future, please.

Knowledge Fair

Knowledge Fair set the scene for the week by giving participants a wide range of choice. They could look at presentations, videos and poster displays, or attend workshops covering a variety of topics, all proposed and presented by CIFOR staff. ‘It was very important for me to find out about research carried out by other scientists,’ explained Mathurin Zida, who had recently joined CIFOR’s Dry Forest Programme in Burkina Faso. ‘I learned a lot during the Knowledge Fair and gained a better global vision about what CIFOR is doing.’

Open Space

Open Space allows individuals to choose a topic and invite anybody interested to join a discussion and debate. During a period of just 10 minutes on the second morning, 27 people came up with 29 separate topics, ranging from the managerial to the scientific, from the broad and philosophical to the very specific. ‘I liked the way people could put things on the table and discuss them in a very open way,’ said Marieke Sandker, a young Dutch scientist who had just joined CIFOR. Eighty-five per cent of participants said they would like to use the Open Space approach again.

Peer Assist

Peer Assist is a process which brings together a small group to help one person solve a particular problem with which he or she is grappling. This was a novel approach for most CIFOR scientists, and many said they would use it in the future. For example, Daniel Tiveau from CIFOR’s Burkina office – his question was, ‘How do you live up to the expectation of national partners?’ – said that although his group didn’t come up with much he hadn’t already considered, he liked the exercise. ‘I would like to try this process with a scientific problem next time,’ he said.
CIFOR News – worth the effort

A CIFOR News reader survey, conducted at the end of 2005, showed just how popular the newsletter is. ‘We received an overwhelmingly positive response,’ says Greg Clough, CIFOR’s Communications Specialist and editor of CIFOR News. ‘It was pleasing to learn that readers find CIFOR News useful and interesting.’ Had the survey found otherwise, CIFOR would have probably halted production.

The survey sought readers’ opinions on design and language, as well as the length, quality and choice of stories. The vast majority of respondents – over 270 people filled in the questionnaire – said they liked CIFOR News just as it is. Still, there is always room for improvement, and several suggestions from readers have already been implemented.

The survey found that 80 per cent of respondents, most of whom are researchers, donors, policy-makers and trainers, read CIFOR News for job-related reasons, and 87 per cent consider it an important source of information about forestry issues outside their own country. Over two-thirds read more than half the newsletter and a third share it with colleagues. Around half the respondents would like four editions a year instead of three, with a few optimistic souls suggesting it should be monthly.

CIFOR News can be read online at www.cifor.cgiar.org
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## Donors

SCHEDULE OF GRANT REVENUE FOR THE YEARS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2005 AND 2004 (in US Dollar 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNRESTRICTED</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL, UNRESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,472</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESTRICTED</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Wildlife Foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (EMBRAPA)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAR Secretariat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRAD-Forêt</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation International Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORDAID</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Trends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (GTZ/BMZ)</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IITA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRENA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Centre for Research in Agroforestry</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Research Centre</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Food and Policy Research Institute</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Tropical Timber Organization</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INIA (Spain)</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Africaine du Bois</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Development Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Environmental Consulting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSCI-Peruvian Secretariat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Agency for Env. Forests &amp; Landscape</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Overbrook Foundation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical Forest Foundation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropenbos International</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (DFID)</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waseda University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Conservation Union (IUCN)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Resources Institute</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund for Nature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL, RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,592</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,662</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNRESTRICTED AND RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,846</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top Ten Donors 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>2005 Value</th>
<th>2004 Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>1,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**United Kingdom:** 1%

**Europe:** 11%

**Netherlands:** 11%

**United States:** 6%

**Norway:** 5%

**Germany:** 5%

**Sweden:** 5%

**Canada:** 4%

**Switzerland:** 4%

**Others:** 28%
## Financial Statements

**STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION**
31 DECEMBER 2005 AND 2004
(in US Dollar 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>10,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors, net</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,098</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,441</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, plant and equipment, net</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NON-CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,694</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,698</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,792</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,139</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS | | |
| CURRENT LIABILITIES | | |
| Accounts payable | | |
| Donors | 4,017 | 4,265 |
| Others | 49 | 53 |
| Accrued expenses | 946 | 685 |
| **TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES** | **5,012** | **5,003** |
| NON-CURRENT LIABILITIES | | |
| Employee benefits obligation | 2,294 | 2,285 |
| **NET ASSETS** | | |
| Unrestricted | | |
| Undesignated | 5,483 | 5,848 |
| Designated | 3,003 | 3,003 |
| **TOTAL NET ASSETS** | **8,486** | **8,851** |
| **TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS** | **15,792** | **16,139** |

**STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES**
YEARS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2005 AND 2004
(in US Dollar 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNRESTRICTED</th>
<th>RESTRICTED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>2004 TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>7,679</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>16,846</td>
<td>14,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,319</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,177</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program related expenses</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>14,918</td>
<td>13,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general expenses</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,684</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,283</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES IN NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>(365)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>(365)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(106)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENTS OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS
YEARS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2005 AND 2004
(in US Dollar 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDESIGNATED</th>
<th>DESIGNATED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invested in property, plant and equipment</td>
<td>Reserve for replacement of property, plant and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as at 31 December 2003</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation for the year ended 31 December 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(306)</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions of property, plant and equipment during the year ended 31 December 2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>(354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in net assets for the year ended 31 December 2004</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as at 31 December 2004</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation for the year ended 31 December 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(345)</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions of property, plant and equipment during the year ended 31 December 2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>(295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in net assets for the year ended 31 December 2005</td>
<td>(365)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as at 31 December 2005</td>
<td>5,483</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
YEARS ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2005 AND 2004
(in US Dollar 000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in net assets</td>
<td>(365)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile changes in net assets to net cash (used in) provided by operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on the disposal of property, plant and equipment</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>(1,068)</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assets</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>(248)</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued expenses</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(412)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits obligation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET CASH (USED IN) PROVIDED BY OPERATING ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>(1,074)</td>
<td>1,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES |      |      |
| Acquisition of property, plant and equipment | (295) | (354) |
| Proceeds from the disposal of property, plant and equipment | 8    | 14   |
| NET CASH USED IN INVESTING ACTIVITIES | (287) | (340) |

| NET (DECREASE) INCREASE IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS | (1,361) | 797 |
| CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, BEGINNING OF THE YEAR | 10,237 | 9,440 |
| CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, END OF THE YEAR | 8,876 | 10,237 |
Collaborators

Australia
ATSE Crawford Fund
Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR)
Australian National University
Charles Darwin University
Charles Stuart University
Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries Queensland
Forestry and Forest Products Division, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
Murdoch University
Queensland Forestry Research Institute

Bolivia
Fundacion José Manuel Pando para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Bosque Amazónico (FJMP)
Fundacion Natura Bolivia
Instituto Boliviano de Investigacion Forestal (IBF)
Municipal government of El Sena in Pando, Bolivia
Programa de Manejo de Bosques de la Amazonia Boliviana (PROMAB)
Proyecto de Manejo Forestal Sostenible (BOLFOR)
Research Center for Labor and Agrarian Development (CEDLA)
Universidad Técnica del Beni

Botswana
Southern African Development Community, Forestry Sector Technical Coordination Unit (SADC FSTCU)

Brazil
Embrapa Amazônia Oriental
Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuaria (EMBRAPA)
Escola Superior de Agricultura ‘Luiz de Queiroz’ (ESALQ)
FSC Brazil
Instituto de Florestas Tropicais (IFT)
Instituto de Pesquisas Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM)
Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia (IMAZON)
Instituto Internacional de Educacao Brasileiro (IIEB)
Juruá Florestal Ltda
Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi (MPEG)
Suzano de Paper e Celulose, Brazil
Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia

Cambodia
Forestry Administration of Cambodia
World Wide Fund for Nature - Cambodia

Cameroon
Association pour le Développement des Initiatives pour l’Environnement (ADIE)
Association pour le Développement Intégral des Exploitants Agricoles du Centre (ADEAC)
Cameroon Environmental Watch (CEW)
Campo Ma’an National Park, Campo
Centre de Recherche et d’Action pour le Développement Durable (CED)
Cercle de Promotion des Forêts et des Initiatives locales de Développement (CEPFD), Ma’an
Cercle des Agroforestiers du Cameroun (CERAF)
Commission des Forêts d’Afrique Centrale (COMIFAC)
Concertation des Associations Paysannes pour le Développement Rural de la Mvila (CAPDR)
Conservation International (CI), MLW landscape, DRC
Dja Biodiversity Reserve/ECOFAC (Lomie, Cameroon)
FAGAPE, local NGO, Kribi, Cameroon
Fondation Fritz Jakob
Confédération des Organisations Rurales pour le Cameroun Economique (FORCE) (National Farmer Confederation)
Forest Steward Council (FSC), Cameroon
Foundation for Environment and Development in Cameroon (FEDEC)
Global Forest Watch
HÉVECAM, (Rubber company) Nienne
Institut de Recherche Agricole pour le Développement (IRAD)
L’Unité Technique Opérationnelle (UTO) Dimako/Doume
Evaluation and Planning Mission for the Ocean (MEAO)
Memvène Dam Socioeconomic project, Kribi
Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOR)
Ministry of the Environment and Nature Protection (MINEP)
Model Forest site of Dja et Mpmombo Model forest site of Campo-Ma’an
National Agency for the Support of Forest Development (ANAFOR)
Network for the Environment and Sustainable Development in Central Africa (NESDA-CAC)
PALLISCO, (Logging Company)
ROCAM (local NGO Network, Kribi)
ROLD (local NGO Network, Lomié)
SCIEB, (Logging Company) Campo
Twanholt Mixed Farming Common Initiative Group
UGAO (local women training NGO, Kribi
University of Dschang
University of Yaounde I
University of Yaounde II
WIJMA, (Logging Company) Ma’an, Cameroon

Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV), Ouagadougou
Secrétariat Permanent du Conseil National pour le Développement Durable (SP/CONEDD)
Tree Aid West Africa
Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine (L’UEMOA), Ouagadougou
Université du Ouagadougou (UO)
Université Polytechnique de Bobo (UPB)

WIJMA, (Logging Company) Ma’an, Cameroon
Canada
CARE Canada
Department of Rural Economy, University of Alberta
International Model Forest Network
Royal Road University
University of British Columbia
University of Manitoba, Center for Earth Observation Science

China
Agricultural Economic Department, Business School, Guangxi University
Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CCAP, CAF)
China Forestry Publishing House
China National Forestry Economics and Development Research Center (FEDRC)
Chinese Academy of Forestry (CAF)
International Forestry Cooperation Centre, State Forestry Administration
Research Institute of Tropical Forestry, Chinese Academy of Forestry (RITF, CAF)

Colombia
Corporacion Ecoverosa
Costa Rica
Asociacion Coordinadora Indigena Campesina Forestal de Costa Rica (ACICAFORC)

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)
Institut National de Recherche Agricole (INERA)
Unité de Recherche sur la Productivité des Plantations Industrielles (UR2PI)

Denmark
Danish Forests and Landscape Research Institute (DFLRI)
Royal Agricultural and Veterinary University, Copenhagen

Ecuador
EcoCiencia
Fundación Servicio Forestal Amazónico

El Salvador
Programa Salvadoreño de Investigación sobre Desarrollo y Medio Ambiente (PRISMA)

Ethiopia
Wondo Genet College of Forestry

Finland
European Forest Institute (EFI)
Finnish Forest Research Institute (METLA)
World Forest, Society and Environment - Research Program (WFSE)

France
Centre de coopération internationale en recherche agronomique pour le développement (CIRAD)
CIRAD-Forêts
Ecole Nationale du Génie Rural et des Eaux et Forêts (ENGREF)
Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD)
Institut national pour la recherche agronomique - Centre de Nancy

Gabon
L'Institut de Recherche en Ecologie Tropicale/ Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (IRET/CENAREST)

Ghana
Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG)
Ghana Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Kwame Nkrumah University of Science, Kumasi

Germany
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)
University of Freiburg, Institute of Forest Policy

Guatemala
Universidad Rafael Landivar
Asociación de Comunidades Forestales de Petén (ACOFOP)

Guinea
Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF)

Honduras
Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Forestales (ESNACIFOR)

India
Birsa Agricultural Institute (BAU)
Birsa Institute of Forest Management Research (BFMR)
Jharkhand Ministry of Forests and Environment
Kerala Forest Research Institute

Indonesia
Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah (BAPPEDA), Kabupaten Bungo, Jambi
Bogor Agricultural University, Faculty of Hydrometeorology
Bogor Agricultural University, Faculty of Forestry
Biosfer manusa (BIOMA) NGO, Indonesia
Center for Forestry Education and Training (CFET), Ministry of Forestry
Center for the Study of Law and Regional Autonomy (Pusat Studi Hukum dan Otonomi Daerah) PSHK ODA, Jambi
Conservation Training and Resource Centre (CTRC)
FSCEDC, FORDA, Indonesia
Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA), Ministry of Forestry
Forestry Research Institute of Sulawesi
Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI), Bogor
Forum Kerjasama Pengelolaan Hutan Antar Kab./Kota di Propinsi Kalimantan Timur (FKPHD)
Government of Bungo District, Jambi
Government of Jepara District , Central Java Province
Government of Kuala Tungkal District, Jambi
Government of Kutai Barat District, East Kalimantan
Government of Malinau District, East Kalimantan
Government of Kapuas Hulu District, West Kalimantan
KOPPESDA, Indonesia
Hydrometeorology Laboratory, Department of Geophysics and Meteorology (FMIPA-IPB)
Indonesian Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (INTRAC)
Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)
Indonesian Working Group on Forest Finance (IWGFF)
Inspirit Innovation Circles
International NGO Forum on Indonesian Development (INFID)
LATIN-Lampung Indonesia
Lembaga Alam Tropika Indonesia (LATIN)
Medecins du Monde (MDM)
Ministry of Environment
Mulawarman University (UNMUL-PPHT), Tropical Rain Forest Research Center
Multistakeholder Forestry Program, DFID
Musi Hutan Persada, PT
National Institute for Space and Aeronautics (LAPAN)
National Meteorological and Geophysical Agency (BMG)
Natural Resource Conservation Agency at Provincial Level (BKSDA), West Kalimantan
Perhimpunan untuk Studi dan Pengembangan Ekonomi dan Sosial (PERSEPSI)
Perum Perhutani
Pionir Bulungan, Yayasan
Pusat Informasi Lingkungan Indonesia (PILI)
South Sumatra Forest Fire Management Project (SSFMP)
Tropenbos Indonesia
University of Gadjah Mada (FOF-UGM), Faculty of Forestry
University of Hasanuddin, Faculty of Forestry
University of Mulawarman (FOF-UNMUL), Faculty of Forestry
University of Papua Province, Faculty of Forestry
Wetlands International, Indonesia
World Wide Fund for Nature - Indonesia Programme (WWF-IP)
WWF Nusa Tenggara Program
Yalhimo, Manokwari, Papua
Yayasan Almamater, Merauke, Papua
Yayasan AYO Indonesia
Yayasan Kembang Pari
Yayasan Titian, Pontianak, Indonesia
Yayasan Gita Buana, Indonesia

Japan
Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (FFPRI)
Institute of Developing Economies, Japan External Trade Organization (IDE-JETRO)
Japan Center for Area Studies, the National Museum of Ethnology (UCAS)
Japan Overseas Plantation Center for Pulpwood (JOPP)
Kyoto University, Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies (ASAFA) and Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS)
The Forest Tree Breeding Center (FTBC)
Waseda University, Graduate school of human sciences

Lao PDR
National Agriculture and Forestry Extension Service

Liberia
Forestry Development Authority (FDA)
Greenstar (Liberia) Inc.
Liberia Forest Initiative (LFI)

Malawi
Forestry Research Institute of Malawi

Mali
AMADER (Agence Maliene pour le Developing d'Energie Rurale) Bamako
CNRST (Centre National de Recherche Scientifique et Technologique) Bamako
Meteorological department
Mali Folk Centre Bamako
Ministry of Environment
Netherlands Development Organisation (SNV), Bamako
World Conservation Union (IUCN), Bamako

Malaysia
Forest Research Institute of Malaysia (FRIM)
Universiti Putra Malaysia, Faculty of Forestry (FOFUPM)

Mexico
El Colegio de la Frontera Sur (ECOSUR)
FSC Mexico

Mozambique
Eduardo Mondlane University
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries – DNFFB-Department for Wildlife and Forestry

Nepal
Forest Action
Federation of Community Forest User Groups Nepal (FECOFUN)
Leasehold Forestry and Livestock Program, Department of Forests
Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development (LI-BIRD)
New Era Limited

Netherlands
Netherlands Development Organization TROPENBOS International
Wageningen University

Niger
Regional Centre for Agro-Hydro-Meteorology (AGRHYMET), Niamey

Norway
Agricultural University of Norway
Norway University of Life Sciences

Panama
Central American Agricultural Frontier Program (PFA)

Papua New Guinea
University of Papua New Guinea

Peru
Asociación para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Integral (AIDER)
Instituto Nacional de Investigacion Agraria (INIA)
Peruvian Research Institute for the Amazon (IAP)

Philippines
University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)

Republic of South Korea
College of Agriculture & Life Sciences, Seoul National University (CALS-SNU)
Korea Forest Research Institute (KFRI)

Russia
Economic Research Institute, Khabarovsk

Switzerland
Intercooperation
Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape (BUWAL), Swiss Forest Agency
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFZ)

Tanzania
Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)
Tanzania Forestry Research Institute (TAFORI)
United Kingdom
Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests
London School of Economics
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
Oxford Forestry Institute
People and Plant International (PPI)
University of Reading, International & Rural development Dept.

Uruguay
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca de Uruguay (MGAP)
World Rainforest Movement (WRM)

USA
Academy for Educational Development (AED)
Care International
Cornell International Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development (CIIFAD)
Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI)
Forest Action Network
Global Forestry Services (Inc.) (GFS)
International Resources Group (IRG)
North Carolina State University
School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University (Yale F&ES)
State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry (SUNY/ESF)
United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USDA-FS)
University of Indiana

Venezuela
CIDIAT, ULA Mérida

Vietnam
Department of Forestry
Forest Science Institute of Vietnam
Forest Sector Support Programme and Partnership Coordination Office (FSSP-CO)
International Cooperation Department (ICD)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Tropenbos International, Vietnam Programme
Vietnam Forest Sector Support Program and Partnership
Vietnam National University
World Wide Fund for Nature Indochina Programme

Zambia
Copperbelt University, School of Forestry and Wood Science
University of Zambia, Department of Biological Sciences
Zambia Revenue Authority
Zambia Forestry Department

Zimbabwe
AREX
Chivi Rural District Council
Forestry Commission
Gokwe North District Council
Shanduko, Centre for Agrarian and Environmental Research
Southern Alliance for Indigenous Resources (SAFIRE)
University of Zimbabwe, Institute of Environmental Studies

International and Regional Organisations
African Timber Organization
African Wildlife Foundation
Amazon Initiative
Asia Pacific Association of Forestry Research Institutes (APAFRI)
Asian Development Bank
CAB International
Central Africa Regional Program for the Environment (CARPE)
Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza (CATIE)
Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)
Conservation International
CORDAID Foundation
European Forest Institute (EFI)
European Tropical Forestry Research Network (ETFRN)
Flora and Fauna International
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Forest Stewardship Council
Forest Trends
Forest Watch
Helvetas, The Swiss Association for International Cooperation
INHUTANI II
Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales (INRENA)
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación en la Agricultura (ICA)
International Alliance, Thailand
International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)
International Food and Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
International Foundation for Science (IFS)
International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)
International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)
International Union for Forest Research Organisation (IUFRO)
International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (PGRI)
People Plants International
Perum Perhutani, PT
PI Environmental Consulting
Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC)
Rhodes University
Riau Andalan Pulp & Paper, PT
RSCI-Peruvian Secretariat
Suzano de Papel e Celulose, Brazil
Telapak, Indonesia
The Nature Conservancy International
The World Conservation Union (IUCN)
The Overbrook Foundation
Tropenbos International
Tropical Forest Foundation
United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat (CBD)
United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification Secretariat
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
United Nations Global Environment Facility Secretariat (GEF)
World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)
World Bank
World Conservation Union (IUCN)
World Resources Institute
Worldwide Fund for Nature – International (WWF)
WWF-Central Africa Program
Staff and Consultants

Office of the Director General
David Kaimowitz (USA), Director General
Yemi Katerere (Zimbabwe), Assistant Director General
Ninta Karina Bangun (Indonesia), Executive Officer
Purabi Bose (India), Social Policy Analyst/Impact Assessment Analyst (until October 2005)
Fiona Chandler (Canada), Programme Development Coordinator
Ketty Kustiyawati (Indonesia), Programme Development Assistant
Lucya Yamin (Indonesia), Secretary

*Consultant
Rizalina Gonzalez (Philippines), ‘EPMR’ Coordination/Development Management
Masruloh Ramadani (Indonesia), Programme Development Assistant

Regional Offices

Latin America (based in Brazil)
Alvaro Luna Terrazas (Bolivia), Regional Coordinator South America
Graci de Oliveira Anjos (Brazil), Secretary (until March 2005)
Carlos André Cunha (Brazil), Office Assistant
Michael Pereira de Lira (Brazil), Office Administrator
Tereza Cristina Ribeiro (Brazil), Secretary
Daniela Cláudia Duarte de Souza, (Brazil), Secretary (since April 2005)

West Africa (based in Burkina Faso)
Daniel Tiveau (Sweden), Regional Coordinator West Africa (since July 2005)
Paul Bama (Burkina Faso), Driver
Augustine Ouedraogo (Burkina Faso), Secretary (since February 2005)

*Intern
Drissa Soulama (Burkina Faso), Environmental Sciences

Central Africa (based in Cameroon)
Ousseynou Ndoye (Senegal), Regional Coordinator
Martin Ahanda (Cameroon), Driver
Cecile Effila (Cameroon), Administrative and Financial Controller
Ivo Ekane (Cameroon), Driver
Louis Lekegang (Cameroon), Driver
Florence Munget Munoh, (Cameroon), Secretary

*Consultant
Georgette C. Mato (Cameroon), Secretary
Sgan B.P. Nyemek (Cameroon), Computer Technician

*Intern
Yelem Basile (Cameroon), Forest Agronomy
William Mala (Cameroon), Forestry and Natural Resources Science
Beatrice Ngum (Cameroon), Botany
Abega Pascal (Cameroon), Geography
Julius Tieguhong (Cameroon), Ecotourism Valuation/Economics

Southern & Eastern Africa (based in Zimbabwe)
Ravindra Prabhu (India), Regional Coordinator
Dzingirai Dingwiza (Zimbabwe), Driver
Consilia Gwaka (Zimbabwe), Administrative Assistant
Eunice Kanaka (Zimbabwe), Office Assistant
Lovenmore Mafuta (Zimbabwe), Driver
Stephen Mupiwi (Zimbabwe), IT Administrator (since February 2005)
Pauline Nechirona (Zimbabwe), Secretary

Information Services Group
Michael Hailu (Ethiopia), Director
Zaenal Abidin (Indonesia), Computer Systems Officer
Tan Bandradi (Indonesia), Computer Systems Administrator
Greg Clough (Australia), Communications Specialist
Irvan Rianto Isbadi (Indonesia), Programmer/Analyst
Indra Kaliana (Indonesia), Programmer (since June 2005)
Budhy Kristanta (Indonesia), Information Services Assistant
Yuan Oktafian (Indonesia), Library Assistant
Widya Prajanthi (Indonesia), Communications Assistant
Eko Prianto (Indonesia), Communications Assistant (since April 2005)
Atie Puntodewo (Indonesia), GIS Specialist
Janneke W. Romijn (Netherlands), Communications Officer (since September 2005)
Nia Sabarniati (Indonesia), Communications Administrator
Mohammad Agus Salim (Indonesia), GIS Assistant
Yani Saloh (Indonesia), Public Awareness/Publication Officer
Yahya M. Sampurna (Indonesia), Multi-media Web Administrator
Dina A. Satrio (Indonesia), Information Services Administrator
Joris Siermann (Netherlands), Information Technology/GIS Analyst (until July 2005)
Melling V.P. Situmorang (Indonesia), Computer Technician  
Sri Wahyuni (Yuni) Soeripto (Indonesia), Information Officer/Librarian  
Luluk Daroja Suhada (Indonesia), Library Assistant (until July 2005)  
Gideon Suharyanto (Indonesia), Desktop Publishing Officer  
Yuliardi Yuzar (Indonesia), Computer Systems Manager

*Consultants*  
Adiseno (Indonesia), Translator  
Catur Wahyu Andito (Indonesia), Desktop Publishing Assistant  
Dien Fiani Ratna Dewi (Indonesia), Programmer  
Megan James (USA), Editor  
Guy Robert Manners (UK), Editor  
Daniel Nash (Bolivia), Translator  
Edwin Yulianto Nugroho (Indonesia), Programmer  
Rizka Taranita Razuani (Indonesia), Database Assistant  
Charlie Pye-Smith (UK), Writer  
Sally Wellesley (UK), Editor

*Interns*  
Nathan Victor Schenkman (USA), Translator/Editor

**Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests Programme**  
Markku Kanninen (Finland), Forester, Director  
Popi Astriani (Indonesia), Secretary (since April 2005)  
Imam Basuki (Indonesia), Forester  
Manuel Boissière (France), Ethnobotanist (Seconded Scientist)  
Unna Chokkalingam (India), Forest Ecologist  
Christian Cossalter (France), Forester  
Rosita Go (Indonesia), Secretary  
Philippe Guizol (France), Socio-economist and Silviculturist (Seconded Scientist)  
Tini Gumartini (Indonesia), Forester  
Philippe Hecketsweiler (France), Forest Ecologist (based in Gabon)  
Hety Herawati (Indonesia), Forester  
Enrique Ibarra (Costa Rica), Economist  
Monica Ebene Idinobua (Nigeria), Agro-Climatologist (since December 2005)  
Ulrik Listedt (Sweden), Forester/Soils Scientist  
Haris Iskandar (Indonesia), Forester  
Piia Koponen (Finland), Ecologist (since February 2005)  
Nining Liswanti (Indonesia), Silviculturist  
Julia Maturana (Nicaragua), Natural Resources Economist (until June 2005)  
Daniel Murdiyarso (Indonesia), Forest Meteorologist  
Robert Nasi (France), Forest Ecologist (based in France)  
Johnson Ndi Nkem (Nigeria), Ecologist (since December 2005) (based in Burkina Faso)  
Michael Padmanabha (Indonesia), Forester  
César Sabogal (Peru), Silviculturist (based in Brazil)  
Levania Santoso (Indonesia), Forester  
Marieke Sassen (Netherlands), Natural Resources Ecologist (based in France) (until July 2005)  
Douglas Sheil (Ireland), Ecologist  
Indah Susilanasari (Indonesia), Secretary  
Takeshi Toma (Japan), Forest Ecologist (until March 2005)  
Elke Verbeeten (Netherlands), Physical Geographer (based in Burkina Faso)  
Melinda Wan (Indonesia), Agronomist

*Senior Associates*  
Wilhelmus de Jong (Netherlands), Social Forester  
Laura Snook (USA), Forester

*Consultants*  
Nguyen Hoai An (Vietnam), Translator  
Marco Boscolo (Bolivia), Forest Policy Analyst/Forest Economist  
Antonio Carandang (Philippines), Forester  
Jorge E. Catpo (Peru), Forest Engineer  
Violeta Colan-Colan (Peru), Forester  
Kristen Evans (USA), Writer/Photographer  
Claudio Forner (Spain), Climate Policy Specialist  
Isan Franseda (Indonesia), Information Technology  
Herlina Hartanto (Indonesia), Ecologist  
Sofyan Kurnianto (Indonesia), Hydrologist  
Daniel Marmillod (Swiss), Forest Engineer  
Dwi R. Muhtaman (Indonesia), Forester  
Paian Sianturi (Indonesia), Forester  
Miriam van Heist (Netherlands), GIS Analyst

*Interns*  
Motoshi Hiratsuka (Japan), Human Science  
Chiharu Hiyama (Japan), Development Management & Development  
Romain Pirard (France), Environment & Natural Resources Economics

**Forests and Livelihoods Programme**  
Bruce Campbell (Zimbabwe), Ecologist, Director  
Ramadhani Achdiawan (Indonesia), Statistician  
Abdon Awono (Cameroon), Agronomist (based in Cameroon)  
Brian Belcher (Canada), Natural Resources Economist  
Z. Henri-Noël Z. Bouda (Burkina Faso), Forester (based in Burkina Faso)  
Sonia Dewi (Indonesia), Theoretical Ecologist and Modeler (until May 2005)  
Edmond Dounias (France), Ethno-ecologist (Seconded Scientist)  
Christiane Ehringhaus (German), Environmental Scientist (based in Brazil)  
Petrus Gunarso (Indonesia), Policy Analyst
Syarfiana Herawati (Indonesia), Executive Assistant
Habtemariam Kassa (Ethiopia), Social Scientist (based in Ethiopia)
Chetan Kumar (India), Forester (based in India)
Dany Kurniawan (Indonesia), Programmer (until December 2005)
Iwan Kurniawan (Indonesia), Remote Sensing/GIS Analyst
Koen Kusters (Netherlands), Geographer (until November 2005)
Febry Littamahuputy (Indonesia), Secretary Crispem Marunda (Zimbabwe), Forester/
Landscape Ecologist (based in Zimbabwe)
Gabriel Medina (Brazil), Forester (based in Brazil)
Manyewu Mutamba (Zimbabwe), Economist (based in Zambia)
Ani Adivinata Nawir (Indonesia), Socio-economic
Danielle Lema Ngono (Cameroon), Sociologist (based in Cameroon)
Hari Priyadi (Indonesia), Forester (since February 2005)
Marijeke A.A.H Sandker (Netherlands), Ecologist (since September 2005) (based in Cameroon)
Kresno Dwi Santosa (Indonesia), Natural Resources & Environmental Management Specialist (since February 2005)
Patricia Shanley (USA), Ecologist
Soaduon Sitorus (Indonesia), Forester
Titin Suhartini (Indonesia), Secretary
William Sunderlin (USA), Rural Sociologist
Jusupta Tariyan (Indonesia), Forester (until January 2005)
Makmur Widodo (Indonesia), Forester (since December 2005)
Sven Wunder (Denmark), Economist (based in Brazil)
Mathurin Zida (Burkina Faso), Environmentalist (since June 2005) (based in Burkina Faso)

*Senior Associates
Arild Angelsen (Norway), Natural Resources Economist
Tonny Cunningham (Australia), Ethno-ecologist
Marty K. Luckert (UK), Forest and Natural Resources Economist
Manuel Ruiz Perez (Spain), Ecologist
Sheona Shackleton (UK), Ecologist

*Consultants
Zakaria Ahmad (Indonesia), Forester
Emmanuel Chidumayo (Zambia), Biologist
Riskan Effendi (Indonesia), Forester
Dai Guangcui (China), Forest Resource Economist
Sokh Heng (Cambodia), Forester
Pamela Anne Jagger (USA), Public Policy & Political Science
Wilhelmus A. De Jong (Netherlands), Social Forester
Elise Noubissie Kouemeni (Cameroon), Forester
Witness Kozanayi (Zimbabwe), Agricultural Management
Sarah Laird (USA), Ethnobiologist
Patrice Levang (France), Agro-Economist
Citaoli Lopez (Mexico), Social Scientist
Tribby Macdonald (USA), Anthropologist
Philip Sabar Tua Manalu (Indonesia), Forester
Frank Matose (Zimbabwe), Sociologist
Fadjar Pambudhi (Indonesia), Surveyor
Deep Narayan Pandey (India), Forester
Bishnu Hari Pandit (India), Forester
Luke Thomas Wyn Parry (Brazil), Ecologist
Ririn Saliwa Purnamasari (Indonesia), Economist
Erie Sills (Australia), Economist
Mary Stockdale (USA), Forest Ecologist
Anton Suhartono (Indonesia), GIS Specialist
Arrita Suvarno (Indonesia), GIS Analyst
Julius Chupezi Tieguhong (Cameroon), Forester
Soni Trison (Indonesia), Forester
Dawn Ward (USA), Ecologist/NTFPs
Karah Wertz (USA), Proposal Development & Project Management
Whiwinh Widyat (Indonesia), Forester

*Interns
Andrea Martin Funk (Switzerland), Environmental Science

*Visiting Scientist
Misa Kishi (Japan), Public Health/Medical Doctor

Forests and Governance Programme
Doris Capistrano (Philippines), Resource Economist, Director
Panca Ambarwati (Indonesia), Secretary
Agus Andrianto (Indonesia), Forester (since March 2005)
Christopher Barr (USA), Policy Scientist
Paolo Omar Cerutti (Italy), Forester & GIS Specialist (based in Cameroon)
Carol J.P. Colfer (USA), Anthropologist
Peter Cronkleton (USA), Anthropologist (based in Bolivia)
Ahmad Dermawan (Indonesia), Agriculturist
Chimere Diaw (Senegal), Anthropologist (based in Cameroon)
Herlina Hartanto (Indonesia), Ecologist (until May 2005)
Dina Juliarti Hubudin (Indonesia), Secretary
Yoo Byoung Il (Korea), Forester
Yayan Indratmoko (Indonesia), Anthropologist
Rahayu Koesnadi (Indonesia), Secretary
Heru Komarudin (Indonesia), Forester
Ruben De Koning (Netherlands), Developmental Scientist (based in Cameroon)
Moira Moeliono (Indonesia), Social Scientist
Muriadi (Indonesia), Administration Assistant
Samuel Assembe Mvondo (Cameroon), Jurist (based in Cameroon)
Joachim Nguiebouri (Cameroon), Forester (based in Cameroon)
Krystoff Obidzinski (USA), Anthropologist
Pablo Pacheco (Bolivia), Geographer (since February 2005)
Ferdinandus Agung Prasetyo (Indonesia), Forester
Ida Ayu Pradnya Resosudarmo (Indonesia), Policy Analyst (on study leave)
Bambang Setiono (Indonesia), Financial Analyst
Yulia Siagian (Indonesia), Forester
Charlotte Soeria (Indonesia), Secretary
Hasantoha Adnan Syahputra (Indonesia), Anthropologist
Luca Tacconi (Italy), Economist (until April 2005)
Yunetty Tarigan (Indonesia), Secretary (since April 2005)
Nugroho Adi Utomo (Indonesia), Forester
Eva Wellenbergh (USA), Natural Resources Management/Anthropologist (until August 2005)
Yurdi Yasni (Indonesia), Forester (on study leave)
Elizabeth Linda Yuliani (Indonesia), Ecologist
*Associates
Deborah Barry (USA), Economic & Cultural Geographer (since October 2005)
Sian McDougall (Canada), Social Scientist
Nontokozo Nabane Nemarundwe (Zimbabwe), Anthropologist
*Consultants
Muhamad Adnan (Indonesia), Statistician
Bayu Agung (Indonesia), Statistician
Marco Antonio Albornoz (Bolivia), Forester
Eddy Mangopo Angi (Indonesia), Ecologist
Jeremy Stephen Broadhead (UK), Agroforester
Timothy Brown (USA), Agricultural & Resource Economics
Ramses Iwan (Indonesia), Field Researcher
Ade Cahyat (Indonesia), Facilitator
Timothée Fomete (Cameroon), Forester
Paul Gellert (USA), Sociologist
Christian Gonner (Germany), Forester
Hendra Gunawan (Indonesia), Natural Resources and Environmental Science
Kubo Hideyuki (Japan), Environmental Science
Mayang Meilantina (Indonesia), Agriculture Socio-Economics
Novasyurahati (Indonesia), Biology
Charles Palmer (UK), Development Research
Steve Rhee (USA), Socio-cultural and political aspects of natural resource management
Hery Romadan (Indonesia), Forestry Management
Aula Sakinah Muntasyarah (Indonesia), Conservation, Forest Resources
Samsu (Indonesia), Forestry Management
Tantra Panca Skober (Indonesia), Anthropology
Sudirman (Indonesia), Law
*Interns
Gusti Z. Anshari (Indonesia), Geography and Environmental Science
Agusnawati (Indonesia), Gender and Development
Judith Mangani Kamoto (Malawi), Agriculturist
Gaku Kato (Japan), Economist
Trikumianti Kusumanto (Netherlands), Tropical Crop Scientist
Godwin Limberg (Netherlands), Agriculturist
Anne Margaret Larson (USA), Resource Sociologist
Lusayo Mwabumba (Malawi), Forester
Tendayi Mutumikuru (Zimbabwe), Agricultural Economist
Ngateno (Indonesia), Gender and Development
Herry Purnomo (Indonesia), Modeler/Computer Analyst
Renaaldy (Indonesia), Agricultural Economist
Fabiola Roca (Bolivia), Administrative Assistant
Rolando Haches Sanchez (Bolivia), Research Assistant
Bintang Simangunsong (Indonesia), Forest Economist
Brian Leslie Stafford (Australia), Forest Finance Analyst
Eddy Harfa Surma (Indonesia), Jambi Field Coordinator
Peter Taylor (USA), Sociologist
Anne Marie Tiani (Cameroon), Socio-Ecologist
Brian Walker (Australia), Ecologist
Catur B. Wiati (Indonesia), Forester
Dede Wiliam (Indonesia), Social Forester
Chandra Irawadi Wijaya (Indonesia), Forester
Yentirizal (Indonesia), Filed Facilitator
*Visiting Scientist
Ganga Ram Dahal (Nepal), Social Scientist (since September 2005)

Corporate Services
Norman Macdonald (Canada), Deputy Director General, Corporate Services
Jennifer Crocker (Canada), Manager, Human Resources
Susan Kabiling (Philippines), Financial Controller
Hudayanti Abidin (Indonesia), Human Resources Assistant
Agung Saeful Alamsyah (Indonesia), Guest House Assistant
Rubeta Andriani (Indonesia), Human Resources Officer
Henty Astuty (Indonesia), Systems Support Assistant
Mohammad Nuzul Bahri (Indonesia), Office Assistant
Purnomo Djatmiko (Indonesia), Facility Services Officer (until February 2005)
Umar Djohan (Indonesia), Driver
Anastasia Elisa (Indonesia), Management Accountant
Nina Handayani (Indonesia), Receptionist
Kusuma Hendriani (Indonesia), Accountant
Suhendar Husain (Indonesia), Guest House Assistant
Heny Pratiwi Joebihakto (Indonesia), Human Resources Officer
Elfi Joelijarty (Indonesia), Banking Assistant
Nurjanah Kambarrudin (Indonesia), Accountant
Sylvia Kartika (Indonesia), Accountant
Henny Linawati (Indonesia), Programme Accountant
Ismed Mahmud (Indonesia), Procurement Officer
Johannes P. Manangkil (Indonesia), Receptionist
Hani Mardhiyah (Indonesia), Administrative Support Assistant
Edward Martin (Indonesia), Financial Accountant
Didi Marudin (Indonesia), Dispatcher
Esa Kurnia Muhammis (Indonesia), Procurement Assistant
Kusnadi Muhi (Indonesia), Guest House Assistant
Siti Nadiroh (Indonesia), Office Assistant
Ocim (Indonesia), Driver
Karina Veronika Palar (Indonesia), Cashier
Juniarta L. Panjaitan (Indonesia), Human Resources Assistant
Pendi (Indonesia), Office Assistant
Sisi Ratnasari (Indonesia), Human Resources Assistant
Rina (Indonesia), Programme Accountant
Supandi Rodjali (Indonesia), Office Assistant
Ukat Sanusi (Indonesia), Office Assistant
Henny K. Saragih (Indonesia), Executive Assistant
Murniati Sono (Indonesia), Operations Officer
Kustiani Suharsono (Indonesia), Operations Assistant
Hari Sukmara (Indonesia), Programme Accountant
Suratman (Indonesia), Driver
Ilie Suwarna (Indonesia), Driver
Tony Syafei (Indonesia), Driver
Lely Pingkan C. Tauh (Indonesia), Human Resources Officer
Ani Tentrem (Indonesia), Cook
Tina Turtinawati (Indonesia), Cook
Lia Octari Wan (Indonesia), Facility Services Officer (since June 2005)

*Consultants
Orit Ahmed Adus (Ethiopia), Systems Analyst
Jeremy Akester (UK), Property Engineer
Lazaro Diaz (USA), Human Resources Consultant
Peter Fowler (UK), System Analyst
Imas Kurniati (Indonesia), Accountant
Fitriani Mulyana (Indonesia), Human Resources Data Management Assistant

*Interns
Panji Pamungkas Arsyad (Indonesia), Hospitality Study
Valeria Castelon (Nicaragua), Business Administration
Ferry Kusumawardani (Indonesia), Hospitality Study
Suci Eka Ningsih (Indonesia), Accounting

* The associates, consultants and interns listed above are those who had contracts for a minimum duration of 6 months.
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The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
CIFOR is a leading international forestry research organisation established in 1993 in response to global concerns about the social, environmental, and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR is dedicated to developing policies and technologies for sustainable use and management of forests, and for enhancing the well-being of people in developing countries who rely on tropical forests for their livelihoods. CIFOR is one of the 15 Future Harvest centres of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). With headquarters in Bogor, Indonesia, CIFOR has regional offices in Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Zimbabwe, and it works in over 30 other countries around the world.