Medium Term Plan: 2007 - 2009

Center for International
Forestry Research

June 2006

Office address: Jalan CIFOR, Situ Gede, Sindangbarang, Bogor Barat 16680, Indonesia
mailing address: P.O. Box 6596 JKPWB, Jakarta 10065, Indonesia
tel: +62 (251) 622 622, *fax:* +62 (251) 622 100,
e-mail: cifor@cgiar.org

CIFOR is an institute of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Research Highlights and Achievements.....	4
Examples of CIFOR influence and impact during the past year	4
Research Awards.....	7
Research dissemination and communication	7
CIFOR in the International Arena	10
International Events	12
Capacity Building	13
CIFOR's Context.....	13
Results of CIFOR's Second External Programme and Management Review.....	13
Major changes since the 2006-2008 MTP	14
Host country conditions.....	14
Regional Office Conditions	15
Staffing Highlights	16
CIFOR and the CGIAR	17
Host Country Collaboration	19
Implementation of EPMR Recommendations	19
Highlights of the 2007 Project Portfolio	20
Changes in Response to the Science Council's Commentary on the 2006-2008 MTP	20
System Priority Alignment.....	21
Portfolio composition.....	21
Financial highlights	23
Financial Health Indicators.....	23
Risk management	23
Project Narratives	24
Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests	24
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests	24
Background and rationale	24
System Priority alignment.....	24
Goal.....	25
Objectives.....	25
Changes	25
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	25
Intended impact pathways.....	26
Partnerships	27
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes.....	31
Background and rationale	31
System Priority alignment.....	31
Goal.....	32
Objectives.....	32
Changes	32
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	32
Description of impact pathways.....	33
Partnerships	34
Biodiversity-related Cross Programmatic Linkages	37
CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity-Platform.....	38
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services	39
Background and rationale	39
System Priority alignment.....	39
Goal.....	40
Objectives.....	40

Changes	40
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	40
Description of impact pathways.....	41
Partnerships	42
Forests and Governance	46
Project 4: Governance of multi-stakeholder forested landscapes	46
Background and rationale	46
System Priority alignment.....	46
Goal.....	47
Objectives.....	47
Changes	47
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	48
Description of impact pathways.....	49
Partnerships	50
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability.....	53
Background and rationale	53
System Priority alignment.....	53
Goal.....	54
Objectives.....	54
Changes	54
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	55
Description of impact pathways.....	56
Partnerships	57
Forests and Livelihoods.....	60
Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods	60
Background and rationale	60
System Priority alignment.....	60
Goal.....	61
Objectives.....	61
Changes	61
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	61
Description of impact pathways.....	62
Partnerships	63
Project 7: Improving Human Well being through Forests	67
Background and rationale	67
System priority alignment.....	67
Goal.....	68
Objectives.....	68
Changes	68
Research approach to International Public Goods.....	68
Description of impact pathways.....	69
Partnerships	70
Project Logframes	76
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests	76
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes.....	79
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services	82
Project 4: Governance of Multistakeholder Forested Landscapes	86
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability.....	89
Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods	93
Project 7: Protecting and Improving Human well being through Forests	95

Financial Tables.....	98
Table 1. CIFOR-Cost Allocation: Allocation of Projects Cost to CGIAR System Priorities, 2005-2009 (in \$ million).....	98
Table 2. CIFOR-Undertaking, Activities and Sectors, 2005-2009 (in \$ million).....	99
Table 3. CIFOR-Cost Allocation: Allocation of Projects Cost to CGIAR Regions, 2005-2009 (in \$ million).....	100
Table 4. CIFOR-Expenditures, 2005-2009 Object of Expenditure, (in \$million).....	102
Table 5. CIFOR-Financing: Members/Non Members Unrestricted Grants, 2005-2007 (in \$ million).....	103
Table 6. CIFOR-Financing: Allocation of Members/Non Members Grants to Projects, 2005-2007 (in \$ million).....	104
Table 7. CIFOR Staff Composition: Internationally and Nationally Recruited Staff, 2005 - 2009.....	107
Table 8. CIFOR-Financial Position: Currency Structure of Expenditures, 2005-2007 (in \$ million).....	108
Table 9. CIFOR Statement of Activities for the Year Ending December 31, 2005 (in \$million).....	109
Table 10. CIFOR Statements of Financial Position as of December 31, 2005 (in \$ million).....	110
Appendix I: Progress report on implementation of CGIAR approved EPMR recommendations	112
Appendix II: Glossary of Acronymns	113
Appendix III: CGIAR System Priorities	115

Introduction

Forests comprise a critical resource for the poor. Approximately 30% of the world's land area is covered by forests, which contain about 80% of the Earth's terrestrial biodiversity. Forest products and services provide energy, construction materials, water purification, carbon sequestration, health benefits, environmental stability and innumerable other means of support to the rural impoverished. Forests also serve as a primary source of income for tens of millions of rural poor, and as an important supplementary income source for hundreds of millions more.

It is imperative that the many important services that forests provide be preserved and enhanced. However, at present there are many threats to the sustenance of critical forest resources, as tropical deforestation progresses at a rapid pace. Pressure from competing land uses and inappropriate institutions drive much of this loss of forest cover. In many areas of the world, control of forest resources is limited to an elite few, due to restrictive and exclusive tenure regimes. Even where management modalities and rules may be appropriate, limited institutional implementation capacity often results in unsustainable management and inequitable benefit distribution.

Opportunities for improved products and services to the poor are often missed by existing research and development efforts. While the bulk of tropical forestry research concerns silvicultural methods that are appropriate to large-scale timber plantations, there is persistent underinvestment in appropriate techniques and opportunities for the production of forest products by smallholders. As a result, there is inadequate attention to novel marketing and production methods that can make a difference in the lives of hundreds of millions of forest-dependant people.

CIFOR, as the forest centre of the CGIAR, is oriented towards identifying and exploiting opportunities for forest management that better serves the long-term interests of the poor. It does so by: identifying improved modalities, procedures, and tools for collective resource appraisal and management; identifying insights that can better target forestry-sector development interventions; and identifying and developing opportunities for the poor to derive improved incomes from the production of forest products. CIFOR targets dissemination of research on these topics towards the main global forestry organizations and processes, the international media, the international scientific community and the world's leading forestry decision-makers and practitioners.

Research Highlights and Achievements

Examples of CIFOR influence and impact during the past year

CIFOR's research strives to catalyse discernable improvements in major policies that affect the ability of forests to offer sustained vital services to the rural poor. The Center is pleased to report that there are a number of cases where there is clear evidence that such has happened. Here are a few recent examples:

- CIFOR's research on rattan management and trade has shown that rattan garden systems can be economically competitive with other cash crops, especially when non-financial benefits are taken into account. NGOs and CIFOR used these results to press for removal

of an export ban on raw rattan material, which the Ministry of Trade, in turn, eliminated after extensive direct dialogue with CIFOR. Removal of the ban should provide benefits to many of the 700,000 people employed by the raw material industry in Indonesia.

- The 2005 CIFOR book, *Frutíferas e Plants Uteis na Vida Amazonica*, highlights the cultural significance, economic value, practical uses and ecology of 21 widely utilized fruit trees, palms and vines, and illustrates the impact of logging practices on consumption of forest goods. The manual has influenced programmes of the Brazilian Ministries of Environment, Health, Culture and Education, which have requested approximately 6000 copies of the book. The manual has been adopted in courses that have instructed nearly 4000 ‘trainers of trainers,’ and a training component developed from this manual has been used to educate approximately 1000 foresters.
- In Indonesia, recommendations from CIFOR’s research led the government’s Financial Intelligence Unit (PPATK) to include ‘forestry crimes’ as a predicate offense in the country’s revised anti-money laundering law. This was a landmark step as Indonesia became the first country in the world to specifically define ‘forestry crimes’ as a money laundering offense and policymakers and regulatory agencies in other countries are now looking at Indonesia as a pilot case for using anti-money laundering laws to curtail illegal logging.
- Inspired by CIFOR’s research on money laundering and illegal logging, the Indonesian government has lobbied for international action to combat the problem. A delegation from Indonesia has thus begun to lobby for passage of a draft UN resolution on “International Cooperation in Preventing and Combating Smuggling of Natural Resources, Including Timber Products from Illegal Logging.”
- Participatory techniques for collective resource management developed by CIFOR’s Adaptive Collaborative Management project have been utilized in the establishment of two model forests covering 1.5 million hectares in Cameroon. As a result, local forest dependant populations will have greater opportunity to ensure that they benefit from sustainable management of this extensive forest area.
- CIFOR’s research has shown that oil palm cultivation is not appropriate for many upland regions, as investigation of 200 sample plots in the upper reaches of Malinau District in East Kalimantan revealed not one that had the potential for being developing into an oil palm plantation. Certain major stakeholders and investors in Indonesia have taken notice of this finding, and are increasingly hesitant to fund palm oil plantation expansion into upland areas.
- A CIFOR report that analyses consumption and processing of illegal imported timber by Chinese industries has widely raised awareness about the severity of the problem. Key findings from the report have been further disseminated through a number of prominent international NGOs, such as Greenpeace, and many international media outlets have reiterated the findings.
- CIFOR’s research has played a decisive role in leading the World Bank Group’s Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) to withdraw from plans to provide political risk guarantees for a planned 600,000 tonne/year pulp mill in South Kalimantan,

Indonesia. In a set of recommendations presented to the World Bank, MIGA, and other financial stakeholders, CIFOR discouraged investment in the planned pulp mill until it had a credible plan for sustainable fibre supply and until rigorous social and environmental impact assessments had been conducted and appropriate safeguard measures adopted.

- CIFOR was asked to make a presentation to the Special Commission of the Brazilian House of Representatives in May 2005 about a new forestry concession law that will regulate exploitation of about 11 million hectares of forest. The Center's influence helped to increase the law's flexibility, and helped to highlight the importance of addressing factors outside of the law's bounds.
- The World Wildlife Fund has translated CIFOR's manual on Reduced Impact Logging (RIL) to Vietnamese. Forest managers in the country have also been trained by the Tropical Forest Trust in RIL techniques developed by CIFOR.
- A high proportion of surveyed traders of non-timber forest products in Cameroon reported that information provided by CIFOR on markets, prices and effective business strategies has improved their incomes. These income gains may be particularly important, as most of these traders are women.
- A key World Bank report on the impact of structural adjustment on forests extensively cited CIFOR research to identify forest-poverty linkages, and analyse the consequences of macroeconomic change for forests and the forest-dependant poor. By proposing a methodology for ex ante evaluation of the consequences of development policy lending on forests, the paper attempts to address CIFOR recommendations that these consequences be considered as part of lending due diligence.
- Adaptive-Collaborative-Management action-research has increased awareness, enhanced capacities, improved decentralization and cooperation between forest users and decision-makers at village/municipality, district/province and national levels in seven countries (Bolivia, Cameroon, Guatemala, Indonesia, Nepal, Nicaragua and Zimbabwe). ACM approaches have been adopted in Indonesia (30+ villages, 3 districts, 5 provinces), Zimbabwe (9 districts), Mali (5 villages), Cameroon, Bolivia (15 municipalities) and Brazil (1 province). In Nepal, Guatemala and Nicaragua, it strengthened capacity and facilitated networking of grassroots forest user federations representing thousands of members.
- The Peruvian government has prepared innovative regulations for improved forest management in timber concessions, which were influenced by CIFOR's research on policies to encourage forest managers to use harvesting and silvicultural techniques that sustain or enhance future yields while maintaining environmental services.
- CIFOR released a critical analysis of Non-Timber Forest Product Certification at a Certification Trade Fair in Brazil, which the Brazilian Ministry of Environment intends to use, and which has influenced the agendas of a number of important donor agencies.
- The World Bank's Indonesia Forest Strategy for 2006-2009 has drawn on CIFOR's findings, and prioritizes interventions in problem areas that CIFOR has analysed, such as

transparency, accountability, rule of law, governance, industrial restructuring, and decentralization. Furthermore, the Strategy recommends increased engagement to address areas of intervention that CIFOR has identified.

Research Awards

CIFOR is also pleased to report that the quality of research undertaken at the Center has been recognized through several prestigious awards in the past year.

- The pioneering work of CIFOR scientist Patricia Shanley has been recognized in a major award from the CGIAR. Patricia won the CGIAR's Science Award for Outstanding Communications for co-editing with Gabriel Medina, the book *Fruit Trees and Useful Plants in the Lives of Amazonians* (or *Fruitíferas e Plantas Úteis na Vida Amazonica in Portuguese*).
- CIFOR scientist, Ravi Prabhu, has been granted the prestigious 2005 Queen's Award for Forestry by the Commonwealth Forestry Association. The award is given to an individual of a Commonwealth country who has made an outstanding contribution to Forestry.
- CIFOR scientists, Douglas Sheil and Agus Salim have been awarded the Biotropica Award for Excellence in Tropical Biology and Conservation. The award is for an article that suggests tree species use four general strategies to survive under stressful conditions: repellence, resistance, tolerance and avoidance.

Research dissemination and communication

CIFOR in the International Media:

A powerful way of reaching policy makers and opinion leaders is via the media, and over the last twelve months CIFOR again achieved a high number of hits in both local and international media. A strong media presence also delivers our message to NGOs, donors and stakeholders and increases public awareness of forestry issues. Good media coverage raises CIFOR's profile and identifies CIFOR as a reliable source of scientific information on forests and the people who depend on them.

Between June 2005 and May 2006, 78 programs on radio and television featured CIFOR science or mentioned CIFOR. The Center was also covered in over 130 print articles around the world in outlets such as: Aftenposten, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, BBC, Canberra Times, CNBC, El País, Folha de Sao Paulo, Guardian, Le Monde, Le Figaro, Liberation, Miami Herald, Nature, New Straights Times, Rede Globo TV, San Francisco Chronicle, Science, South China Morning Post, Svenska Dagbladet, The Hindu, The Economist, Time Magazine, USA Today, Voice of America and the Washington Post. Most major international wire services communicated CIFOR's science, as did many of the major dailies in Cameroon, Zimbabwe, Brazil and Indonesia. Among the topics that received most attention were the Malinau Research Forest, forests and floods, forest fire haze, Model Forests in Cameroon, forests and conflict, illegal logging, deforestation and money laundering, and risk assessment and safeguard procedures for pulp mill finance.

Following a Board recommendation to improve media coverage in Africa and Latin America, a Dutch JPO has been placed in Cameroon. The work she and the communications assistant there

have been doing has resulted in a strong presence in the Cameroonian media for CIFOR. The Regional Communications officer in the Brazil office has also succeeded in generating good coverage for CIFOR.

Publications:

During the last year CIFOR staff and partners working on CIFOR projects published slightly more than in the previous twelve-month period. Of the total 185 documents, 68 were peer-reviewed journal articles, 49 were books and 36 were peer-reviewed book chapters (significantly more than last year's total of nine). The Center also published 24 information briefs and three Occasional Papers.

CIFOR was involved in a number of high profile publications over the last year. Here are some examples:

The book *Forests in the Global Balance – Changing Paradigms* was produced with eight other research institutions and reviews the main trends and issues related to forests. The book grew out of an IUFRO project and was officially launched in Brisbane at the IUFRO Congress.

The journals *World Development* and *Forests, Trees, and Livelihoods* published special issues based on our Bonn conference on *Forests, Livelihoods, and Conservation*. *World Development* has a high 'impact factor,' and this issue will make people in policy circles more aware of the links between forests and livelihoods.

Over 200 people attended the launch of the Mexican edition of *Riches of the Forest*. The attendees at the Mexico City event included the head of the National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR) and leading officials from the Ministry of the Environment (SEMARNAP). CIFOR, the Mexican Community Forestry Project (PROCYMAF) and the Center for Education and Training in Sustainable Development (CECADESU) published 10,000 copies and CECADESU will use the book in its work with rural teachers throughout Mexico.

Another book that grew out of CIFOR's global non-timber forest products study was a new Earthscan volume *Carving Out a Future: Forests, Livelihoods, and the International Woodcarving Trade*.

CIFOR scientist, Carol Colfer, published two major books on Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) and decentralization. *The Complex Forest, Communities, Uncertainty and Adaptive Collaborative Management*, published by Resources for the Future, pulls together the lessons from all CIFOR's recent research on ACM, and assesses its impact. *The Politics of Decentralization, Forests, People, and Power*, published by Earthscan, pulls together the best material from the 2004 global workshop on forests and decentralization in Interlaken, Switzerland.

CIFOR published six Impact Assessment Papers series during the last three months of 2005. These series are the results of internally conducted impact assessment studies of research and its processes. The studies aim to ensure CIFOR's collaborative research has well documented outcomes and uptake.

Além da Madeira: A certificação de produtos florestais não-madeireiros (*Beyond Timber: certification of non-timber forest products*) by Patricia Shanley *et al.* was launched at the 2nd Brazilian Fair of Certified Products in São Paulo, Brazil in April 2006. Over 120 people came to the launch of this book which promotes forest certification as a market-based instrument that aims to encourage sustainable forest management for the multiple values of the forest beyond timber, to include non-timber forest products and services, social and cultural values and future options.

Justice in the forest: Rural livelihoods and forest law enforcement, by Colchester, recommends that future Forest Law Enforcement and Governance initiatives be developed in transparent ways, with broad civil society engagement. The study is designed to initiate a new generation of Forest Law Enforcement and Governance efforts that truly favour poor and marginalised peoples in both developing and developed countries.

Five case studies were published in both English and Indonesian as part of the series: *CIFOR Reports on Decentralization and Forests in Indonesia*. The series covers impacts of decentralization in the forestry sector in Indonesia and is intended to help inform policy decision-making. The case studies in this series show how decentralization has brought short-term economic windfalls to some forest-dependent communities, and brought decision-making closer to local stakeholders to improve livelihoods and the natural environment.

Report of the first international workshop on community forestry in Liberia by CIFOR/ICRAF is a valuable community forestry reference work that contains proceedings of a historic workshop held in December 2005 that addressed a range of community forestry issues and resulted in The Monrovia Declaration.

Financing Pulp Mills: An Appraisal of Risk Assessment and Safeguard Procedures was launched with a press release that generated much attention. This study analyses the risk assessment and socio-environmental safeguard procedures associated with the financing of pulp mill projects and presents a set of recommendations to stakeholders, the financial community, regulators, pulp producers and users of safeguard measures.

Other Dissemination Activities:

CIFOR produced a two-part documentary with the assistance of a DFID grant and funding from the World Bank. Entitled 'Our Forest' the film explores how local communities perceive and use rainforests in the Malinau District of Indonesian Borneo and how these uses may be changing, especially under decentralization. There is a DVD available with English and Indonesian language options, and a VCD in Indonesian.

CIFOR also produced a VCD entitled: *The People of Baru Pelepat: Learning to Change*. This film describes the ways Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) has been applied in Baru Pelepat Village, Sumatra. The village is an ACM pilot site and the documentary covers learning cycles and changes resulting from this in Indonesia. The film aims to share findings from this village, which recently won an important Indonesian environmental award. .

CIFOR's communications team also produced 13 posters about CIFOR's work during the last 12 months, which were presented at several events including an IUFRO Congress.

CIFOR's website is a valuable source of information for many outside the organization. Hundreds of thousands of PDF documents were downloaded from CIFOR's site over the last year and over one million individual visits to the site were made. The number of visits per month¹ increased steadily during the year from about 76,000 in June 2005 to 170,000 in April 2006, which shows the site's increasing popularity.

¹ Neither the download nor visits figures are a completely accurate representation of human visitors because the data includes automated searches and downloads by services such as Google. A new system is currently being implemented to more accurately separate 'human' visitors from 'robots'.

CIFOR in the International Arena

A dozen or so global institutions and processes strongly influence what happens to tropical forests and those that depend on them. These include: the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF), the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO). Governments, NGOs, and academics often look to these institutions for advice and leadership and some invest large amounts of money in forest activities.

One way a relatively small international institution like CIFOR can use its resources most efficiently and achieve substantial impact is by influencing these institutions and processes. CIFOR has clearly done this. It has worked with FAO, World Bank, ITTO, UNFF Secretariat, IUCN, IUFRO, UNFCCC, and the CBD both individually and through the Collaborative Partnership on Forests (CPF), an inter-agency task force on forests, to which all of them belong. Other international partnerships CIFOR has been actively involved in include the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA), Environment Task Force of the Millennium Project, the Poverty Environment Partnership (PEP), the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Consortium (ASB), and the Amazon Initiative. CIFOR has also been involved in a growing number of joint activities with CARE International, TNC, Conservation International, and WWF in Cameroon, DRC, Indonesia and Peru.

CIFOR has a wide range of partnerships with FAO, including active participation in the Collaborative Partnership on Forests, which FAO chairs. CIFOR also worked with FAO on forestry definitions, a code of practice for planted forests, Global Forestry Information Service (GFIS), Tsunami relief, forests and floods and forests and conflict.

CIFOR has co-organized seminars with the Asian Forest Partnership (AFP) with the ITTO at other fora, such as the UNFF, and has played an active role in the fifth meeting of the AFP in Yokohama, November 2005. CIFOR continues to manage the AFP Information Sharing Secretariat, and is one of the four lead partners in the AFP, together with the governments of Japan and Indonesia and The Nature Conservancy.

CIFOR has extensive interaction with the World Bank. CIFOR's findings have influenced bank operations through the Center's Director General, who in his personal capacity continues to be a member of World Bank's External Advisory Group (EAG), charged with reviewing the implementation of the Bank's forest policy and strategy. CIFOR's Director General has also been a member of the World Bank's International Advisory Group of the G7 Pilot Project for the Brazilian Amazon. CIFOR has worked closely with the World Bank in Brazil, DRC, India, and Indonesia and in several regional activities. In addition, CIFOR has provided input into the Bank's Indonesia Forest Strategy.

CIFOR has worked with IUFRO on the Global Forestry Information System (GFIS), the science-policy interface, and in the IUFRO Special Project, "World Forests, Society and Environment." CIFOR has also provided pre IUFRO World Congress training courses on topics, such as "Methods to Understand the Role of Forests in Local Livelihoods." CIFOR participated in satellite, sub-plenary and technical sessions at the 2005 IUFRO Congress, as well.

At the suggestion of the Government of Indonesia, CIFOR staff member Petrus Gunarso was elected Vice-President of the Committee on Reforestation and Forest Management of the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). That committee is responsible for reviewing

and approving the majority of project proposals submitted to the ITTO. CIFOR also continued to implement ITTO projects in Indonesia and the Congo Basin.

Rights and Resources Initiative

CIFOR is a founding partner for a new international initiative to advocate for stronger community forest tenure rights. This Rights and Resources Initiative will mobilise a global network of organizations, including community groups, NGOs, research institutions and governments to help advance tenure, policy and market reforms in developing countries. With the support of the a new organization called the Rights and Resources Group, the Initiative will conduct strategic global analyses of tenure reform, pro-poor conservation approaches, investment models, global finance and subsidy reforms. To inform and facilitate use of these insights, global and regional dialogues will be convened. Doris Capistrano, CIFOR's Programme Director for Governance, serves as Chair of the Rights and Resources Group's Board of Directors.

UN Forum on Forests (UNFF)

The United Nations Forum on Forests provides a valuable mechanism for communicating the results of CIFOR's work to an influential international audience and for staying in touch with our major stakeholders. At the sixth session of the Forum held at the UN Headquarters, NY in February 2006, CIFOR hosted two side events. One of these focused on "Due Diligence, Timber Trade, Livelihoods and Local Governance," while the other concerned achievements of the Asian Forest Partnership.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment has now been concluded with substantial input from CIFOR. This was the largest scientific assessment ever of ecosystems and human well-being. It provides a baseline of knowledge on what is the current state of ecosystem services and human well-being, what have been the historical trends in ecosystem changes and their impact on people, what are the future prospects and the policy response options for ecosystem management.

Doris Capistrano, a CIFOR director, served as member of the 13-member Millennium Assessment (MA) panel, and co-chaired the working group on sub-global assessments which now consists of 34 assessments all over the world. CIFOR was represented on the core writing team of the General Synthesis Report, as well as the report on Multi-scale Assessments released in the third quarter of 2005. CIFOR has been involved as both chapter review editor and coordinating lead author in chapters.

UN Climate Change Conference – COP11

CIFOR had a strong presence at the first meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol in Montreal, which was conducted in conjunction with the eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention. The Center sponsored a Roundtable Discussion on Compensated Emission Reduction at the Conference, organized with Joanneum Research of Austria and IPAM of Brazil. In addition, CIFOR organized with IWMI an event on Generating Agricultural Knowledge for Addressing and Responding to Climate Change. A new climate change adaptation project TroFCCA, the book on Adaptation to Climate Change, Sustainable Livelihoods and Biological Diversity and CarboFor website were all announced and/or launched

at the event.

International Events

Since June 2005, CIFOR sponsored or co-sponsored 17 international workshops and 20 national and sub-national workshops in 15 countries, in which several thousand people participated. That is nearly one workshop per week and represents a huge effort, as well as an important mechanism for CIFOR to disseminate its results. A few examples include:

- West African workshop on Nature, Wealth and Power. June 21 – 22, 2005, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso
- Forests and Livelihoods: Methods to Understand the Role of Forests in Local Livelihoods, IUFRO pre-Congress training course. August 15 – 18, 2005, Brisbane, Australia
- Session "Changes in forest ecosystems and their implications on human health" at IUFRO Congress 2005. August 8 – 13, 2005, Brisbane, Australia
- Kyoto Protocol 11th Conference of Parties Side Event: Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry in a Post 2012 Climate Agreement. December 5, 2005, Montreal, Canada
- Forest Research for Africa's Development: Creating opportunities with an undervalued resource. December 11 – 15, 2005, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe
- Forum on Security, Development and Forest Conflict. February 8 – 9, 2005, Brussels, Belgium
- UN Forum on Forests Side Event: Beyond Forest Law Enforcement: Due Diligence, Timber Trade, Livelihoods and local governance in 6th Session of the UNFF. February 16, 2005, UN Headquarters, New York, USA
- UN Forum on Forests Side Event: Asian Forest Partnership - Challenge and Achievement, held at the 6th session of the UN Forum on Forests. February 22, 2006, UN Headquarters, New York, USA.
- Tropical Forest and Climate Change Adaptation (TroFCCA) Kick-off regional meeting for Central America. April 3 – 6, 2006, Turrialba, Costa Rica
- Forests that benefit the poor: Linking income generation to influence for forest communities in Asia. May 9 – 11, 2006, Bogor, Indonesia
- Reducing Emissions from Deforestation in Developing Countries: A workshop to discuss methodological and policy issues. May 10-12, 2006, Bad Blumau / Austria
- Tropical Forest and Climate Change Adaptation (TroFCCA) Kick-off regional meeting for Asia. May 29 – 30, 2006, Bogor, Indonesia

Capacity Building

Four capacity building projects that involve innovative methodologies for training young professionals continue to be managed by CIFOR in 2005. These include: the Poverty Environment Network (PEN), the Makokou Project, the Leadership in Forestry Reform Project, and a project entitled Mitigating Conflict and Strengthening Capacity of Civil Society Group to Reduce Illegal Forest Activities. These are supplemented by a number of other individual training events to disseminate novel methods and findings from the Center's research on topics ranging from alternative wood residue utilization techniques to enterprise development.

PEN has assembled a group of 20 PhD students from various universities to study the links between forests and poverty. It will not only train students, but also develop a detailed panel data set that should be useful for many further studies of the topic.

Similarly, the Makokou Project is a small grants programme for PhD fieldwork by West African students. Initiated in 2003, the project is funding 10 students from various universities to do research on biodiversity issues of international importance.

The Leadership in Forestry Reform project, coordinated by CIFOR and funded by the Ford Foundation, allows young professionals and students to learn more about forest tenure and decentralization by combining periods at CIFOR with field research. Eleven students have taken up this opportunity.

The CIFOR project Mitigating Conflict and Strengthening Capacity of Civil Society Group to Reduce Illegal Forest Activities has organized a series of training events participants from civil society groups and government institutions in Papua to improve the capacity to use available legal and policy tools to mitigate forest crimes.

CIFOR's Context

Results of CIFOR's Second External Programme and Management Review

CIFOR recently concluded its External Programme and Management Review, which is now awaiting CGIAR approval. While the Review took considerable effort during late 2005 and early 2006, the Centre was pleased with the process and resultant recommendations. The report draws very positive conclusions about the quality, relevance and impact of the Center's work, and 17 of the 20 "findings" are very positive. Notable positive observations include:

- "Overall the Panel finds that CIFOR is the leading international forest research center within its mandate and that it is highly appreciated for its credible and relevant high-quality research."
- "CIFOR's research and policy-oriented outcomes are significant and in many cases outstanding."
- CIFOR's communications strategy is "very successful and could serve as a model for other CGIAR centres."
- The Center "conducts its research through appropriate partnerships."
- CIFOR's management processes are generally "logical, thorough, appropriate to the business and programmatic needs, inclusive, flexible, adaptive, and transparent."

- CIFOR's Board of Trustees "exemplifies the expression 'high performing board.'"

The EPMR also noted a number of areas for potential improvement. The report supported CIFOR's previously stated intention to undertake a new strategy after the arrival of a new Director General later this year. To better substantiate and implement the new strategy, the Review recommended that priority setting should be made more transparent and systematic. In addition, the review recommended that responsibilities of regional coordinators be clarified. CIFOR has accepted all of the EPMR recommendations, and plans to implement accordant changes in the context of a new strategy.

Major changes since the 2006-2008 MTP

1. An extensive and competitive search process resulted in the selection of Frances Seymour as the Center's new Director General. She will begin the position in October 2006.
2. The Center's EPMR has been completed, endorsed by the Science Council, and now awaits CGIAR approval.
3. A Center Commissioned External Review on the Scope and Focus of Forest Resource Management at CIFOR was completed in 2005, and awaits approval by CIFOR's Board.
4. A Center Commissioned External Review on Partnerships was complete in 2005, and awaits approval by CIFOR's Board.
5. Increased resources are being devoted to Africa. The proportion of Center expenditures targeted towards the continent has risen from 26% in 2005 to 32% in 2007 and is projected to reach 36% by 2008.
6. The Research Agenda requirement for 2007 is projected at \$16.5 million. The distribution of effort across the CGIAR System Priorities is projected to be relatively stable over the plan period.
7. In developing a Plan to 2009, it is projected that overall revenues will fall by 3% in 2007, due to the completion of a number of large restricted projects, then remain stable.
8. The expenditures required for personnel will represent approximately 48% in 2007 of overall expenditures. The collaborative budget for partnership research is projected to be at 29%.
9. While the Centre will have a deficit of \$390,000 for 2006, due to the costs of completing the EPMR (USD 160,000) and recurring operational costs (USD 230,000), a balanced budget is envisioned for 2007 and subsequent years.
10. The location and composition of staff for the coming Triennium is likely to change as a result of an ongoing process of regionalization, as well as increases in the number of bilaterally funded appointments. These changes are a reflection of a strategic staffing plan approved by the management of the centre.

Host country conditions

Within the Center's host country, Indonesia, during 2005 and early 2006, there has been continued popularity of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and a stable political situation.

While rising fuel prices and reductions in fuel subsidies have caused high rates of short-term inflation and have reduced GDP growth in 2005 to 4.8%, the longer-term macroeconomic outlook is more promising with growth rising to 5.8% by 2007. Pressure on natural resources remains high in the country however, with the 2003 state of the environment report indicating that the condition of forests has entered a critical stage due to legal and illegal logging, forest fires, legal and illegal mining in forests, as well as the conversion of forests into housing estates or plantations.

Indonesia continues to face significant acute challenges. Despite recent progress, corruption remains an important constraint to effective governance. Avian influenza (“bird flu”) is endemic to the country, and Indonesia would be rather vulnerable if the disease were to become communicable from human to human. To date, there have been nearly 40 confirmed bird flu deaths in Indonesia. The possibilities of human-to-human transmission are being closely monitored. CIFOR has in place a bird flu committee that has developed a preparedness plan and provides updates to staff.

The country has been severely afflicted by a series of natural disasters. Most recently, an earthquake near Yogyakarta on 27 May 2006 resulted in more than 6,000 deaths, 20,000 injuries, the displacement of 650,000 people, and the destruction of 135,000 homes. Prior to this, an earthquake and subsequent tsunami on 26 December 2004 caused immense loss of life and physical destruction, which was followed by an earthquake on Nias Island in March 2005. The number of dead and missing from the 2004 tsunami and 2005 earthquake has reached nearly 220,000, with another 500,000 homeless. CIFOR has offered advice and guidance to government agencies and donors involved in tsunami reconstruction through a Working Group on Environment and Natural Resources.

Finally, there are also positive recent developments in the archipelago. Aceh, which has suffered more than 30 years of brutal civil war, is now experiencing relative calm and stability as a result of a peace pact signed in August 2005 between the main rebel faction and the Indonesian government. There is now greater freedom from violent conflict in Indonesia than at any other point in recent history. While analysts feel that there is an ongoing risk of terror attacks, great progress has been made in arresting terrorists and reducing their networks ability to conduct operations.

Regional Office Conditions

CIFOR regional offices outside of Indonesia have also experienced changes in their external environments:

- In Brazil, CIFOR continues to be hosted by EMBRAPA under the IICA umbrella. A new Terms of Cooperation and Technical Cooperation Project (TCP) has been negotiated and is being signed with IICA until April 2007, which will allow CIFOR to receive funds from third parties within Brazil. Essentially, in 2006, all CIFOR operations in Brazil will be channelled through IICA. In addition, a new TCP has just been signed with EMBRAPA, which lasts until December 2009.
- The Cameroon Office has had success in developing collaborative research initiatives. Peace in the Democratic Republic of Congo presents opportunities for the formation of new research partnerships. The Commission des Forêts de l’Afrique Centrale, as the sub-regional organization with the mandate to coordinate forest conservation and management activities

in the entire Congo Basin, has been a principal partner in the region.

- In Zimbabwe, the political and economic crisis continues. Through access to facilities of the UN system, CIFOR's regional operations in Southern Africa can continue to operate.
- CIFOR has established a new regional office in West Africa by upgrading its project office based in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, which is responsible for ongoing work in Liberia, Mali, Ghana and Guinea. The office is still operating under a Memorandum of Understanding with the national government, and a host country agreement is expected to be complete by the end of the year.
- CIFOR now has project offices in Bolivia, Gabon, Ethiopia, Zambia, India, Peru, Montpellier (France), Sumatra and Malinau (Indonesia).

The internal environments of the regional offices have been strengthened through the appointment of full-time regional coordinators in Brazil, Cameroon and Burkina Faso. Recruitment is frozen for the time being for Zimbabwe.

Staffing Highlights

CIFOR expects to maintain its current staffing profile and numbers for the duration of the medium term plan. The current staff complement includes staff appointed on a global, regional or national basis. In addition, CIFOR has been successful in seconding numerous staff from partner organizations (CIRAD, IRD, Ministry of Forestry, and Government of Indonesia). There has been an increase in the numbers of bilateral appointments at the Masters and Post Doc levels, and this trend is expected to continue. These positions are funded primarily by European countries including Finland, Netherlands, Italy, Germany and Sweden.

In 2005, the Management Group devoted much effort to strategic staffing to establish a future vision of staffing for CIFOR. One outcome of this meeting was a commitment to maintain a critical mass of scientists in each region. In addition, during the meeting strategies were developed to increase retention of scientists and to overcome challenges linked to recruiting senior staff.

CIFOR staff is becoming increasingly dispersed. Currently approximately 25% of our staff is posted outside the Head Office in 10 countries. The Center's preference is to post staff in developing countries and where possible with other CGIAR centres or partner institutions. CIFOR has committed to devoting 40% of our effort to Africa, so the Center expects to see further staff appointments in offices there while maintaining current investments in Asia and Latin America.

The diversity of CIFOR staff is increasing in terms of nationalities (approximately 30 countries). Citizens of developing countries constitute all national and regional appointments. Forty percent of the global appointments are from developing countries. Increasingly CIFOR is making regional rather than global appointments to staff regional projects. This recruitment strategy will continue to increase the diversity of staff.

There are significant HR challenges to attract and retain global staff due to limited opportunities for spousal employment, as well as security and lifestyle issues in CIFOR locations. CIFOR has implemented flexible approaches to staffing and family friendly policies to support our staff to deal with work-family balance issues. Although these issues impact all staff, the family related issues tend to impact women more than men. As a result, the current representation of women in

global roles is limited to approximately 25% of global staff (although this still compares favourably with other CGIAR centres).

The average tenure of a global CIFOR staff member is approximately five years. Many CIFOR staff members move on to partnership roles (Senior Associate positions) when their tenure with CIFOR ends. The retention of their expertise facilitates the transfer of knowledge to new staff and partners, and increases the Center's leverage as these associates are usually in positions to influence others.

CIFOR works extensively through partnerships. At any given time, there are approximately 200 research partners. The majority of our partners are from developing countries. The partnership strategy is key to increasing the effectiveness of our staff appointments and research activities, disseminating our research results and increasing our potential for influence and impact

CIFOR and the CGIAR

Collaboration with the World Agroforestry Center

The World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF) and CIFOR have a strong partnership, as there are many synergies between forest-related research themes (CIFOR's focus) and research themes concerning tree cultivation and use on farms (ICRAF's focus). Thus the two centres coordinate research activities through a number of mechanisms and share a number of joint activities.

CIFOR's Board of Trustees (BOT) includes an ICRAF Board Member, Professor Ragnhild Lund, who serves as a member of Programme Committee in her capacity as the representative of ICRAF's Board Chair. Cristian Samper represents the CIFOR BOT Chair on the ICRAF BOT. At the management level, the ICRAF Southeast Asia Regional Coordinator annually attends a Management Group Meeting to ensure that opportunities for enhanced inter-Center collaboration are utilised.

The two centres share substantial infrastructure, as ICRAF's largest regional office outside of headquarters is hosted by CIFOR, and in Belem CIFOR hosts the ICRAF/CIAT coordinator at its offices on the Embrapa campus. Two joint scientific staff members help to ensure that research on common themes is coordinated. These linkages have allowed the centres to successfully work together on over 20 projects, such as Alternatives to Slash and Burn Programmes (ASB) and Underlying Causes of Forest Fires.

ICRAF and CIFOR have produced 25 co-publications and worked closely together in disseminating information such as policy briefs on issues dealing with fire and the Clean Development Mechanism. The collaboration has also yielded about 10 co-funded, ongoing projects, such as Congo Livelihood Improvement and Food Security (CLIFS), Biodiversity Matrix Matters, Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods in Guinea and a joint community forestry initiative in Liberia.

Further details on CIFOR-ICRAF collaboration can be found in a joint paper entitled "ICRAF and CIFOR: Building on Past Experience for a Stronger Alliance". This paper was commissioned following a meeting between the Board Chairs and DGs of the two centres and presented to their respective EPMR panels in 2005.

Joint Biodiversity Platform

A joint Biodiversity Platform with ICRAF, which will focus on biodiversity issues in multifunctional landscape mosaics, is an important focus for inter-Center collaboration. After several preparatory joint meetings in 2005 the CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform was launched in an inaugural workshop on March 2006, where scientists from both institutions agreed upon a set of goals, objectives and principles for the Platform. During the workshop participants i) shared their expertise and experiences to give the Platform a large and solid grounding, ii) developed a common understanding of what the Platform should be and where it should go (with targeted outcomes and outputs) and iii) started to design the first research project of the Platform.

Alternatives to Slash and Burn Programme (ASB)

CIFOR has been an active partner in the Alternatives to Slash and Burn Systemwide Programme, which received substantial praise from a recent Externally Commissioned Review. This innovative programme works in collaboration with 80 other agencies to analyse causes and solutions for agricultural expansion at the forest margin. By bringing together local knowledge, policy perspectives, and science, ASB works to understand the tradeoffs among conservation and development goals and to identify and develop innovative policies and practices that work for both people and nature. The Programme also strengthens the capacity of partners in developing countries to participate fully in the search for solutions. ASB is hosted by the World Agroforestry Centre with a Global Steering Group (GSG), acting as ASB's global governance body. CIFOR is now the Chair of the GSG.

Amazon Initiative (AI)

The ASB SP has evolved in part into the Amazon Initiative, which assesses causes, consequences and possible solutions for natural resource degradation practices in the Amazon basin. CIFOR is one of the 10 founding members of the Initiative, which is intended to become a Systemwide Programme. CIFOR has been an active member of the Technical Committee of the AI, along with CIAT, ICRAF and IPGRI.

Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM)

CIFOR continues to play an active role in the working Group on Integrated Natural Resource Management. CIFOR has taken a leading role in developing INRM guidelines *Navigating amidst complexity: Guide to manage R&D interventions for improving livelihoods and the environment*, which will be published in 2006. This booklet is about improving the effectiveness of research and development (R&D) in natural resource management (NRM), so that livelihood and environmental outcomes are enhanced. This is presented as a “new way of doing business” for R&D in natural resource management, but, as will be indicated, builds on approaches in the agricultural, conservation and governance fields. This book is directed towards those who are implementing NRM projects, undertaking research on NRM, or setting policies for NRM.

The theoretical foundations and operational framework were established during a series of four annual workshops involving over 200 scientists from the CGIAR and its partners. Specialists were drawn from the full spectrum of land use systems and NRM perspectives

Gender and Diversity Programme

CIFOR has been a contributing member of the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Programme. In 2005, CIFOR played host to the annual Gender and Diversity meeting June 13-17.

Collaboration with WorldFish and IWMI

CIFOR is closely monitoring the development of a joint Corporate Services initiative of the World Fish Center and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), and is considering future participation. Such participation may take many forms including full partnership, partnership on specific projects or purchasing of services. The first substantial point of collaboration is the joint development of a Human Resource Management System. This computer database will allow for efficient management of staff information, streamlined consideration of candidates for vacancies, as well as efficient processing of staff benefits.

The three centres are also collaborating with FAO on development of the Electronic Natural Resources Information Center (eNRIC). The aim of eNRIC is to deliver high quality services in information retrieval and delivery to CGIAR researchers through integration of library services.

Host Country Collaboration

In 2005 and 2006 CIFOR continued to collaborate closely with the Ministry of Forestry and FORDA on the Asia Forest Partnership, the ITTO Malinau Project, decentralization, community-company partnerships, forest rehabilitation and other topics. These efforts continue and most are going well. Regarding the ITTO Malinau Project phase II which ends in November 2006, the parties agreed to prepare a project proposal for a third phase and to identify internal funds to cover an anticipated one year funding gap. In 2006 at the request of the Ministry of Forestry, CIFOR supported the Indonesian government's delegation to the negotiations to the successor agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement (ITTA) of 1994.

Implementation of EPMR Recommendations

Although CIFOR recently underwent an External Programme and Management Review, it will not be endorsed by the CGIAR until the 2006 Annual General Meeting. Thus, the last CGIAR approved EPMR dates from 1998.

The 1998 EPMR had five primary recommendations:

1. CIFOR should evolve its current grouping of research activities into a framework that links more closely and clearly its research activities and their outputs to CIFOR's mission and to the broad thematic needs implied by it.
2. CIFOR should develop a more transparent and systematic priority setting process that includes an explicit set of criteria for 1) judging project exclusion or inclusion: appropriateness to mission, cost-effectiveness, international public goods contribution; and (2) setting priorities among the group of included project activities.
3. The BOT should seek Trustees who, between them, have broad managerial and financial competencies, familiarity with the CGIAR System, and with the private sector.
4. CIFOR should carefully consider re-establishing the link between performance

evaluations and salary increases.

5. Management should implement an organisational arrangement that (a) filters all potential and present projects and their component activities through an organising framework to ensure consistency with CIFOR's mission and strategic objectives; and (b) maintains the essential underpinnings of good management processes

In the years since that EPMR, CIFOR has successfully implemented four of these five recommendations (see Appendix I for further details); with the sole exception being recommendation two. While CIFOR has attempted to improve research project selection, it has not yet done so in a fully transparent and systematic manner. However, CIFOR does recognize that further action is needed on this issue, and the Center intends to make priority setting more systematic and transparent during the development of a new Center strategy later in the year.

Highlights of the 2007 Project Portfolio

Changes in Response to the Science Council's Commentary on the 2006-2008 MTP

While the overall tone of the Science Council's Commentary on the 2006-2008 MTP was positive, a few areas for potential improvement were identified. In particular, the Science Council noted that a number of CIFOR output targets were not sufficiently precise or represented intermediate activities. This year, output targets are more precise, so the nature of the research and research products completed by the end of the output target year is clear. Such descriptions will clearly define improvements to understanding of the output topic anticipated within the year, and should identify specific methods, tools, models, and/or analyses that will result.

The Science Council commented last year that in CIFOR's MTP "links to poverty alleviation are indirect and not often clearly noted." Similarly, it generally observed that "a better specification of pathways from outputs to impact is needed." To make these pathways more explicit, anticipated improvements in the actions/effects of those who adopt or are influenced by CIFOR outputs are better articulated. Moreover, the consequences of these improvements are linked more explicitly to particular intended benefits for the poor and the environment.

As per Science Council feedback received last year, the "Global Public Goods and Impact Assessment Project" is too minor in terms of funding (\$160,000 per annum) to warrant inclusion as a distinct Project (with typical funding of at least \$500,000 per annum) in the logframes or Project Narratives. Thus, the *Forest Spatial Information Catalogue* and the *Global Forest Information Service* will be reported as an Output in one of the other projects. As impact assessment and other forms of research evaluation are not to be usually included in research Project logframes as Outputs or Output Targets, and the resources devoted to this activity are far below Project levels, such will be reported as a non-System Priority undertaking.

Last year's Science Council MTP commentary on Project 5, Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability, noted a) a national focus that is not likely to result in International Public Goods, b) doubts about whether the project responds sufficiently to the CGIAR goals (particularly poverty alleviation) to merit inclusion in the priority research agenda and c) concerns that the project lies outside of the Center's comparative advantage. As a result, it

was suggested that the project should be phased out.

CIFOR's, Board of Trustees, management and staff reflected extensively on these observations. Ultimately, CIFOR concluded that last year's MTP narrative and project logframes did not adequately present the rationale and importance of the Project. As a result, the Center believes that the Council drew inaccurate conclusions about the Project, as the research is intended to: a) derive generalisable principles about the scale and magnitude of illicit forestry activities and appropriate regulatory measures that can be applied by multiple countries and international bodies; b) the consequences of reduced illegal forestry activities are likely to be pro-poor and improve the equity of the distribution of forest returns; and c) there is systematic inattention to the topic by other bodies, while CIFOR has capacity to undertake such research. Thus, the BOT recommended that Project 5 be retained in the portfolio, with an improved articulation of characteristics of intended outputs, outcomes and impacts in the Narrative and logframes.

System Priority Alignment

CIFOR is pleased with the outcome of the CGIAR Science Council's priority-setting process, which has been embodied in the CGIAR-endorsed System Priorities. The Priorities effectively reflect the work that the Center has been undertaking for some time, as the Center's entire research portfolio aligns with one or more of the identified Priority topics. Thus, the Center is pleased to report that no adjustments to the Center's Project Portfolio were necessitated for alignment.

The Project Narratives and Financial Plan in subsequent sections report how individual Projects and Project Outputs align with System Priorities in terms of research content and resource allocation. It should be noted that in this reporting, the System Priorities are not mutually exclusive, as many research activities fall under multiple priorities simultaneously. Accurate division of expenditures among these overlapping priorities is not possible. As a result, some of the statistics presented should be interpreted with care. For example, while a majority of the research portfolio clearly falls under System Priority 3d, Sustainable Income Generation from Trees and Forests, a minority of the budget is reported to be allocated to this theme, due to division of expenditures with other themes that overlap.

Portfolio composition

CIFOR's programmatic research strategies are operationalised through the Project Portfolio presented in the present MTP. There have been minor changes to most of the Output titles and objectives to better reflect the thematic content of intended research products.

Although there are some small changes in the structure of the portfolio, the main focus and priorities of CIFOR's research over the coming triennium fundamentally build on plans presented in previous MTPs. The sole structural change is that Project 4, governance of multi-stakeholder forested landscapes, now has two Outputs, rather than three. The Project's research on decentralization and community forestry have been merged into a single Output in the new structure.

CIFOR Programme & Project Title	Outputs
Environmental Services & Sustainable Use of Forests	
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests	1.1.: Identification of best practices, regulations, and criteria that will help to encourage the use of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices that are not currently widely adopted 1.2.: Analysis of the long-term sustainability of the supply of timber, fibre and other forest products from natural forests and plantations
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes ('cross-cutting' with other Projects)	2.1.: Tools and strategies to integrate biodiversity conservation into improved management practices at the landscape level 2.2.: Support to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through the collection and use of better information and participatory tools regarding biodiversity in landscape mosaics for problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision making This project is implemented through integrated research initiatives that cut across all three CIFOR programmes. There are strong links with research in Project 4, Project 5 and Project 7.
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services	3.1.: Tools and best practices for balancing water use and carbon sequestration services from forests at the landscape level 3.2.: Identification of pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes involving forest ecosystems and articulation of the role of forest ecosystems in adaptation to climate change 3.3.: Guidelines and methods for rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes
Forests and Governance	
Project 4: Governance of multi-stakeholder forested landscapes	4.1.: Analysis of decentralisation policies and practices in selected countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America 4.2.: Analyses, tools and recommendations for effective stakeholder collaboration, forest-related conflict mitigation, and institution building for collaborative forest management
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability	5.1.: Analyses of legal timber verification methods, and policy-relevant forest trade scenarios with assessment of implications for forest sustainability, economic development and human well-being, especially among the forest dependent poor 5.2.: Analysis, guidelines, strategies and approaches for improved regulations and business practices of corporate entities involved in forestry-related transactions and operations in tropical developing countries
Forests and Livelihoods	
Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods	6.1.: Analyses and case studies of conservation-development initiatives (including payment for environmental services (PES) schemes) that result in methods, options and strategies for improving pro-poor outcomes 6.2.: Concepts, methods, and analysis at the landscape scale of the socio-economic and physical determinants of the role and potential of forests in livelihoods and livelihoods improvement
Project 7: Improving Human Well-being through Forests	7.1.: Analysis of the conditions and factors that facilitate successful small enterprise development and secure safety nets from forest biodiversity 7.2.: Guidelines, strategies and policy recommendations to improve involvement of poor people in timber and natural product industries 7.3. Recommendations for poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes that take into account forests and forestry in a way that promotes rural livelihoods

Financial highlights

Grant revenues in 2006 are expected to be slightly lower compared to 2005 due to the completion of some restricted projects. It is expected that restricted revenue will slightly decrease again in 2007.

The proportion of the Agreed Research Agenda financed by restricted contributions is expected to be approximately 54% of donor funding throughout the MTP period.

The continued political stability and renewed consumer demand in Indonesia has had calming effects on the Rupiah exchange rate which is projected to trade in the range of 9000 to 9500 per U.S. Dollar for the balance of 2006, with major shifts not expected during 2007. Inflation will decline to about 8 to 10% in 2006 and is projected to continue at that pace in 2007.

Personnel costs in 2007 are expected to be 48% of the budget while a substantial portion of the budget will support partnership activities (29%). Regional Office expenses are expected to be 7%. The resources allocated to the regional sites, particularly Africa and Latin America have increased over the years and it is planned to increase the investments in Africa. Future capital expenditures will be mostly to replace depreciated assets.

Financial Health Indicators

CIFOR's Board of Trustees has approved, and closely monitors, financial policies designed to ensure adequate reserves to ensure liquidity in the event of short-term funding variations. CIFOR's BOT approved a strategy to very gradually reduce the reserves towards its long standing internal targets. These targets maximize the funds available for the research programmes, but also ensure that liquidity measures will remain above both the Board approved minimum levels and the CGIAR minimums for liquidity and solvency.

Within this policy, CIFOR's Board approved a deficit of USD 390,000 in 2006 which includes the costs of completing the EPMR (USD 160,000) and recurring operational costs (USD 230,000). By the end of 2006, the reserves will have reached the minimum level, thus balanced budgets are planned for 2007 and beyond.

The CGIAR liquidity indicator was 191 days in 2005 and is projected to decrease slightly due to the planned deficit in 2006. However, this is well above the top end of the CGIAR recommended minimum range. Similarly, the solvency indicator was 144 days in 2005 and will decrease slightly in 2006, but will remain above the CGIAR targets.

Risk management

Financial risks are part of a broader spectrum of risks that CIFOR manages. The Board annually approves an updated risk assessment, and an internal control/risk policy, which uses a framework developed by the CGIAR Internal Audit Unit to: 1) identify, evaluate, and prioritize risks and opportunities across the organization; 2) develop risk mitigation strategies which balance benefits with costs; and 3) monitor the implementation of these strategies.

Project Narratives

Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests

Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests

Background and rationale

The world's forests cover approximately 3,500 million hectares, or about 30% of the total land area excluding Greenland and Antarctica. About 57% of those forests, mostly tropical, are located in developing countries. Between 1980 and 1995, the total area of forest decreased by about 180 million hectares as a result of human activities. About 200 million hectares were converted to agriculture (crops, pasture, and fallow), but a 40 million hectare increase in plantations partially offset this loss. Fragmentation, unsustainable logging of mature forests and other types of forest degradation have also occurred over large areas. With the decrease of areas of mature “untouched” forests, secondary forests will be gaining in importance and become a prominent source of timber and non-timber forest products.

Only a small fraction of tropical forests, either mature or secondary, are effectively managed to produce goods and services sustainably. Nevertheless, there are a number of success stories, both for natural forests and plantations, where the operations are sustainable, competitive, and provide decent livelihoods. Activities under this project will help to learn from and build on those successes.

The role of forest plantations in global wood production and trade is growing rapidly. Growing demand for wood, including round wood, wood fibre and bio-energy is likely to place new pressures on natural forests and to promote the establishment of plantations. At the same time, the concern for poverty reduction create potential for smallholder plantation forestry to generate new livelihood options for rural communities. This project will produce knowledge, information and tools for promoting sustainable forest plantations at all scales for the production of goods and environmental services.

System Priority alignment

Project 1 falls completely within the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III), and has required no changes due to System Priority Alignment. As the Project is primarily concerned with sustainable forest management, so as to foster long-term income generation opportunities and environmental services for the poor, it is primarily aligned with Priority 3d – Sustainable Income Generation from Trees and Forests. As sustainable management requires consideration of landscape level interactions, the research is also aligned with System Priority 4a – Integrated Land, Water and Forest Management at a Landscape Scale.

More specifically, Output 1, “Identification of best practices, regulations, and criteria that will help to encourage the use of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices that are not currently widely adopted,” has a relatively high emphasis on Priority 3d, as it primarily concerns analysis at the concession scale of impediments and opportunities for sustainable income generation from forest resources. Thus, 56% of 2007 expenditures fall under this Priority. Some analysis at wider scales will contextualise this research, so 44% should be considered to fall under Priority 4a.

Output 2, “Analysis of the long-term sustainability of the supply of timber, fibre and other forest products from natural forests and plantations,” concerns landscape level assessment of current

management practices and harvesting, as well as analysis of the consequences of regional trade processes. In addition, implications of current harvesting rates for other important natural resources, such as water and carbon, will be analysed. As a result of this landscape scale focus and analysis of multiple resources, 58% of 2007 expenditures fall under Priority 4a. As forestry for sustainable income generation is the primary intended outcome of the research, much of this also falls under Priority 3d. Thus, 42% of expenditures fall under this Priority.

Goal

To promote the sustainable use of primary and secondary forests and forest plantations and the adoption of appropriate forest management practices that allow competitive and sustainable production of goods and services.

Objectives

- To promote best practices and locally adapted strategies and frameworks for managing forests so the operations will be competitive and produce timber and other goods and services sustainably.
- To encourage actions that will ensure a sustainable supply of raw materials for forest-based industries.

The project builds on activities that are closely linked to CIFOR objectives. The activities in this project are aimed at providing analysis, information, tools and advice to assist in making policy decisions about sustainable forests and land use. The goal is to better utilise the potential for sustained and improved productivity of forest systems for the benefit of people in developing countries. Capacity building is carried out in two main ways: a) by involving young scientists and other national and local partners in joint research projects, and b) through regional and national networks and joint research sites developed together with regional, national, and local actors to address new and emerging topics.

Changes

This project is likely to go through a major revision during the coming year due to the fact that several restricted projects are coming to an end, and that there will changes in the senior scientific staff working on this project.

Research approach to International Public Goods

The project will identify best practices, regulations and criteria that will help to encourage the use of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices are not currently widely adopted. To do so, the project will develop tools and methods for improving smallholder and community forest management practices and forestry enterprises, to make them more competitive and make their raw material supply more sustainable. Forest-based industries are expanding to meet the growing demand for timber and wood fibre. However, in many tropical countries, plantation and natural forest operations are not managed adequately for long-term sustainability.

In addition, the project will analyze and develop tools for analysing and modelling of the long-term sustainability of the supply of timber, fibre and other forest products from natural forests and plantations. This work is closely linked with the results of research being conducted in Project 5 on improving the systems of accountability of government and corporate actors in forest, finance and related sectors.

Target ecoregions of this project are Amazon Basin (Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru) in South

America, Central Africa (Congo, DRC, Cameroon and Gabon), and East and South-East Asia (China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Vietnam).

Comparison of experiences across the sites and regions and synthesis work on the tested tools will result in the provision of tools widely applicable to other forest management and planning processes occurring in tropical areas where the long-term sustainability of wood supply objectives is a priority. In addition, the tools (computer models, data bases, etc.) synthesise research results from different regions and conditions to derive generalisable means of appraising the sustainability of fibre sources. These tools will be applied to the Center in regional scale analysis, so as to identify means for countries in the region to ensure that that critical environmental services for the poor are preserved.

The project, in collaboration with national institutions and other partners such as international and regional networks (for instance the International Model Forest Network), will contribute to policy change by demonstrating results at key sites and sharing information with regional institutions and processes, and in national meetings. The project also provides technical information and analytical support for regional initiatives such as in the Mekong, the Amazon and the Congo Basin.

Intended impact pathways

Major direct beneficiaries and end users of the results and findings of this project are extension services, farmer groups, forest enterprises, private forest companies and NGOs working with farmers and communities. The project will collaborate with national and local governments, industry, donors and NGOs in the development of appropriate policies, strategies, and guidelines.

The project will work with international organizations and processes, such as UNFF, CPF, ITTO, FSC and FAO, and international and local NGOs, and other partners to develop best management practices for different types of forests and to disseminate the results and promote up-take. It is anticipated that these partners will embed silvicultural findings in extension programmes.

Key policy makers and donors will be targeted to illustrate how it can be economically viable for smallholders and communities to manage natural, secondary and plantation forests to supply forest products and how forest-based industries can sustainably meet the growing demand of timber and wood fibre. Furthermore, analysis of best practices, regulations and criteria for sustainable forest management (SFM) practices will be disseminated to private corporations, investors, banks, development agencies and other key actors (UN agencies and processes, the World Bank, the regional development banks) that invest in forest industries.

Much of the silvicultural work will involve action research that integrates target groups such as extension services, farmer groups, forest enterprises and NGOs into the research process to ensure the relevance and uptake of research findings. The project will also engage national and local governments, industry, donors and advocacy groups in a dialogue about appropriate policies, strategies and guidelines. As a growing share of the wood production and wood supply is coming from farm forestry and smallholder and community forestry in the future, wide dissemination and subsequent application of sustainable forest management concepts and methods will have direct impacts and benefits on the livelihoods of the poor living in rural areas.

The project intends that utilization of enhanced sustainable forest management methods by smallholders will increase their forestry income through enhanced access to premium timber markets. In so doing, the use of more sustainable practices will help to conserve important environmental services and safety nets for the poor. Similarly, enhanced sustainability of fibre

sources will help to prevent expansion of plantation area into natural forests with high biodiversity value, and will help to prevent displacement of poor forest-dependant populations.

It is assumed that all the stakeholder groups mentioned above are willing to participate fully and contribute to project, that existing data is freely accessible to the project, and that forest authorities and industry have sufficient flexibility to explore new arrangements that may be developed under this project.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 1, Output 1: Identification of best practices, regulations, and criteria that will help to encourage the use of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices that are not currently widely adopted

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determinaton	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	20	15	13	13	13	5	13	20	Y	Y
University of Freiburg, Germany	25	25	10	5	10	10	5	10	Y	Y
University of Wageningen, The Netherlands	25	20	10	20	10	5	5	5	Y	Y
University of León, Spain	20	15	10	20	10	10	5	10	Y	N
Universidad Técnica del Beni, Bolivia	5	10	10	25	10	20	10	10	Y	N
Instituto do Homem e Meio Ambiente da Amazônia, Brazil	5	10	10	25	10	20	10	10	Y	N
Fundación Servicio Forestal Amazónico, Ecuador	5	10	10	25	10	20	10	10	Y	N
Asociación para la Investigación y el Desarrollo Integral – AIDER, Peru	5	10	10	25	10	20	10	10	Y	N
Universidade Federal Rural da Amazônia, Brazil	5	10	10	25	10	20	10	10	Y	N
University Uppsala	20	10	15	0	25	0	10	20	Y	Y
Forest Science Institute of Vietnam	20	10	0	10	20	10	10	20	Y	N
FSC-IC	20	20	10	0	15	15	20	0	Y	Y
FSC Brazil	10	10	0	0	15	20	20	25	Y	Y
FSC Mexico	10	10	0	0	15	20	20	25	Y	Y
FSC Cameroon	10	10	0	0	15	20	20	25	Y	Y
ProForest	10	0	10	10	0	35	0	35	Y	N
The Nature Conservancy	20	10	10	20	10	0	15	15	Y	Y
UNEP	20	20	20	5	20	5	5	5	Y	N

Partners' roles in Project 1, Output 2, Analysis of the long-term sustainability of the supply of timber, fiber and other forest products from natural forests and plantations

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminat or/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	23	20	17	7	17	3	5	8	Y	Y
Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Japan	20	20	20	5	20	5	5	5	Y	Y
CSIRO Forestry and Forest Products, Australia	10	0	20	30	20	5	10	5	Y	Y
Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries Queensland, Australia	5	0	10	30	20	5	15	15	Y	Y
Escola Superior de Agricultura 'Luiz de Queiroz' (ESALQ), Brazil	10	0	20	30	20	5	10	5	Y	Y
CIRAD-ESALQ, Brazil	10	0	20	35	20	5	5	5	Y	Y
Suzano de Papel e Celulose, Brazil	0	0	20	30	10	5	15	20	Y	Y
Research Institute of Tropical Forestry, China	10	5	20	30	20	5	5	5	Y	Y
Unite de Recherche sur la Productivite des Plantations Industrielles, Congo	5	0	20	30	20	5	10	10	Y	Y
Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique Centre de Nancy, France	10	5	25	25	20	5	5	5	Y	Y
CIRAD-Forêt, France	5	0	20	30	30	15	0	0	Y	Y
Kerala Forest Research Institute, India	10	5	20	30	15	5	10	5	Y	Y
Musi Hutan Persada, Indonesia	5	5	20	30	20	5	10	5	Y	Y
Riau Andalan Pulp & Paper, Indonesia	5	5	20	30	20	5	10	5	Y	Y
Japan Overseas Plantation Center for Pulpwood	0	0	20	30	20	5	10	15	Y	Y
Institute for Commercial Forestry Research, South Africa	5	5	15	30	20	5	10	10	Y	Y

Forest Science Institute of Vietnam	5	5	20	30	20	5	5	10	Y	Y
Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia	10	10	10	15	20	5	10	20	Y	N
Universiti Putra Malaysia	10	10	10	15	20	5	10	20	Y	N
University of the Philippines Los Banos (UPLB)	10	10	10	15	20	5	10	20	Y	N
CATIE, Costa Rica	20	10	15	5	10	10	10	20	Y	Y

Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes

Background and rationale

To meet conservation targets for forest diversity requires strategies for managing ecosystems in landscape mosaics. The purpose of this project is to conserve forest biodiversity in rural landscape mosaics through the development of integrated approaches and solutions in line with the Millennium Development Goals. The project seeks to find ways to balance biodiversity conservation with sustainable use of natural forest resources and improved local livelihoods.

The project will develop methods, tools and best practices for participatory analysis and modelling of landscapes, and for integrating biodiversity conservation of managed forests into the broader context of forest and ecosystem management.

The project aims at: (a) providing better scientific information for biodiversity management in landscape mosaics; (b) developing best practices for biodiversity management in managed forests; (c) influencing global and national biodiversity policies; and (d) building capacity and developing resource materials for training in biodiversity management and conservation.

System Priority alignment

Project 2 falls completely within the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III), and has required no changes due to System Priority Alignment. As the Project is primarily concerned with managing forested ecosystems in landscape mosaics, it is primarily aligned with Priority 4a – Integrated Land, Water and Forest Management at a Landscape Scale. The project also aims at fostering long-term income generation opportunities and environmental services for the poor. Thus, it is also aligned with Priority 3d – Sustainable Income Generation from Trees and Forests. In addition, the project aims at improving the livelihoods of smallholders and rural forest communities through better use of local biodiversity. This makes it aligned with the Priority 1b - Promoting conservation and characterization of under-utilized plant genetic resources to increase the income of the poor.

More specifically, Output 1, “Tools and strategies to integrate biodiversity conservation into improved management practices at the landscape level” has a relatively high emphasis on Priority 4a, as it primarily concentrates on developing better tools for land-use management strategies at the landscape scale for improved biodiversity conservation, while maintaining economic profitability of forests and ecosystems. As the project concerns forest ecosystems, it also has a high emphasis on 3d. Thus, 33% of 2007 expenditures fall under 4a and 34% fall under 3d. Some work is aimed at improving the local livelihoods through better use of local biodiversity, so 10% should be considered to fall under Priority 1b. Smaller shares fall under 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Output 2, “Support to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through the collection and use of better information and participatory tools regarding biodiversity in landscape mosaics for problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision making,” concentrates on forest land-use management strategies at the landscape scale. The forest land use context means that 34% of expenditures fall under 3d. As a result of this landscape scale focus and analysis of multiple resources, 33% of 2007 expenditures falls under Priority 4a. Enhanced use of biodiversity is also a focus, so 10% should be considered to fall under Priority 1b. Smaller shares fall under 5b, 5c, and 5d.

Goal

To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity through generation and diffusion of improved knowledge about biodiversity in forested rural landscape mosaics.

Objectives

1. To promote the integration of biodiversity conservation into improved land use guidelines and management practices for managed natural forests and forest plantations in multifunctional landscapes.
2. To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of forest biological diversity through the collection and use of better information regarding biodiversity in landscape mosaics for problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision making.

The activities in this project contribute to CIFOR's goal through the capture and analysis of information on biodiversity in landscape mosaics for better problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision-making. The contribution of integrating biodiversity conservation leads to improved land use principles and management practices for managed natural forests and forest plantations. Capacity building is central to the project. It uses research activities to build capacity in several countries, particularly as the research involves young researchers from host countries.

Changes

There have been no significant changes in research direction for the project, although Output phrasing has been clarified.

Research approach to International Public Goods

The project seeks to develop and disseminate biodiversity assessment and monitoring techniques to provide information that help to conserve biodiversity in ways suited to meet the needs of poor rural families. CIFOR's previous work on biodiversity assessment, multidisciplinary landscape surveys and forest restoration make it well placed to work in this area.

The project will also develop pragmatic approaches to help managers plan and implement more 'biodiversity-friendly' land use guidelines and management activities. By developing and testing tools to produce and evaluate land use management options, the research will help select preferred scenarios and generate procedures that managers and other stakeholders can use under local conditions. In selected landscapes of South-East Asia, different parts of Africa and the Amazon region, research will bring detailed findings on the way to assess and promote biodiversity conservation in mosaic landscapes, i.e. to maintain the sustainable use of the biodiversity-rich patches.

Cross-site comparison of experiences and synthesis work on the tested tools will result in the provision of tools widely applicable to other land-use planning processes occurring in tropical areas where the combination of development and conservation objectives is a priority, such as frontier landscapes.

Thematically, the Biodiversity Platform (a joint effort between ICRAF and CIFOR) aims to collaboratively gather field experiences and deliver international public goods on the following research questions:

- What methods can be used to identify and assess biodiversity's contribution to livelihood

- security in multifunctional landscapes?
- What are recurrent patterns in the dynamics and spatial configurations of landscape mosaics? (toward a landscape typology).
- How can appropriate incentives be provided for more optimal biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing in landscape mosaics?
- How can efficient customary rules be better supported by statutory tenure and access regulations in relation to multifunctionality of landscape mosaics?

Description of impact pathways

As described above, the research will develop biodiversity assessment and monitoring techniques as well as socio-economic evaluation of land use scenarios in particular landscapes. The analysis of critical features such as access rights to land and resources will be included in the developed scenarios and some potential policy changes participatory developed.

Major direct beneficiaries and end users of the results and findings of this project are extension services, farmer groups, forest enterprises and NGOs working with farmers and communities. The project will collaborate with national and local governments, land use planners, industry, donors and NGO's in the development of appropriate policies, strategies and guidelines.

CIFOR's work on biodiversity can influence major governmental and non-governmental conservation and development agencies by providing useful recommendations on institutional mechanisms and tools for analysing, monitoring and evaluating biodiversity in rural land-use strategies. Through scientific publications and active input to key events such as CBD, COP and major congresses, the role of landscape patches and diverse mosaics for biodiversity conservation will be demonstrated to influence international environmental actors so that they will better invest and integrate protected areas as a part of their surrounding bio-cultural matrix (CBD, UICN, WWF, WCS, CI, etc.).

Furthermore, concepts of participatory negotiation mechanisms and examples of revised land use and land access models will be disseminated to development agencies and other key actors (UN agencies and processes, the World Bank, the regional development banks, the European Commission). The provided information will serve to demonstrate the necessary role of farmers for a biodiversity-friendly landscape management and provide elements to reward them by different channels (especially the State, the private sector and environmental NGOs in corridor areas). More effective biodiversity conservation will allow environmental services of importance to the poor to be sustained longer into the future. In addition, enhanced *in situ* conservation will avert potential losses of important future use values for biodiversity in activities that benefit the poor, such as medical research and crop genetic improvement.

CIFOR has strong, working partnerships with conservation and development actors as well as with the CBD secretariat, FAO, ICRAF, IUCN, ITTO, UNFF, WWF, WCS and CI on biodiversity issues. The project will work with these and other partners to illustrate biodiversity conservation options in fragmented landscapes and to develop and disseminate best land use principles and forest management practices for biodiversity conservation.

The project, in collaboration with partners such as regional networks (Partnership on Forest Landscape Restoration, International Model Forest Network) and other research agencies will contribute to policy change by demonstrating results at key network sites and sharing information with regional institutions and processes and in national meetings. The project also provides technical information and analytical support for regional initiatives such as in the Mekong, the Amazon and the Congo Basin.

Moreover, all CIFOR projects will coordinate their biodiversity research with ICRAF and jointly implement activities outlined in the workshop report of the CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 2, Output 1, Tools and strategies to integrate biodiversity conservation into improved management practices at the landscape level

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator / advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	25	10	10	5	20	10	10	10	Y	Y
ICRAF	10	10	10	20	20	10	10	10	Y	Y
CIRAD, France	0	10	10	10	10	20	20	20	Y	N
Tropenbos International, Netherlands/Vietnam	0	30	0	0	10	30	10	20	Y	N
Japan Center for Area Studies, Japan	20	30	10	0	10	0	30	0	Y	N
Forest Science Institute of Vietnam, Vietnam	10	10	10	20	20	10	10	10	N	N
The Nature Conservancy, Indonesia	25	20	0	0	5	10	20	20	y	n

Partners' roles in Project 2, Output 2, Support to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through the collection and use of better information and participatory tools regarding biodiversity in landscape mosaics for problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision making

Research partner name and country	Role (specify % of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter/tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	25	20	0	0	5	10	20	20	Y	Y
ICRAF	10	10	10	20	20	10	10	10	Y	Y
CIRAD/France	0	10	10	10	10	20	20	20	Y	N
Conservation International	25	20	0	0	5	10	20	20	Y	Y
Helvetas, Switzerland/Vietnam	0	10	0	0	20	50	10	10	N	N
Fundación Jose Manuel Pando, Bolivia	0	10	0	0	20	50	10	10	Y	N
Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Indonesia	10	20	0	50	5	5	5	5	Y	N
Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB), Indonesia	25	15	0	40	5	5	5	5	Y	N
Riau Andalan Pulp and Paper Company (RAPP), Indonesia	20	20	0	40	5	5	5	5	Y	N
WWF, Indonesia	30	30	0	10	5	10	10	5	Y	N

Biodiversity-related Cross Programmatic Linkages

Project 2 is implemented through integrated research initiatives that ‘cut across’ all three CIFOR programmes and therefore there are strong links between several component projects within CIFOR’s research portfolio.

The Environmental Services and Sustainable Use of Forests Program will generate outputs that focus on “biodiversity in fragmented landscapes” i.e. conservation of forest and trees biodiversity in rural landscape mosaics through the development of integrated approaches. It will also generate outputs that contribute to the sustainable management and conservation of biodiversity in managed forests.

Close linkages with Project 4 ‘Governance of multi-stakeholder forested landscapes’ will ensure that the use of ACM tools and multi-stakeholder processes consider the use and management of biodiversity occurring in productive landscapes. Land use planning situations in complex landscape mosaics frequently centre on competing demands for land. To capture biodiversity-related benefits we will build upon and expand CIFOR’s previous Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM) initiative. Approaches and tools developed and tested at the community level will be scaled up for application at higher levels of government and with key forestry planning, management and support institutions at national and regional levels. Research that identifies the conditions under which less powerful stakeholders can effectively be involved in decision-making and negotiation that identifies how conflict can be effectively managed will be a key focus. This has large strategic significance for the maintenance and effective sustainable use of biodiversity, since much of the world’s biodiversity resides outside of protected areas but within ‘managed’ landscapes which support the livelihood of the rural poor. Efforts that develop and strengthen the multi-stakeholder mechanisms are needed to capture potential benefits for communities through payments for environmental services, and to create the conditions for sustainable management across landscapes that will generate international public goods. For example, CIFOR’s study on international community forestry networks is being used to influence donor projects that support such networks and help make those projects more effective. The study’s results will also interest forest policy makers and resource managers and agencies working to link local community forestry to international and global forestry processes.

Illegal logging, law enforcement and conflict can have profound implications for the maintenance, management and protection of biodiversity. In this regard there are close connections between this project and the CIFOR Project entitled ‘Forest Finance, Trade, Corporate Accountability (Project 5). The focus in this component will examine the implications of governance failure, typically manifested by large-scale illegal logging, break down of law and order and violence, on forest biodiversity.

Livelihood-oriented aspects of this project are aimed at highlighting the importance of biodiversity for poverty reduction strategies (Project 6 – ‘Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods’ and project 7 – ‘Improving Human Well-being through Forests’). To this end, the review of Integrated Conservation and Development Plans (ICDPs) experiences and the Poverty and Environment Network (PEN) of 15-20 PhD students working in a range of locations is being established. Ways of enhancing the ‘safety-net’ functions of forest biodiversity, both through improved subsistence uses of forest products for nutritional, health and construction purposes, and through more rewarding trade in forest goods, by expanding the range of value-adding activities and improving access to markets, are being explored with communities throughout the

globe.

CIFOR scientists and international experts are also collaborating on the topic of Forests and Human Health, sharing their expertise to better understand the contributions of forests to public health; the impacts of land use, forest-cover change, and vector borne diseases; and the potential for integrating environmental and population-health efforts. This initiative brings together a multidisciplinary team of scientists from all three of CIFOR's programmes, together with collaborators from People and Plants International and the University of Hawaii's John A. Burns Medical School and Ethnobotany Department. The work builds on previous research on gender and multi-stakeholder processes initiated under CIFOR's Adaptive Collaborative Management research and focuses on the biodiversity impacts of women's participation and the incorporation of their knowledge in forest management decision-making in multi-stakeholder negotiating context. The group will synthesize what is known, identify information gaps and catalyse greater dialogue and cooperation between the public health and forestry sectors.

The 'sum of the parts' of this 'crosscutting' project will be a set of activities that support policy change at national and local levels, through demonstration of results at key sites, interactive research and 'best practice' workshops and partnership arrangements that work through national advisory groups that are influential in policy processes and at shaping management practices on the ground. Community exchanges and networking will be designed as an integral element of our biodiversity-oriented research, to foster sharing of experiences and lessons and to strengthen ties between grassroots groups and policy processes relevant to national, regional and global scales.

All of CIFOR's biodiversity-related research activities promote the sustainable use of forest genetic resources through processes and initiatives that go across national, regional and sometimes global scales. Although fully integrated into Project 2, for administrative reasons they are presented in the MTP under other projects.

CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity-Platform

The CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform for rural landscape mosaics is a promising step towards enhanced collaboration and synergy between CIFOR's three research Programmes and ICRAF. Landscape scale research will be coordinated across the forest – agriculture spectrum, focusing on the effects of managed forests, forest remnants, plantations and agroforests on biodiversity and livelihoods. As currently formulated, it presents opportunities for truly interdisciplinary collaboration, with a large number of local, regional and international partners and initiatives such as the Global Partnership for Forest Landscape Restoration. The CIFOR-ICRAF Biodiversity Platform will promote dialogue and networking to catalyse the development of new thinking, approaches, and practice of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in multifunctional landscapes, and will provide opportunities for: 1) lesson sharing, especially across disciplines, sites and scales; 2) synergies (e.g. of resources, skills, mandates), and 3) added value (e.g. through syntheses and generalization).

Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services

Background and rationale

To keep ecosystems resilient in the face of changing climate and social and economic pressures one must understand how ecological and social systems interact to generate particular land use patterns. Often there will be trade-offs between what is globally optimal and what is locally desirable. Therefore, the research under this project will consider different scales and address the links between them.

The project aims at contributing to the Millennium Development Goals on water and to adaptation to climate change. This will include research on conserving watershed functions in forested catchments, adaptation to and mitigation of climate change, and on finding how to produce forest goods without compromising ecosystem services.

The project will develop methods for integrated assessment of environmental goods and services in forested catchments. It will study the interactions between biophysical and socio-economic properties of catchments to better understand the cause-impact chains at patch and landscape scales and the ecological and socio-economic variables affecting land-use.

The project will develop methods, tools, and decision-support systems for climate change adaptation and mitigation. The focus is on developing best practices for promoting synergies between adaptation and mitigation measures and between different ecosystem services in landscapes. The outputs will provide guidance and methodologies for measuring and monitoring carbon in LULUCF CDM projects. In addition, the “CarboFor” web service aims at providing technical information and tools for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project developers.

On the adaptation side, activities are in line with latest discussions on adaptation to climate change currently being discussed under the UNFCCC, in particular, assessments of vulnerability and the mainstreaming of adaptation into development policies. The project focuses its implementation on development issues for which forests play a substantial role. The project will develop methodologies to assess vulnerability relating to these issues and apply them to elaborate vulnerability maps. Once vulnerability has been described and assessed, the project will engage in three regional policy dialogues to discuss the mainstreaming of adaptation into development policies.

System Priority alignment

Project 3 falls completely within the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III), and has required no changes due to System Priority Alignment. As the Project is mainly focusing on producing environmental services at landscape scale, it is primarily aligned with System Priority 4a – Integrated Land, Water and Forest Management at a Landscape Scale. As the project works on forest and water related issues, it is also aligned with the Priority 4c – Improving water productivity. In addition, because the project is concerned with pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, it is aligned with the Priority 3d – Sustainable Income Generation from Trees and Forests and with the Priority 5d – Improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability.

More specifically, Output 1, “Tools and best practices for balancing water use and carbon sequestration services from forests at the landscape level,” has a relatively high emphasis on Priority 4a. Thus, 52% of 2007 expenditures fall under this Priority. In addition, 22% of 2007 expenditures fall under the Priority 3d, and 18% under the Priority 4c. The remainder falls under

5d.

Output 2, “Identification of pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes involving forest ecosystems and articulation of the role of forest ecosystems in adaptation to climate change,” is mainly aligned with the Priority 4a. Thus, 59% of 2007 expenditures fall under this Priority. In addition, 33% of 2007-2009 expenditures fall under the Priority 5d. Small shares fall under 3d and 4c.

Output 3, “Guidelines and methods for rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes,” has a relatively high emphasis on Priority 4a. Thus, 54% of 2007 expenditures fall under this Priority. In addition, 30% of 2007 expenditures fall under the Priority 3d. Priority 5d receives 12% of expenditure, and 4c receives the remainder.

Goal

To increase resilience and reduce vulnerability by developing tools and best practices for integrated planning and management of forest ecosystem services that enhance synergies between forest ecosystem services.

Objectives

3. To promote synergies between environmental services and integrate the production of forest products and environmental services by developing methods, tools and best practices for planning and managing forest ecosystem services at the landscape level.
4. To promote pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes involving forest ecosystems and articulate the role of forest ecosystems in adaptation to climate change.
5. To promote the rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes and integrate rehabilitation into national and regional environmental conservation strategies by developing best practices and appropriate activities.

The project supports CIFOR’s mission and objectives through generating information that leads to a greater understanding of the biophysical environment and socio-economic factors of present and potential forest systems and forestry. The project examines their functional relationships, and creates potential for the sustained and improved productivity of forest systems for the benefit of people in developing countries. It provides analysis, information and advice to assist in making policy decisions about forests and land use, and it is aimed to increase capacity in target countries.

Changes

After 2007, it is planned to merge the Output 3 with the Output 1 of this project.

Research approach to International Public Goods

The project will develop methods for integrated assessment of environmental goods and services in forested catchments. It will study the interactions between biophysical and socio-economic properties of catchments to better understand the cause-impact chains at patch and landscape scales and the ecological and socio-economic variables affecting land-use.

The project will develop guidelines, tools and methodologies for facilitating the development carbon sequestration projects under the CDM mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol in many Latin American countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and

Uruguay). In addition, the “CarboFor” web service aims at providing technical information and tools for CDM project developers at a global level. The aim is to be able to produce guidelines, approaches and methods that can be generalized and applied into various project cases and situations.

Adaptation to climate change requires methods and best practices for measures to maintain ecosystem resilience and reduce their vulnerability. In climate change mitigation, cost-effective mechanisms are required for using forests to sequester carbon under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and other schemes in ways that are sustainable and improve the low-income peoples’ livelihoods. The focus is on developing best practices for promoting synergies between adaptation and mitigation measures and between different ecosystems services.

Studies on vulnerability and adaptation to climate change will be carried out in Indonesia, West Africa (Burkina Faso, Mali and Ghana) and Central America (Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica). Other studies are carried out in Indonesia, Vietnam and several countries in Latin America – both South and Central America. New activities are planned for Eastern and Southern Africa. These studies are using a common methodology for vulnerability assessment, which is applied in these cases studies. As a result of these studies, it is possible to develop and test general methods for vulnerability assessment that can be used in different ecological, social and policy environments.

Description of impact pathways

The main target groups are: local and national organizations involved in developing and implementing forest management guidelines, national governments, and international policy processes on forested watersheds and climate change adaptation and mitigation. Major direct beneficiaries and end users of the results and findings of this project are extension services, farmer groups, forest enterprises, and NGOs working with farmers and communities. The project will collaborate with national and local governments, industry, donors, and NGO’s in the development of appropriate policies, strategies, and guidelines.

It is expected that land use and forest planners involved with the analysis and research will have greater understanding of the cause-impact chains at landscape scales and the ecological and socio-economic variables affecting land-use. In climate change mitigation (carbon sequestration), the project will provide information tools and knowledge for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) project developers, National Focal Points of Climate Change and institutions and organizations in Latin America. It is expected that models and tools developed by the project will help carbon sequestration projects to minimize negative impacts on other natural resources needed by the poor, such as water.

The project will work with international organizations and processes, such as UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNFF, ITTO and FAO, international and local NGO’s and other partners to develop and disseminate best practices for integrated planning and management of forest ecosystem services. CIFOR also continues to support global, regional and national initiatives on climate change and forests including IPCC, ITTO, UNEP, and FAO.

The project contributes to activities of the Inter-Center Working Group on Climate Change (IWGCC). The project collaborates with ICRAF- South-east Asia on carbon sequestration in Indonesia.

On the adaptation to climate change, the project is directly tackling development issues linked to forest ecosystems. In all targeted countries, forests and the environment are directly linked to poverty as many people depend on their goods and services for survival. For example, forests

provide woodfuel and non-timber products that are vital for the livelihoods of local communities. A substantial amount of the activities will be devoted to understanding how climate change is likely to affect the provision of such goods and services and to further exacerbate poverty. Without adequate knowledge, effective planning for adaptation to climate change is very difficult. To support this, the project will develop, among others, methodologies to assess the vulnerability of specific resources (e.g. woodfuel), it will apply these methodologies to elaborate vulnerability maps, it will develop criteria and indicators for better managing threatened forests, and it will engage into the analysis of policies that can promote adaptation and help the poorest adapt to climate change. The project intends that national forestry ministries and development agencies will use information derived from the project to plan and prioritize mitigation interventions, so as to help avert potential losses of key forest-derived resources for the poor due to climate change.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 3, Output 1, Tools and best practices for integrating planning and management of forest ecosystem services

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	15	15	5	5	20	10	20	10	Y	Y
IPB/Indonesia	25	10	0	10	45	0	0	10	Y	N
Wetlands International/Indonesia	0	40	0	40	0	10	10	0	N	N
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences/Sweden	25	10	0	10	45	0	0	10	Y	Y
Charles Darwin University/Australia	15	10	15	10	30	10	0	10	Y	N
IMWI	30	30	0	30	0	0	0	10	N	Y
ICIMOD/Nepal	40	40	0	10	0	10	0	0	N	N
Institut de l'Environnement et de Recherches Agricoles /Burkina Faso	0	20	0	40	10	10	10	10	Y	N

Partners' roles in Project 3, Output 2, Identification of pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes involving forest ecosystems and articulation of the role of forest ecosystems in adaptation to climate change

	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
Research partner name and country	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	18	13	10	5	15	10	15	15	Y	Y
CATIE, Costa Rica	20	10	15	5	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
El Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA), Spain	15	15	5	5	20	10	20	10	Y	Y
El Colegio de la Frontera Sur (ECOSUR), Mexico	15	15	5	5	20	10	20	10	Y	Y
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca de Uruguay (MGAP), Uruguay	15	15	5	5	20	10	20	10	Y	Y

Partners' roles in Project 3, Output 3, Guidelines and methods for rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes

	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
Research partner name and country	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	20	10	15	5	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Forest Science Institute of Vietnam	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Tropenbos International - Vietnam	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
WWF - Indochina	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Embrapa Amazônia Oriental, Brazil	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia (IPAM), Brazil	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Museu Paraense Emilio Goeldi (MPEG), Brazil	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agraria (INIA), Peru	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N
ICRAF - Peru	15	10	15	10	10	10	10	20	Y	N

Forests and Governance

Project 4: Governance of multi-stakeholder forested landscapes

Background and rationale

The trend towards decentralization and adoption of national forest programmes in many countries has opened up increasing opportunities for stakeholders with diverse needs and interests to participate in forest-related policy and decision-making. These institutional innovations and multi-stakeholder processes, in theory, can facilitate conflict management and foster agreements and coordinated action through sharing of knowledge, experiences, lessons and good practices. However, in reality, such fora and processes are often limited in their ability to accommodate competing views and interests. Efforts to craft effective and equitable forest management decisions and implement actions are generally constrained by lack of relevant and readily accessible analytical information, practical tools and widely applicable approaches. Disparities in power, influence and capacities among stakeholders -- between stakeholders at different levels and among stakeholders at a given level, (e.g., local, sub-national and national)—and the inequities that generally result, are also a major constraint.

Despite the adoption of participatory multi-stakeholder mechanisms and attempts at decentralization, communities, forest users and important stakeholders, particularly those at the grassroots level, remain largely and systematically excluded. Typically, these marginalized stakeholders are neither positioned nor equipped to participate and represent their interests in these processes. As a result, decisions, policies and implementation procedures often do not adequately consider the implications for their livelihoods, security and general well-being. Lack of access to information and opportunities, insecure forest use and access rights, limited financial and technical capacity, physical and social isolation and remoteness from centres of power and loci of decision-making are common constraints to their effective participation and enjoyment of their fair share of benefits.

Policies and forest management decisions imposed on these marginalized forest users generally tend to prioritize timber over the diverse range of forest products and services to meet different needs of multiple stakeholders. They also tend to unfairly concentrate the flow of benefits to powerful, often more distant stakeholders, while local stakeholders bear a disproportionate share of the associated damage and costs. Conflicts in or about forests, particularly when these turn violent, can further exacerbate the insecurities and incapacities of these stakeholders and make their livelihoods even more vulnerable.

System Priority alignment

Project 4 aligns fully with the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III), particularly with Strategic Priorities 3 (Reducing rural poverty through agricultural diversification), 4 (Poverty alleviation and sustainable management of water, land and forest resources) and 5 (Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation).

The project will generate two main outputs. Output 1 will consist of “Analysis of decentralization policies and practices in selected countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America”. And Output 2 will consist of “Analyses, tools and recommendations for effective stakeholder

collaboration, forest-related conflict mitigation, and institution-building for collaborative forest management” Both outputs will make consistent contributions to the following System sub-priorities: 3d (Sustainable income generation from forests), 4a (Integrated land, water and forest management at landscape level); 4d (Sustainable agro-ecological intensification); 5a (Science and technology policies and institutions); 5c (Rural institutions and their governance); and 5d (Improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability), with emphasis on the last two sub-priorities.

More specifically, Output 1 aligns principally with System Priority 5d, as 43% of 2007 expenditures fall under this priority. Priority 5c follows, with 21% of expenditures, while 19% of the projected budget is within 5a. Priorities 5b, 4a and 3d also each have smaller shares.

Output 2 is also aligns principally with Priority 5d, as this category includes 47% of 2007 expenditures. Priority 5c follows with 19%, while 15% of the projected budget falls under 4a. Smaller expenditures fall under 5a, 5b, 3d and 4d.

Goal

The goal of this project is to strengthen multi-stakeholder processes, policy frameworks, institutions and capacities for equitable sharing of benefits, and sustainable management of forested landscapes.

Objectives

1. To develop approaches to multi-stakeholder governance of forested landscapes that accommodate different interests justly, promote sustainable forest use and enable forest dependent communities, especially women, ethnic minorities and other marginalized groups, to better influence, participate and equitably share in the benefits.
2. To analyze and share lessons from the experiences of collaborative management and forest-related grassroots social movements, how they have been influenced by external agencies and have in turn influenced broader external agendas, and how these have shaped their forests and landscapes
3. To provide analysis and technical support to multiple stakeholders on how to strengthen policies, multi-stakeholder processes and institutions to enable decentralization to be implemented in a manner that mitigates conflict, promotes sustainable forest use, secure livelihoods and effective representation of communities in agenda setting and decision-making.

Changes

During this plan period, the project will have a more explicit analytical focus on the implications of different decision-making processes and forest management approaches on well-being, especially of women and the forest-dependent poor. The project now adopts the definition of human well-being developed by the Millennium Ecosystems Assessment. Beyond livelihoods, human well-being encompasses security, health, good social relations and the ability to exercise freedoms and choices.

The project will pay particular attention to the relationship between forest and health, an

important dimension of human well-being. This issue is of special interest to women and poor communities in developing countries that rely mostly on medicinal forest products to treat their diseases and ailments. The project will complement the health-related work in CIFOR's other projects.

There will also be more explicit attention to women's perspectives, and gender related issues in the analysis of conditions necessary for effective collective action and adaptive forest management strategies. While dimensions of gender and health have been included in the project since inception, these will be made more explicit in line with the recommendation from CIFOR's recently concluded EPMR.

During the plan period, the project will also take a closer look at trends and patterns in collaborative forms of management across countries and regions, and examine opportunities and impediments to environmentally sustainable and economically viable community forestry operations. The project will analyze how forest tenure, access rights, and specific policies, such as decentralization, interact to create incentives and disincentives for effective collaborative management, and what these imply for the well-being of different forest users and stakeholders. The project will identify and assess options for tenure and policy reforms in key countries and provide strategic approaches and recommendations on how the forestry sector may contribute more effectively to the reducing poverty in forested areas and environmental sustainability in support of the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals.

Research approach to International Public Goods

This project analyzes processes of collaboration, conflict and learning among stakeholders as foundations for more inclusive and better informed forest-related policies, decisions and actions. The project is being implemented in Brazil, Bolivia, Cameroon, Central America, Democratic Republic of Congo, Indonesia, Liberia, Nepal, Philippines and Zimbabwe and explorations for expansion in other strategically important countries is underway.

The research examines under what conditions multi-stakeholder processes and institutional mechanisms promote collaboration, conflict mitigation and shared learning and innovation among diverse stakeholders, and how these promote or inhibit sustainable forest management, equitable benefit sharing and effective poverty alleviation. The working hypothesis is that inclusion of a wider range of stakeholders, including women and other marginalized groups, results in better representation of their needs and interests, leading to decisions, policies and practices that more effectively accommodate and address needs for poverty alleviation and well-being. The project examines how decentralization affects these dynamics, and analyzes the role of forest-related grassroots networks and social movements and their relations with external actors in shaping policy agendas. As part of this analysis, the project will examine the role and significance of communities, community enterprises and grassroots organizations, their links with external actors and how these influence the nature and effectiveness of their engagement with forest-related policies and processes, especially in the context of decentralization.

The project also examines the dynamics of collaboration and conflict among diverse stakeholders of transboundary forests and protected areas, under what conditions they occur, why and how collaboration can be promoted and conflict mitigated. The term transboundary is a scale-dependent concept, and depends on how the boundaries are defined. This may pertain to forests that span boundaries between countries, between regions or communities, between resource systems in a landscape, (e.g. between forests and agricultural fields), or between administrative divides, (e.g. contiguous forests on private and state owned lands, etc). In some locations (e.g.

Indonesia-Malaysian border; Cameroon-Nigerian border), the project analyzes legal and illegal forest products trade across boundaries and assesses the implications for livelihoods and prospects for sustainable forest management in these locations as well as more generally, under similar conditions elsewhere. The project will examine the feasibility of sustainable forest management in areas prone to violent conflict (Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nepal and Indonesia) and distil lessons and general recommendations for conflict mitigation, institution building and sustainable forest management.

Ultimately, the project intends to derive general principles for effective participatory management of collective natural resources through analysis of particular deliberative procedures. These general principles will be adapted to specific contexts through processes of reflexive learning among groups of stakeholders at different levels. Because the concepts, approaches and lessons can be adapted for different scales and levels as needed, these are expected to have both site- and country- specific as well as general applications. The outputs from this project will thus have relevance and applicability to countries and regions faced with similar issues and conditions of decentralization of collective resource management, as well as in other sectors outside of forestry.

Description of impact pathways

The project will identify, assess and synthesize approaches, principles and lessons for improved decentralization, enhanced collaboration, reduced conflict and over-all more effective multistakeholder governance of forested landscapes. The project will generate analytical information, tools and concepts that can be applied more broadly to catalyze creative approaches to multi-stakeholder decision-making and action, in ways that enhance the role of poor and marginalized forest stakeholders.

Outputs from the project are expected to serve as credible and readily accessible inputs for discussions and negotiations among stakeholders and to facilitate agreement and adoption of more appropriate and equitable options for forest use and management. This influence is likely to occur especially in study countries which have been and will continue to be strategically selected on the basis of the presence of significant forests and forest-dependent poor (eg Brazil, Indonesia, Cameroon and Democratic Republic of Congo) and/or opportunities for uptake and policy influence (Bolivia, Central America, Philippines, Nepal, and Liberia).

Outputs and substantive findings from the project are expected to be used by relevant national, sub- national and local government officials charged with forest-related decision-making authority, forestry bureaucracies, planning and development agencies. Forestry research and training institutes, academic institutions and international environmental and advocacy organizations, as well as community forest networks and federations and donor agencies are also expected to benefit from the outputs and findings from the project. A range of publications, training materials, tools and other products will be generated and packaged to reach key audiences and stakeholders. Strategically targeted dissemination channels will be employed to ensure that appropriately packaged information and recommendations reach intended audiences. This will be complemented by media and mass communication strategies to reach the general public.

It is expected that increased awareness of issues, policy constraints and options for improvement of decentralized management modalities would lead to the development of a constituency for

reform among key government and non-government actors and stakeholders who then promote and advocate for needed action. In the long term, it is intended that reformed policies and practices serve to remove constraints, provide incentives for more sustainable forest use, and generate increased benefits from forests, especially for the forest dependent poor. More specifically, it is intended that legislation and regulations governing decentralization will be improved by incorporation of CIFOR's insights, so as to result in more effective participatory institutional arrangements for collective resource management, while concession policies will be improved so as better balance access rights of different stakeholder groups. In turn, more effective representation of diverse local interests in forest management decisions is intended to lead to more equitable distribution of forest-derived benefits.

International donors and development agencies, conservation organizations, border security agencies, and international bodies such as the UN Forum on Forests are key audiences for products from the analysis of cross-country conflict and collaboration on transboundary forests and protected areas. Findings and outputs from this component of the project are expected to focus attention to conflict-prone forest areas, catalyze improvements in policy coordination in order to mitigate conflict and promote more secure, equitable and sustainable forest management and benefit sharing. Ultimately, these are expected to contribute to more sustainable forest use and to the improved livelihoods and well-being of poor communities and local stakeholders who depend on these forests to meet their diverse needs. The progress towards achieving the intended outcomes and impacts from this project, however, will be contingent to a significant extent on the political commitment of governments, international development agencies, donors and key stakeholders to follow through with coordinated policy implementation on the ground.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a "centre without walls" all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 4, Output 1, Analysis of decentralisation policies and practices in selected countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	15	20	25	10	25	5	0	0	Y	Y
University of Hasanuddin (South of Sulawesi) Indonesia	3	20	20	0	20	20	0	0	Y	N
Australian National University, Australia	2	15	15	20	15	25	0	0	Y	N
District Government of Kutai Barat in East Kalimantan, Indonesia	3	20	20	0	20	0	20	20	Y	N
District Government of Malinau in East Kalimantan, Indonesia	3	20	20	0	20	0	20	20	Y	N
Municipal government of Bolpebra in Pando, Bolivia	6	20	20	0	20	20	20	0	N	N
Municipal government of El Sena in Pando, Bolivia	10	20	15	0	20	15	20	10	Y	N
Freiburg University	2	15	15	20	15	25	0	0	Y	N
World Resources Institute, Washington DC	15	25	25	0	25	0	10	0	N	Y

Partners' roles in Project 4, Output 2 Analyses, tools and recommendations for effective stakeholder collaboration, forest-related conflict mitigation, and institution building for collaborative forest management

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	15	20	25	10	25	5	0	0	Y	Y
University of the Philippines Los Banos + DENR	20	15	20	20	15	0	0	10	Y	N
Forest Action + New Era in Nepal	10	10	20	10	15	15	10	10	Y	N
CIRAD, France	20	15	20	15	20	20	0	10	Y	Y
Forestry commission of Zimbabwe	15	15	20	20	15	15	0	0	Y	N
Gokwe north district council Zimbabwe	15	15	20	20	15	15	0	0	Y	N
Ministry of Forestry and wildlife, Cameroon	15	15	20	20	15	15	0	0	Y	N
FAO, Cameroon	15	15	15	15	15	15	0	10	Y	Y
Municipalities (10) in Cameroon	15	15	15	20	15	15	15	0	Y	N
WWF Cameroon	15	15	15	15	15	15	0	10	Y	Y
District Administrator Office in Gowke, Zimbabwe	15	15	15	15	15	15	10	0	Y	N
AREX Zimbabwe	15	15	20	20	15	15	0	0	Y	N
International Model Forests Network Secretariat	15	20	20	0	25	0	10	10	N	Y
Ministerial Commission of Central African Forests (COMIFAC)	40	40	0	0	0	0	20	0	N	N
Stichting Nederlandse Vrijwilligers, SNV, Cameroon	25	10	10	25	0	15	0	15	N	Y
Local communities in Simchembu village Zimbabwe	20	0	0	0	30	35	0	15	Y	N

Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability

Background and rationale

Institutional weaknesses in investment and trade policy and regulation are major factors underlying continued unsustainable forest exploitation in most tropical developing countries. Contradictory or unclear policies, ineffective or inconsistent law enforcement, corruption and overall weakness in the rule of law prevent countries and communities from realizing the potential socio-economic, developmental and environmental benefits from forests. The structure of rights, processes for policy decision-making and implementation and day-to-day practices of key institutions significantly and ultimately affect the way forests are used, and how their benefits are shared. The 'rules of the game', systems of incentives and disincentives and 'ways of doing business', i.e., the very essence of governance, need reforms to create conditions necessary for sustainable and equitable forest use, livelihood security and effective poverty alleviation.

Major reforms in policies and practices are needed in order to promote more effective public regulation and accountable forest-related business behaviour. Normative frameworks and mechanisms for overseeing forest finance and trade flows at the national and international levels need to be developed or strengthened. This requires better national and international policy coordination, concerted law enforcement, more effective risk assessment of forest-related investments, as well as improved information sharing, monitoring and joint action of key countries, agencies and actors.

This also requires strengthening the capacities of critical actors and stakeholders to participate in making and implementing forest-related decisions, and supporting the development of informed and equitable policies, inclusive practices and just and transparent institutions. And it requires credible analytical information and tools with which to identify and assess options and practical tools and approaches with which to take appropriate action.

System Priority alignment

Project 5 is in full alignment with the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III) especially Strategic Priorities 3 (Reducing rural poverty through agricultural diversification), 4 (Poverty alleviation and sustainable management of water, land and forest resources) and 5 (Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation).

The two main outputs of the project are: Output 1 (Analyses of legal timber verification methods, and policy relevant forest trade scenarios with assessment of implications for forest sustainability, economic development and human well-being, especially among the forest dependent poor); and Output 2 (Analysis, guidelines, strategies and approaches for improved regulations and business practices of corporate entities involved in forestry-related transactions and operations in tropical developing countries).

Output 1 will contribute most directly to sub-priority 5c (Rural institutions and their governance). In addition, it will contribute significantly to the following sub-priorities: 5b (Making

international and domestic markets work for the poor)3d (Sustainable income generation from forests); 4d (sustainable agro-ecological intensification); 5a (Science and technology policies and institutions); and 5d (Improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability).

More specifically, 5c receives 44% of 2007 Output 1 expenditures, while 5d follows with 20%. Smaller shares fall under 3d and 5a, as these receive 11% and 10%, respectively. Priorities 5b, 4a and 4d each receive small allocations.

Output 2 will also contribute directly to 3d (Sustainable income generation from forests) and 5b (Making international and domestic markets work for the poor) but will have a pronounced emphasis on 5c (Rural institutions and their governance). In addition, output 2 will contribute to the following sub-priorities: 4a (Integrated land, water and forest management at the landscape level); 4d (sustainable agro-ecological intensification); 5a (Science and technology policies and institutions) and 5d (Improving research and development options to reduce poverty and vulnerability).

More specifically, 30% of 2007 Output 2 funding falls under Priority 5c, while 5b follows with 29%. Priorities 3d and 5d each represent 12% of expenditures, while small shares fall under 5a, 4a, and 4d.

Goal

To assist governments, civil society organizations, and the private sector to develop and adopt economic, financial and governance policies and practices to encourage sustainable forest management and enhance social justice and livelihood security.

Objectives

1. To promote improved due diligence, risk assessment and monitoring tools and mechanisms for financial institutions, regulatory agencies and civil society organizations to better track and analyze performance and behaviour of key public and corporate entities operating in or impacting on the forest sector.
2. To increase understanding of the implications of finance and trade policies and practices for forests and forest-based livelihoods and develop recommendations for policy reforms aimed at enhancing social justice, securing livelihoods and promoting sustainable forest management.
3. To generate analytical information on illegal forest activities, their modes of finance and impacts on forests, livelihoods and power relations among stakeholders, and to develop policy options and practical approaches to address the problem.

Changes

During this plan period, the project will extend the analysis of macro level scenarios and trends in forest trade and investment, which has so far focused on the Asia Pacific region, where China's growing demand for wood products is a major driving force. This work will be extended in two

directions. Firstly, within Asia Pacific, the project will undertake more detailed analysis of the implications of major trends in forest products demand, investment and employment for countries, regions within these countries and forests and forest dependent communities that are most likely to be affected. The project will analyze the implications of identified major trends for local livelihoods, development options, forest rights and access and prospects for sustainable forest management. Indonesia, as the biggest supplier of tropical wood to China and the rest of the world, will continue to receive significant attention. However, the project will broaden the analysis beyond Indonesia. Thus, secondly, the project will be extended to include select countries in Central/ West Africa and Latin America, particularly those with strong market and strategic links to the Asia Pacific region. Findings from on-going analysis will serve as a basis for final selection of countries to be included. Cameroon and Democratic Republic of Congo, Brazil and Bolivia are likely to be included in this expanded analysis.

The project will also employ a broader range of research methods and analytical techniques, particularly in the work related to corporate social responsibility. Adapting some of the participatory research methods used in Project 4, the project will experiment with the use of social learning networks and multi-stakeholder forums to understand forest-related corporate practices and develop tools and general approaches to encourage socially and environmentally responsible corporate behaviour. The project will also explore the possible role of communities in promoting more accountable public and corporate behaviour and in reducing illegal logging and forest crime.

Research approach to International Public Goods

This project will illustrate that rapid tropical deforestation is not only driven by land opportunity values and consumer demand for forest products, but that substantial deforestation results from market failure attributable to institutional inefficiency. The research builds on the new institutional economics literature through applied analysis of information asymmetries for wood product markets in developing countries and the consequences of these asymmetries for the poor and the environment. Broadly applicable recommendations will be derived for reducing the social costs of this cause of market failure in the forestry sectors of many areas of the globe.

More specifically, this project examines legal, regulatory framework, guidelines and standards that together make up the context and system of incentives and sanctions for public and corporate conduct, and their ultimate impacts on forests and forest dependent communities. This project analyzes dominant trends and driving forces in forest-related finance, trade and investments and their likely effects on forest sustainability, livelihoods and equity. Research focuses on the political-economic and regulatory levers, mechanisms and instruments necessary for responsible and accountable public and corporate behaviour in the forestry sector. The research also explores the possible role of communities and community forestry in promoting more accountable public and corporate behaviour and in mitigating illegal forest activities.

In particular, the project examines the changes required in financial sector legislation and investment policies, financial due diligence and risk analysis practices, trade policies, corporate and government transparency and accountability standards and industrial development strategies to support sustainable forest management and reduce forest crimes, including illegal logging. The research has a pronounced focus on market mediated opportunities and tools to encourage improved policies and governance practices of key state and corporate entities and their influence on livelihoods, forests and the way their benefits are shared.

Outputs from this project will contribute to sustainable forest use, poverty alleviation and improved well-being through grounded analysis of issues, practical approaches and recommendations for reforms and behavioral change, particularly of influential actors whose decisions leave significant imprints on forests and forest dependent communities both far and near.

Beyond the research findings and products for use in specific countries included in this project, the outputs will be broadly applicable to countries faced with poor institutional performance in the forestry sector. The methods for scenarios development, risk assessment tools, guidelines, strategic approaches to bilateral and international cooperation and corporate behavioral change will also have wider application outside of forestry. More generally, the research should help to advance understanding of how institutional inefficiencies can be remediated, and insights derived thereof should be applicable in many governance contexts beyond the forestry sector.

Generally, there has been little previous analysis of institutional determinants of deforestation outcomes, so this research attempts to begin to fill a substantial void in current understanding. More specifically, there are no groups doing research independently from CIFOR on how regulation of investment in the forestry sector can reduce poverty and improve environmental sustainability or how to reform forest law enforcement to reduce rural poverty. CIFOR has comparative advantage to pioneer such research due to its strong social science capacity, as well as the credibility, neutrality and the strategic vantage point that the Center brings to these issues.

Description of impact pathways

By working at the international, national and local levels, research under this project is designed to reach and influence a broad spectrum of important actors and to have significant impacts. Products and outputs from this project will be targeted to the following key actors and decision-makers: government policymakers and planners especially in consumer and investor countries such as China, Europe and North America, and in select forest product supplier countries, especially in Asia-Pacific; private and state-owned forest and wood processing companies; forest trade federations, trade analysts; banking and investment institutions; civil society organizations; international environmental organizations, donor agencies, and multilateral initiatives such as Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) and the Asia Forest Partnership.

CIFOR is well placed to deliver expected outcomes and impacts from this research because of: a) its previous and ongoing work on forest finance and corporate social responsibility, trade and industrial forestry policies, and illegal logging; b) its relations and on-going collaboration with the target actors including The World Bank, WWF, IUCN, TNC, AFP and FLEG initiatives; and c) the project's broad analytical lens which includes analysis of the relationships between forest, banking and financial sector policies, law enforcement and rural development, rather than focusing on the forestry sector alone.

A range of publications, training materials, tools and other products will be generated and strategically targeted dissemination channels will be employed to ensure that appropriately packaged information and recommendations reach intended audiences. Mass media and

communication strategies will also be employed to ensure that research results and key messages reach the general public.

Products and outputs from this project are expected to increase awareness and strengthen the capacity of policy makers and key actors in leading forest product consumer and supplier countries to anticipate likely scenarios and take action to avoid negative implications through appropriate investment and regulation. This is expected to translate into improved risk assessment and due diligence in forest-related investments and reduced financial flows to illegal activities and forest-related crimes. Key actors and agencies are also expected to take appropriate action to increase transparency, accountability and social responsibility of corporate entities involved in forest-related transactions. As a result of improved institutional performance, there should be fewer inefficient investments that harm the poor by displacing forest-dependant populations and eliminating critical environmental services.

Ultimately, these outcomes are expected to result in the transformation of forest trade in ways that promote more sustainable forest use and management and provide more secure access and equitable distribution of forest benefits. The following impacts are expected in a wide array of countries, provided the necessary actions are taken: significant reduction in forest-related crimes and corruption, increased socially responsible investments leading to reduced forest loss, increased state revenues for poverty alleviation and more secure livelihoods for forest dependent people.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 5, Output 1, Analyses of legal timber verification methods, and policy-relevant forest trade scenarios with assessment of implications for forest sustainability, economic development and human well-being, especially among the forest dependent poor

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	30	20	10	20	10	0	0	y	y
Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA) Indonesia	10	15	15	15	15	10	10	10	Y	N
Centre for Chinese Agricultural Policy	15	15	20	15	15	0	10	10	Y	N
University of Papua New Guinea	15	20	15	15	15	0	10	10	Y	N
Institute of Geography, Vladivostok	20	15	15	15	15	0	10	10	Y	N
Economic Research Institute, Khabarovsk	20	15	15	15	20	0	15	0	Y	N
China National Forest Economic Development and Research Centre, China	15	20	15	20	15	0	15	0	Y	N
Chinese Academy of Forestry	15	20	15	20	15	0	15	0	Y	N
European Forest Institute, Finland	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	Y	Y
CIRAD-Foret, France	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	Y	Y
Forest Trends	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	Y	N
University of British Columbia	15	15	15	15	20	0	10	10	Y	N
Centre for Chinese Agricultural Policy	20	15	20	15	20	0	10	0	Y	N
Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia	20	15	15	15	20	0	0	15	Y	N
Overseas Development Institute	15	15	25	15	25	0	5	0	N	Y
Regional Community Forestry Training Center, Thailand	10	15	15	15	25	0	20	0	Y	N
CATIE Turrialba, Costa Rica	15	10	25	15	25	0	10	0	Y	N

Partners' roles in Project 5, Output 2, Analysis, guidelines, strategies and approaches for improved regulations and business practices of corporate entities involved in forestry-related transactions and operations in tropical developing countries.

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	30	20	10	20	10	0	0	Y	Y
PPATK (Indonesian Financial Intelligence Unit)	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	Y	N
Multistakeholders of Forestry Program DFID, UK	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	N	Y
Indonesian Working Group on Forest Finance	15	15	15	15	15	0	10	15	Y	N
Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (PGRi) and Telapak	15	15	15	15	15	0	15	10	Y	N
Forest Watch, Indonesia	15	15	15	20	20	0	0	15	Y	N
WWF Merauke	15	15	15	15	15	0	10	15	Y	Y
TNC Indonesia	15	15	15	15	20	0	10	10	Y	Y
WWF Indonesia	15	15	15	15	15	0	10	15	Y	Y
Tropenbos, Indonesia	15	15	0	15	15	0	15	15	Y	N
University of Papua	10	15	10	15	15	15	10	10	Y	N
Yalhimo (NGO) Papua	15	20	0	15	20	0	15	15	Y	N
World Agro Forestry Centre Indonesia	20	20	20	0	20	0	20	0	Y	Y
Global Forest Watch	25	20	25	0	20	0	20	0	N	Y
Cameroon Environmental Watch	20	15	25	0	15	0	20	5	N	Y
Overseas Development Institute, UK	30	30	40	0	0	0	0	0	N	Y

Forests and Livelihoods

Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods

Background and rationale

Natural forests are under severe threat in many developing countries. The poor stand to suffer in some cases, but to gain in other contexts from rapid exploitation of forest resources. This poses difficult issues about how to reconcile poverty alleviation and conservation. A key problem for research is how to balance these goals, as initial optimism about Integrated Conservation and Development Programmes (ICDPs) to achieve both objectives has given way to growing recognition of tradeoffs between the two. In addition, there are numerous drivers of landscape change, many of which can derail landscape-level development initiatives. There is now a growing consensus about the need for new conservation approaches and new ways of tackling problems at the landscape level, as reflected in recent statements by the World Bank, the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). One way to achieve both objectives within a landscape might be to find a mix of land uses that satisfies livelihood and development needs while maintaining forest cover in certain areas. Research is needed to identify such mixes and approaches that can be used to achieve such optimised land use allocation. Another way to achieve both objectives would be to make payments for environmental services (PES) to the individuals or communities providing those services, which would provide income, while inducing people to forego destructive land-use practices. However, analysis is needed to identify under what conditions PES would work and whether the poor would really be beneficiaries.

System Priority alignment

This Project aligns fully with the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III). Achievement of this project goal contributes to the CGIAR system priority area 4, especially 4(a) – output 1 and 2 of this project are centrally concerned with management of land and forests at the landscape level. Output 1 concerns “Analyses and case studies of conservation-development initiatives [including payment for environmental services schemes] that result in methods, options and strategies for improving pro-poor outcomes,” while Output 2 focuses on “Concepts, methods, and analysis, at the landscape scale, of the socio-economic and physical determinants of the role and potential of forests in livelihoods and livelihoods improvement.” Both contribute to priority area 1(b) in that research results will lead to conservation of forest species, many of which are underutilized and have the potential to benefit the income of the poor. Both outputs also contribute to impact within priority area 5(c) as governance and institutional issues are key to combating conservation-development tradeoffs and improving landscape management. Both also fall under 5b, as the research is intended to make payment for environmental services work for the poor. As the research is within the forestry section, both fall under priority 3d, as well.

More specifically, Output 1 falls principally under 5c, 4a and 5b, under which 26%, 23%, and 21% of 2007 expenditures are categorised, respectively. This is followed by 1b with 15% and 3d with 14%.

Output 2 falls principally under Priorities 5c, 5b, 4a and 3d, which receive 27%, 23%, 20% and

20% of the 2007 Output budget respectively. Approximately 11% falls under 1b.

Goal

To improve governmental and non-governmental conservation and development policies and projects by helping policy makers and project managers understand how their actions affect livelihoods and land use and how to take advantage of synergies between livelihoods and conservation and reduce trade-offs.

Objectives

1. To help agencies design and implement better landscape-level conservation and development projects by learning from the successes and failures of past initiatives and understanding the trade-offs and synergies between livelihoods and conservation.
2. To assist development agencies and national governments to design and implement more effective projects by taking into account economic, demographic, technological and social changes, forest policies, land-use dynamics and livelihoods.

Changes

The two outputs reported for 2006-2008 have been retained for 2007-2009 but with wording changes to ensure greater differentiation, as per the suggestion of the EPMR that called for this differentiation. Wording change was also directed at more clearly describing the insights and information intended to comprise each Output.

Research approach to International Public Goods

This project is concerned with how policies and practices related to the management and use of forested landscapes affect poor forest-dependent people. The project focuses particularly on ways to enhance the livelihoods of the rural poor, many of whom live on forest land or who depend on forest products for their living, while retaining the biodiversity and processes of these forest ecosystems, thereby sustaining the basis of those livelihoods and enhancing environmental services. The project thus pays attention to the links between livelihoods and sustainability, in coordination with Project 2 Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes and Project 3 Forest Ecosystem Services. Research under this project helps those involved in conservation and development initiatives learn from past experiences. It focuses on tools to analyze and reconcile landscape-level land use changes and their impact on livelihoods, and it explores when it is appropriate to use payments to poor producers for environmental services that they provide. Some key research questions being asked include: (i) What are the success factors to achieving win-win outcomes for livelihoods and forest landscape sustainability? (ii) Under what circumstances will payments for environmental services make a difference to poverty alleviation and landscape environmental management? (iii) At the landscape level, what are the socio-economic and physical determinants of the role and potential of forests in livelihoods and livelihoods improvement? Through this research we will identify policies, processes and tools that constrain and promote conservation and landscape management for enhanced poverty alleviation. For specific tools used in conservation and development and in landscape management we will review and assess what has been used and will undertake action research using modified approaches.

Case studies and 'learning landscapes' have been initiated in several countries. The geographic focus for this project includes Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Guinea, Indonesia, India, Lao, Madagascar, South Africa and

Vietnam. The 'learning landscapes' concept follows the principles of the Rainforest Challenge, a joint initiative of WWF, IUCN, ICRAF-ASB and CIFOR. These are landscapes involving conservation and development partners who are implementing conservation-development initiatives.

Through common approaches and research questions across sites in many countries generalisable principles will be derived about how socially optimal management of forest landscapes can be effectively fostered. These insights will be applicable in a plethora of management contexts across the globe, both within the realm of forest conservation and in other contexts for collective resource management. .

CIFOR is well placed to work on this project due to its previous studies on the causes of deforestation, links between poverty and the environment, integrated natural resource management (INRM) and adaptive collaborative management (ACM). It also has substantial experience working with other agencies at a landscape scale.

Description of impact pathways

This research will yield information and understanding on policy and institutional constraints to conservation-development and landscape management initiatives in both the dry and wet tropics. It will yield approaches and tools that can be used to achieve better outcomes for the environment and people at the landscape level. The research aims to have government and non-government agencies better informed about the potential for and constraints on achieving the twin goals of forest conservation and sustainable development, and the trade-offs that are frequently needed to achieve a large measure of both.

The key users of the outputs from this project are national government agencies, NGOs and community-based organisations involved in planning and implementing conservation and development projects. Other key target groups include those organisations and individuals who seek to provide or purchase environmental services and policy makers and those that shape the decisions of policy makers (e.g. advocacy groups for people and/or forests). Other researchers are also key users, as they will embed findings in recommendations for specific contexts.

Much of the work being undertaken or planned within this project involves action research, with the target users being integral to the process. By engaging major international conservation and development agencies that work in hundreds of sites over millions of hectares globally, the likelihood of research results being widely applied is high. This action research provides an immediate and direct primary impact pathway, more so because the research includes reflecting on and learning from the successes and failures of previous joint conservation and development initiatives. Another impact primary pathway entails assisting those parties engaged in negotiating payments for environmental services (PES), in particular local communities who seek to supply or guarantee the provision of such services. These initiatives will be supplemented by the more conventional means of distributing information for the purpose of achieving wider impact: scientific papers and books; presentations at high-level meetings; involvement, where appropriate, in relevant policy processes, supported by the targeted distribution of policy and information briefs; and through popular articles.

The planned outcomes for this project are better policies and practices adopted by conservation and development agencies, including new approaches to payments for environmental services and more focused and strategic policy- and project-level interventions for forest-based poverty

alleviation in forested landscapes.

Through uptake by major international conservation and development agencies, and by policy makers, the research is expected to significantly improve benefits from conservation-development initiatives that deal with poverty alleviation and landscape management (water, land, forest resources, including biodiversity) by improving the consideration of tradeoffs between multiple objectives. The research is also expected to improve development outcomes for forest dependent people and reduced forest loss through better-targeted and more appropriate interventions.

Higher-level constraints on achieving impacts include policy impediments, lack of political will to devise and implement new policies, lack of interest by conservation agencies in taking a pro-poor approach and limited capacity to change approaches and tools. In that the policy issues will be part of the research, and capacity building will be tackled through action research and specific capacity building initiatives so that some of these constraints will be alleviated.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 6, Output 1, Analyses and case studies of conservation-development initiatives (including payment for environmental services (PES) schemes) that result in methods, options and strategies for improving pro-poor outcomes.

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	15	15	20	25	5	5	5	Y	Y
Cambodia- World Wide Fund for Nature	5	5	0	20	15	30	15	10	Y	N
Cameroon: WWF-Central Africa.	10	0	0	15	30	25	10	10	Y	Y
Conservation International	20	5	10	10	15	15	15	10	Y	N
Colombia: Fundación Ecovera	5	5	10	50	10	5	10	5	Y	N
Ecuador: EcoCiencia	5	10	10	45	10	5	10	5	Y	N
Ethiopia: Wondo Genet College of Forestry	10	10	15	25	10	5	10	15	Y	N
Europe: Institute of Development Studies (IUED);	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Guinea: Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF)	20	20	0	5	5	20	20	10	N	N
ICRAF (Mali)	15	15	15		15	15	10	15	Y	Y
Indonesia: Center for Social Forestry, University of Mulawarman, Samarinda	5	5	5	5	10	10	10	50	Y	Y
Indonesia: District Governments and Forestry Departments of Malinau and West Kutai, East Kalimantan	10	10	10	10	20	10	10	20	Y	Y
Indonesia: Forest Research and Development Agency (FORDA)	20	20	5	5	5	5	10	30	Y	Y
Indonesia: Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI)	10	20	20	10	10	10	10	10	Y	Y

Indonesia: Ministry of Forestry, and its Center for Forestry Education and Training (CFET)	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
Indonesia: WWF-Indonesia	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	20	Y	Y
International Model Forest Network	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
South Africa: University of Port Elizabeth	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Sweden: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Europe: Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (EPFZ)	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Venezuela: CIDIAT, ULA Mérida	5	10	10	60	10	5	0	0	Y	N
Vietnam: World Wide Fund for Nature	10	5	10	25	10	5	10	15	Y	N
Brazil: Embapa	20	10	10	10	10	30	5	5	Y	Y
Bolivia: Fundación Natura	10	15	5	15	10	15	15	15	Y	N
Australia: Charles Darwin University	30	30	10	5	5	5	10	5	Y	Y

Partners' roles in Project 6, Output 2, Concepts, methods, and analysis of the socio-economic and physical determinants of the role and potential of forests in livelihoods and livelihoods improvement at a landscape scale

Forests in rivenwoods and rivenwoods improvement at a landscape scale										
Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Research process						Dissemination			
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	15	15	20	25	5	5	5	Y	Y
Bolivia: Fundación Natura	10	15	5	15	10	15	15	15	Y	N
Kenya: ICRAF	5	10	15	30	35	0	0	5	Y	Y
France: IRD	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Switzerland: IUCN	10	25	20	10	15	5	10	5	Y	Y
Zambia: Department of Biological Sciences, University of Zambia;	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	N	N
India Forest Service	10	10	20	15	20	0	5	20	Y	Y
Italy: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, together with Country portfolio managers and project personnel)	10	10	10	0	20	20	25	5	Y	Y
Nepal: Leasehold Forestry and Livestock Program, Department of Forests, Nepal	15	20	5	5	10	20	25	0	Y	N
India:North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas (NERCRMP), Meghalaya, India	10	20	5	10	10	20	20	5	Y	N
India: North Eastern Hill University, Meghalaya, India	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
Nepal: Forest Action	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
Nepal: Local Initiative for Biodiversity,Research and Development	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
Australia: Charles Darwin University	30	30	10	5	5	5	10	5	Y	Y

Project 7: Improving Human Well being through Forests

Background and rationale

More than 240 million people live in forested regions. Many are poor and depend on forests for income. Forest-based activities in developing countries provide an equivalent of 17 million full-time jobs in the formal sector and another 30 million in the informal sector, as well as 13-35% of all rural non-farm employment. Developing countries produce \$30-40 billion worth of timber and processed wood products each year, though only a small portion of this currently benefits poor households. About two billion people depend primarily on fuelwood, charcoal and other biomass fuels for their energy. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that two billion people rely on traditional medicines for their health, most of which come from forests. Hunting and fishing provide over 20% of household protein requirements in 62 developing countries, and much of this takes place in forests. The rapid growth of domestic markets for forest products has created opportunities for low-income households. These include markets for fuelwood and charcoal, poles, low-grade construction timber, low-cost furniture, medicinal plants and other non-timber forest products. In countries where companies find it difficult to find large areas for pulp wood plantations, small farmers may become suppliers of pulpwood.

Global attention is focused on poverty as articulated in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Even conservation agencies are bringing poverty into their work. Forests are often places with great poverty, but they also represent an important resource which could help people escape poverty. If the MDGs are to be achieved, Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSPs) and similar policies will need to include forested regions and forest-based activities. That, in turn, will require targeted research on the current and potential contribution of forests to alleviating poverty.

System priority alignment

This Project aligns fully with the CGIAR System Priorities (described in Appendix III). Two Outputs fall under this project. Output 1 concerns “Analysis of the conditions and factors that facilitate successful small enterprise development and secure safety nets from forest biodiversity,” while Output 2 includes “Guidelines, strategies and policy recommendations to improve involvement of poor people in timber and natural product industries.” Output 1 and output 2 of this project will contribute through creating wealth among the rural poor through better use of trees and forests (i.e. Priority 3d). Output 1 also contributes to priority area 1b in that the work focuses on forest biodiversity and its sustainable use and conservation. Outputs 1 and 2 work with forest enterprises and forest industry – thus these outputs also contribute to system priority 5b – making markets work for the poor. A major focus of output 3 of this project is on policies that influence forest-based poverty alleviation, so the work will contribute to priority area 5c on governance and institutions. As analysis will often be integrated across sectors and scales, much also falls under Priority 4a.

More specifically, 2007 expenditures for Output1 align fairly equally with Priorities 4a, 3d, 5b, and 5c, under which fall 23%, 22%, 21% and 20% of the budget, respectively. Priority 1b follows with 13%.

Output 2’s 2007 expenditures fall principally under Priorities 5b and 5c, which receive 29% and 27%, respectively. Priorities 3d, 4a and 1b follow with 21%, 14% and 9% respectively.

Goal

To improve human well-being through enhancing local forest-based practices, promote small-holder involvement in industrial forestry and increase the forestry content of poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes.

Objectives

1. To provide community based organizations, educational and extension authorities, health providers, private companies, traders and local NGOs with market, technical and management information needed to improve the practices of rural people, so that enterprise development opportunities can be utilised..
2. To identify strategies and practices for improving the involvement of poor smallholders and communities in the timber and natural product industries.
3. To ensure that poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes take into account forests and forestry in a way that promotes rural livelihoods.

Changes

The outputs remain essentially the same from the 2006-2008 to 2007-2009 MTPs. However the wording was changed to more clearly describe the insights and information intended to comprise each Output.

Research approach to International Public Goods

Research under this project will enhance local practices by making management, market and technical information on how rural people can benefit more from forest biodiversity available to service providers and others. It will also work with forest industries to improve their partnerships with smallholders and local producers and traders. Successful involvement of smallholders and communities in forest industries depends on suitable corporate strategies, appropriate institutional and legal frameworks and supportive national policies. Research under this project will focus on identifying best practices in this regard, in particular the conditions under which pro-poor outcomes emerge. The project's activities also aim to get poverty alleviation strategies, programmes and policies to take into account forests and forestry in a way that promotes rural livelihoods. The role of forest products in helping people meet subsistence and safety-net needs has been documented but rarely well quantified. Much more work is needed to move from generalities about forests being important to having the data required to get forest-related issues incorporated into mainstream poverty reduction strategies and policies. Research under this theme will generate some of that data. The project is establishing a PhD network through which the students will undertake detailed, comparative, household economic analyses. Some key research questions being asked include: (i) What are the conditions and factors that facilitate successful small enterprise development and secure safety nets from forest biodiversity? (ii) How can poor people be better involved in timber and natural product industries? and (iii) What are the key ways in which forests can contribute to poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes? The research will explore what types of households benefit from forests and how the benefits can be increased, especially for the poorest of the poor and marginalised groups such as women, indigenous groups and those affected by HIV/AIDS. It will examine what poor people need to do in order to get better deals from forest-based enterprises, and how community-company partnerships could be structured to achieve better outcomes for both parties.

Detailed case studies are being conducted in a number of target countries: Brazil, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Lao, Mali, Nepal, South Africa, Tanzania, Vietnam and Zambia. Through cross-country comparative analysis the results and lessons are generalisable, and provide information on the forest-poverty nexus that can be widely applied in other humid forest and dry forest sites. This information will be easily accessible to those within the project countries and beyond via a variety of information products.

CIFOR is well placed to work on this project since it builds on previous research on forest product use and marketing and the relations between forests and poverty. CIFOR is widely recognised as an authority in this arena.

Description of impact pathways

This research will yield information on policies that can secure safety nets, enhance enterprise development, improve smallholder engagement in large forest industry and, more generally, ensure that forest-based activities contribute more to poverty alleviation, both in the humid and dry tropics. This project will also yield market, technical and management information needed to improve the practices of rural people in relation to forest products and forest enterprises.

The target groups for this research are primarily the forest-dependent people themselves, community-based organisations, NGOs, local and central government authorities – particularly forestry departments and health-care providers – and private sector companies with the potential to help the poor while pursuing their own interests.

Since much of the work involves action research, in which these target groups are centrally involved, the research process itself provides one impact pathway, with the target groups being encouraged to apply the lessons learned to other situations. In addition, CIFOR will use the more conventional conduits for information – scientific papers, books, reports, brochures and policy and information briefs – to disseminate its knowledge and understanding more widely. Particular attention will be paid to the production and use of training manuals and other educational material. Lessons learnt about local practices in the use of biodiversity, and the opportunities these provide for sustainable management, for example through the certification of small-scale producers, will be made available to donors, international NGOs and global conventions for possible inclusion in international and regional agreements. CIFOR will also press those involved in drafting and implementing poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs) in selected countries, as well as with larger-scale development initiatives such as the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), to take greater account of the potential of forest-related developments to alleviate poverty and, for some, to provide pathways to a more prosperous and secure future. Environmental NGOs who are seeking to integrate concerns about poverty into their work have welcomed CIFOR's efforts and multilateral agencies have called on CIFOR to contribute to their policies and dialogues. Given the importance that development and conservation agencies attach to pro-poor approaches, well-targeted research on this topic with clear products for specific users should have major impact.

The planned research outcome is that users of the research implement policies, practices and programs that more effectively favour the interests of the forest-dependent rural poor. For example, it is planned that forestry and natural product companies will adopt strategies leading to improved engagement with poor people, while smallholders will adopt practices leading to the development of viable farm forestry and/or viable harvesting and management of natural products. Another outcome planned is the adoption of new ideas, approaches and policies that

take into account the role of forests in poverty alleviation, resulting in important poverty mitigation roles being recognized and protected (or compensated) and natural-resource-based poverty reduction opportunities realized.

Given the research focus and the various impact pathways, we believe the impact of the research will be: enhanced livelihoods of the forest-dependent poor, through improved local practices; more secure safety nets; improved natural product markets; better engagement with forestry and natural product companies; and better policies and programs that are founded on sound knowledge of the role of forests in meeting basic needs, providing emergency or stop-gap income, and in some cases, lifting people out of poverty. The ultimate goal of this project is to reduce poverty and improve the well-being of forest-dependent people in line with the MDGs.

Some constraints on achieving impact include lack of corporate responsibility in the private sector, difficulty and complexity of alleviating poverty given its multi-faceted nature and short-term urgent needs of poor people, which may make sustainable utilisation impossible. By working with the private companies and local people we will seek to identify win-win situations for both. The project includes a component where, arguably, the best data global data set on poverty and natural resources will be collected, so we will be in a good position to analyse the complexity of poverty and propose ways forward.

Partnerships

As CIFOR is a 'centre without walls' all research is conducted through an extensive array of partnerships. Due to the number of partners, it is not possible to effectively convey the contribution of each to specific Outputs of the Project in a narrative format of only a few pages. Thus, a tabular approach follows to concisely outline the specific contributions of each research partner to each Output of this project.

Partners' roles in Project 7, Output 1, Analysis of the conditions and factors that facilitate successful small enterprise development and secure safety nets from forest biodiversity.

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Dissemin ator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	15	15	20	25	5	5	5	Y	Y
Australia: Charles Darwin University (CDU)	30	30	10	5	5	5	10	5	Y	Y
Brazil: Instituto de Florestas Tropicais (IFT)	5	0	5		0	30	0	60	Y	Y
Brazil: Instituto de Homen e Meio Ambiente (IMAZON)	10	30	10	20	15	0	15	0	Y	Y
Brazil: Instituto Internacional de Educação Brasileiro (IIEB)	0	10	10		20	10	10	40	Y	Y
Brazil: National Agricultural Research Center (EMBRAPA).	0	50		0	0	0	40	10	Y	Y
Burkina Faso: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique (CNRST);	20	20	10	10	0	10	10	20	Y	N
Cameroon: Association pour le Développement des Initiatives pour l'Environnement (ADIE)	10	10	15	10	5	20	10	20	Y	Y
Cameroon: Association pour le Développement Intégral des Exploitants Agricoles du Centre (ADEAC)	10	10	15	10	5	20	10	20	Y	Y
Cameroon: Concertation des Associations Paysannes pour le Développement Rural de la Mvila (CAPDR)	5	5	15	10	5	20	10	30	Y	Y
Cameroon: Institut de Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (IRAD);	10	15	15	15	15	10	10	10	Y	Y
Democratic Republic of Congo Institut National de Recherche Agricole (INERA)	15	20	5	20	10	10	10	10	Y	Y

Europe: IRD	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Guinea: Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF)	20	20	0	5	5	20	20	10	Y	N
People and Plants International	10	15	10	15	15	0	0	15	Y	Y
South Africa: Rhodes University, Grahamstown	5	10	15	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
USA: North Carolina State	10	5	5	30	25	0	5	20	Y	Y
Tanzania: Forestry and Bee-keeping Division	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	N	N

Partners' roles in Project 7, Output 2 Guidelines, strategies and policy recommendations to improve involvement of poor people in timber and natural product industries.

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	15	15	20	25	5	5	5	Y	Y
Australia: Charles Darwin University (CDU)	30	30	10	5	5	5	10	5	Y	Y
Australia: Australian National University (ANU)	2	20	8	2	20	0	26	22	Y	Y
Australia: Charles Sturt University	15	30	7	2	18	2	15	11	Y	Y
ICRAF	10	10	15	25	25	0	5	15	Y	Y
Indonesia: Forestry District Agency Sumbawa, West Nusa Tenggara	5	7	6	15	20	25	19	3	Y	Y
Indonesia: Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA)	6	16	14	18	17	8	15	6	Y	Y
Indonesia: Forestry Research Institute of Sulawesi (FORDA – Sulawesi)	6	9	10	17	22	16	16	4	Y	Y
Indonesia: World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF Indonesia - Nusa Tenggara Program).	18	13	6	5	12	18	21	7	Y	Y
Zimbabwe: Shanduko, Centre for Agrarian and Environmental Research	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	N	N
Spain: Universidad Autonoma Madrid	10	10	20	15	20	0	5	20	Y	Y

Partners' roles in Project 7, Output 3 Recommendations for poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes that take into account forests and forestry in a way that promotes rural livelihoods.

Research partner name and country	Role (% of effort)								Resource contribution	
	Research process						Dissemination		In kind (Y/N)	Financial (Y/N)
	Problem /priority determination	Research coordination and management	Contributor of concepts /tools	Contributor of data	Participant in analysis	Local adapter /tester	Disseminator/ advocate	Capacity builder		
CIFOR	10	15	15	20	25	5	5	5	Y	Y
Australia: Charles Darwin University (CDU)	30	30	10	5	5	5	10	5	Y	Y
Bolivia: Research Center for Labor and Agrarian Development	15	30	7	2	18	2	15	11	Y	N
Canada: University of Alberta	10	10	10	30	30	0	0	10	Y	Y
Cambodia: Forestry Administration of Cambodia	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
Denmark: Royal Agricultural and Veterinary University, Copenhagen	5	10	15	25	10	15	5	15	Y	Y
Italy: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, together with Country portfolio managers and project personnel)	10	10	10	0	20	20	25	5	Y	Y
Nepal: Leasehold Forestry and Livestock Program, Department of Forests, Nepal	15	20	5	5	10	20	25	0	Y	N
India:North Eastern Region Community Resource Management Project for Upland Areas (NERCRMP), Meghalaya, India	10	20	5	10	10	20	20	5	Y	N
China: Western Guangxi Poverty Alleviation Project, Guangxi, China	10	15	10	5	15	20	20	5	Y	N
India: North Eastern Hill University, Meghalaya, India	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
Nepal: Forest Action	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N

Nepal: Local Initiative for Biodiversity, Research and Development	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
India Forest Service	10	10	20	15	20	0	5	20	Y	Y
China: Research Institute of Subtropical Forestry, Chinese Academy of Forestry, China	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	N
China: Agricultural Economic Department, Business School, Guangxi University, China	20	5	10	25	15	0	15	10	Y	Y
Lao PDR: National Agriculture and Forestry Extension Service	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
Norway: Norway University of Life Sciences	10	15	5	25	35	0	0	10	Y	Y
Sweden: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	10	10	10	35	25	0	0	10	Y	Y
USA: University of Indiana	10	5	5	35	35	0	0	10	Y	Y
Vietnam: Vietnam National University	20	10	10	10	10	10	10	20	Y	Y
Zambia: Forestry Department, Zambia;	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	Y	N
Zambia Revenue Authority	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	N	N

Project Logframes

Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 1:	Identification of best practices, regulations, and criteria that will help to encourage the use of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices that are not currently widely adopted		CPF, international and local forestry NGOs, Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), forest researchers, private forest companies, national forestry departments and smallholder foresters in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Ecuador	Improved practices for sustainable use and management of natural and secondary forests and smallholder forest plantations are adopted and used by forest managers	Smallholders, communities, and forest companies benefiting over longer periods from better and sustainable use of natural forests and plantations
Output Targets 2007	<p>Opportunities for smallholder forest management identified and tested in 3 countries through analysis of 1) smallholder perceptions of forest resources and 2) the resilience of different forest types under different uses.</p> <p>Analysis of the biodiversity effects of alternative logging practices applied in Asia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents presenting most important aspects of the livelihoods, motivations and views of small farmers on forests (FORLIVE + Levelling projects) • Documents presenting information about the contribution of different forest types to the stability of diverse landscape in the Amazon (FORLIVE project) • Book "Experiences of community forestry in Latin America" • Indicators for monitoring biodiversity in small or low intensity managed forest (UNEP/GEF certification project) • Book, Occasional paper + scientific papers about more biodiversity friendly logging practices in Asia (RIL to 	Forest researchers, private forest companies, smallholder foresters and national forestry departments in Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Vietnam, Bolivia, Brazil, Peru and Ecuador	Increased understanding in private forest companies, forestry departments and rural communities on the benefits of SFM	Increase in plantation and natural forest area managed under more biodiversity-friendly and socially responsible practices

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
		promote biodiversity project)			
Output Targets 2008	<p>Analysis of best practices for sustainable forest management focusing on secondary forests and small or low intensity managed forests</p> <p>Appraisal of potential markets/incentives for products/services of certified biodiversity conservation in SLIMF & NTFP operations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents on the strategic potential of managing secondary forest and plantation management by small farmers for the rural development of the Amazon region (FORLIVE project) • Working paper with comparative information of the impact of institutional factors on the functioning of the different forest management systems in different countries (FORLIVE project) • Guide to meet certification standards for High Conservation Values & biodiversity in small and low intensity managed forests (UNEP/GEF certification project) • Report on market potential & incentives for products or services from certified small and low intensity managed forests (UNEP/GEF certification project) 	Forest decision and policy makers in target countries, CPF and NGOs, FSC, Certification bodies	<p>Adoption of biodiversity friendly logging practices by forest companies</p> <p>Funding mechanisms and proposals to donors for products from certified small and low intensity managed forests</p>	Increase in plantation and natural forest area managed under more biodiversity-friendly and socially responsible practices
Output Targets 2009	Recommendations regarding improved standards for certification of small and low intensity managed forests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training materials and training courses (UNEP/GEF certification project) • Sets of certification standards (UNEP/GEF certification project) 	Forest decision and policy makers in target countries, CPF and NGOs, FSC, Certification bodies, Communities	Improved certification standards endorsed and adopted by FSC and other third-party accreditation bodies especially for small and low intensity managed forests	Increase in plantation and natural forest area managed under more biodiversity-friendly and socially responsible practices.

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
Output 2:	Analysis of the long-term sustainability of the supply of timber, fibre and other forest products from natural forests and plantations		Global Site Management and Productivity Network; national forest departments, forest investors, and forest industries in China, Indonesia and Vietnam; forest research community; forest advocacy groups	Adoption of actions and management practices that will ensure a sustainable supply of timber and other forest products for forest-based industries	Sustainable use and management of natural and secondary forests and smallholder forest plantations so that they maintain their ability to provide different products and environmental services to the poor
Output Targets 2007	Development of tools, and decision support systems (simulation models) for analysing the long term sustainability of wood yields under different management practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SILVIA – forest management planning software developed • Document "Lessons learned from the Site Management Network" published 	Global Site Management and Productivity Network; national forest departments, forest investors, and forest industries in China, Indonesia and Vietnam; forest research community; forest advocacy groups	Decision support tools and guidelines forest management of plantations and to improve the long-term sustainability of timber supply for forest industries.	Sustainable use and management of natural and secondary forests and smallholder forest plantations so that they maintain their ability to provide different products and environmental services to the poor
Output Targets 2008	Review of methodologies and tools for appraising the sustainability of plantation management at the landscape scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIFOR report on comparative analysis of plantation management models • Peer reviewed journal article on plantation management appraisal methods 	National forest departments, forest investors, and forest industries in China, Indonesia and Vietnam; forest advocacy groups	Use of improved plantation management methods based on better analysis of long term effects helps to ensure that plantation management is more sustainable.	Sustainable use and management of natural and secondary forests and smallholder forest plantations so that they maintain their ability to provide different products and environmental services to the poor
Output Targets 2009	Analysis of the sustainability of pulp sources in Indonesia, Vietnam and China	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIFOR report on sustainability of pulpwood sources in Indonesia, China and Vietnam. 	National forest departments, forest investors, and forest industries in China, Indonesia and Vietnam; forest advocacy groups	Recommendations regarding enhanced silvicultural practices are adopted in forest concessions and result in more sustainable pulp supplies.	Sustainable use and management of natural and secondary forests and smallholder forest plantations so that they maintain their ability to provide different products and environmental services to the poor

Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 1:	Tools and strategies to integrate biodiversity conservation into improved management practices at the landscape level		Land-use planners, forestry administration bodies, forest managers; UNFCCC; UNCCD, CBD Joint Liaison Group on Synergies between the Rio Conventions; Conservation NGOs; forest and conservation research agencies.	Adoption of better land-use management strategies at the landscape scale for improved biodiversity conservation, while maintaining economic profitability of forests and plantations	Improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest use at multiple scales in fragmented landscapes
Output Targets 2007	Analysis of existing biodiversity monitoring techniques used in community forestry in Latin America and the Mekong basin. Review of efficient participatory tools and strategies to combine biodiversity conservation and management in fragmented landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document based on the review of existing biodiversity monitoring methods and tools in Latin America and in the Mekong area (SDC III) • Article and "toolbox" on analysis and negotiation-support tools for multifunctional landscape management (Biodiversity Platform) 	Land-use planners, forestry administration bodies, forest managers, forest managers of large scale plantations and natural forests; Conservation NGOs; forest and conservation research agencies, CBD	Use by land use planners of tools to improve biodiversity monitoring, to develop different land-use scenarios and analyze trade-offs with multiple stakeholders	Improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest use at multiple scales in fragmented landscapes
Output Targets 2008	Participatory biodiversity monitoring techniques developed and tested in Latin America and in the Mekong. Participatory biodiversity assessment methods and negotiation support tools (scenarios) tested and further developed through action research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of participatory biodiversity monitoring methods and tools in Latin America and in the Mekong area (SDC III) • Reports on the use of scenarios and valuation of biodiversity friendly options in on-going negotiations in benchmark landscapes (Biodiversity Platform) 	Land-use planners, forestry administration bodies, forest managers, conservation NGOs; forest and conservation research agencies, CBD	Integration of tools incorporating biodiversity issues and involving multiple stakeholders into land-use planning processes and promotion of improved monitoring methods.	Improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest use at multiple scales in fragmented landscapes

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
Output Targets 2009	Participatory biodiversity monitoring techniques embedded in decision support tools for Latin America and in the Mekong. Synthesis on the efficiency of participatory biodiversity assessment, negotiation support tools and action research approaches for improved landscape management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory biodiversity monitoring methods and tools validated by different user groups in Latin America and in the Mekong area (SDC III) • Results and findings disseminated in publications and workshops in Latin America and in the Mekong area (SDC III) and published in a journal • Results and findings published in a special issue of a journal and disseminated in workshops in the selected landscapes and at international level (Biodiversity Platform) 	Land-use planners, forestry administration bodies, forest managers, conservation NGOs; forest and conservation research agencies, CBD	Use of better information and adoption of participatory negotiation support and biodiversity monitoring tools by land use planners and consideration of action research potential and constraints by scientists	Improved biodiversity conservation and sustainable forest use at multiple scales in fragmented landscapes
Output 2:	Support to conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity through the collection and use of better information and participatory tools regarding biodiversity in landscape mosaics for problem diagnosis, priority setting and decision making		Local stakeholders in Indonesia, Latin America, Mekong, and Africa, land use planners, forestry administration bodies, CBD, GEF, major biodiversity donors, conservation NGOs, ICRAF, Local; conservation and forest research community	Adaptation and adoption of assessment techniques and of multisatkeholder negotiation processes that help to conserve biodiversity in ways suited to meet the needs of poor rural families	The livelihoods of smallholders and rural forest communities enhanced due to improved conservation and management of local biodiversity that is important for environmental services
Output Targets 2007	Biodiversity assessment and context analysis of biodiversity conservation and management in selected landscape mosaics Development of a "typology" of multifunctional landscapes based on spatial analyses and socio-economic data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network of sites established with clear external biodiversity value and partnerships for action research on the conservation/development interface (including active and past forest margins) (Biodiversity platform) • Spatial characterization and context analysis for the selected sites and a workplan for participatory multifunctional landscape planning processes" (Biodiversity platform) 	Conservation NGOs, ICRAF, local stakeholders, conservation and forest research community, CBD	Appreciation and better consideration by conservation agencies of the environmental values of forest fragments and agroforests in selected landscape mosaics from a local and environmental perspective	The livelihoods of smallholders and rural forest communities enhanced due to improved conservation and management of local biodiversity that is important for environmental services

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output Targets 2008	Adaptation and development of land-use planning instruments for combining conservation and management in selected landscapes with an emphasis on local people's perspectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents on local and external perspectives for landscape mosaics management integrated in land-use plans. • Negotiation reports (land use planning) (Biodiversity Platform) 	Conservation NGOs, ICRAF, local stakeholders, conservation and forest research community, CBD	Integration of local concerns and values into participatory land-use planning processes by local agencies for conservation or production forests in selected landscape mosaics	The livelihoods of smallholders and rural forest communities enhanced due to improved conservation and management of local biodiversity that is important for environmental services
Output Targets 2009	Global recommendations for combining conservation, management and development of multifunctional landscapes and for integrating it into land use principles of selected landscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local and overall synthesis document on findings and experiences of action research in peer-reviewed paper (Biodiversity Platform) • Workshop reports, web-site, (Biodiversity Platform) 	Conservation NGOs, ICRAF, local stakeholders, conservation and forest research community, CBD, GEF, major biodiversity donors	Integration of local concerns and values and biodiversity issues into land-use planning principles promoted by international organizations for conservation and management in landscape mosaics and production forests	The livelihoods of smallholders and rural forest communities enhanced due to improved conservation and management of local biodiversity that is important for environmental services

Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 1:	Tools and best practices for balancing water use and carbon sequestration services from forests at the landscape level		Water for Food Challenge Programme; Forest managers, land use planners in Central America, west Africa, Mekong Basin, Indonesia; forest researchers in landscape assessment, ecosystem services; conservation and development agencies;	Methods on integrating forest ecosystem services are used in forest management and planning	The design and implementation of forest management systems that provide sustainable resource use in forested and mixed land use catchments without excluding the poor
Output Targets 2007	Computer-based tool for cost-effective measuring and monitoring of carbon fluxes and sequestration from different forest types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MAIA – a computer-based system for monitoring carbon in CDM projects developed, and tested in Central America and Indonesia (FORMA project) 5 documents published: Guidelines for CDM project development (FORMA project) 	Forest managers, land use planners in Central America, West Africa, Mekong Basin, Indonesia, forest researchers in landscape assessment, ecosystem services; conservation and development agencies;	Land use and forest planners involved with the analysis and research have a greater understanding of the cause-impact chains at landscape scales and the ecological and socio-economic variables affecting land-use. Increased capacity of researchers in methodologies associated with integrated assessment of environmental goods and services in forested catchments	The design and implementation of forest management systems that provide sustainable resource use in forested and mixed land use catchments without excluding the poor
Output Targets 2008	Models for the provision of environmental services, particularly tradeoffs between carbon sequestration and water transpiration at the landscape level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A computer-based system for managing multiple environmental services in landscapes – Version 1 developed and tested 	Forest managers, land use planners in Central America, West Africa, Mekong Basin, Indonesia, forest researchers in landscape assessment, ecosystem services; conservation and development agencies;	Key decision makers in the target catchments use these tools for better management of environmental services	The design and implementation of forest management systems that provide sustainable resource use in forested and mixed land use catchments without excluding the poor
Output Targets 2009	Decision support systems for multiple environmental services (biodiversity, carbon and water) at the landscape level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A computer-based system for managing multiple environmental services in landscapes – Final version 	Forest managers, land use planners in Central America, West Africa, Mekong Basin, Indonesia, forest researchers	Results of research are adopted in forest management and planning	The design and implementation of forest management systems that provide sustainable

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
		<p>developed and tested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of workshops to get feedback on the use of decision support systems for the provision of environmental services by different user groups 	<p>in landscape assessment, ecosystem services; conservation and development agencies;</p>		<p>resource use in forested and mixed land use catchments without excluding the poor</p>
Output 2:	Identification of pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes involving forest ecosystems and articulation of the role of forest ecosystems in adaptation to climate change		<p>International processes on climate change adaptation and mitigation; national and international researchers in climate change; Asia Forest Partnership; CGIAR ICWGCC; forest and landuse planners; government departments dealing with climate change issues in Indonesia, West Africa, and Central America.</p>	<p>Options for pro-poor climate change mitigation and adaptation schemes are adopted by international and national policy makers and used by forest and landuse planners</p>	<p>Increased resilience and reduced vulnerability of forests and societies to climate change</p>
Output Targets 2007	Development and appraisal of methodologies and tools to assess vulnerability to climate change in Indonesia, West Africa and Central America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified and prioritized sectors that are vulnerable to climate change. • One methodology per region and per identified development issue. • A collection of tools that form part of each methodology. • A literature review with information to support the application of the above methodology. • A toolbox for the application of the methodologies 	<p>International researchers in climate change; CGIAR ICWGCC; government departments dealing with climate change issues in Indonesia, West Africa, and Central America. Forest and landuse planners in Indonesia, West Africa and Central America</p>	<p>Methodologies to assess the vulnerability are available and these or any tool developed for them are used by and beyond the project</p>	<p>Increased availability of methods to assess vulnerability, specifically directed at analysing forest ecosystems and their goods and services.</p>

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
Output Targets 2008	Assessment of vulnerability and vulnerability mapping carried out in Indonesia, West Africa and Central America to identify goods and services from the forest that are at risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional policy dialogues that are conducive to a greater awareness of the importance of adaptation to climate change. National workshops with partners that lead to greater awareness of adaptation at the sectorial level. Scientific information (vulnerability assessments) and tools that will be used by regional actors within their planning. Vulnerability and policy assessments that facilitate the mainstreaming of adaptation into development policies. Vulnerability maps that help in the planning of adaptation. Journal articles and, at least, two books on forests and adaptation 	International researchers in climate change; CGIAR ICWGCC; government departments dealing with climate change issues in Indonesia, West Africa, and Central America. Forest and land use planners in Indonesia, West Africa and Central America	The assessment of the vulnerability of identified national and regional topics of development linked to tropical forest is conducive to plan adaptation. Governments actively participate in the mainstreaming of adaptation into development, in particular, relevant aspects of forest ecosystems.	Increased capacity to plan for adaptation. The approach followed by TroFCCA will help governments in deciding how forests should be managed to reduce sectorial vulnerability to climate change.
Output Targets 2009	Criteria and indicators for adaptive management of tropical forests to minimize the negative effects of climate change and climatic variability developed in Indonesia, West Africa and Central America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A set of criteria and indicators to provide a robust basis for the assessment of vulnerability and for planning adaptation. A series of workshops to discuss adaptation strategies on the basis of the products of the first two years Policy analysis that indicate how adaptation could be streamed into development policies. 	International processes on climate change adaptation and mitigation; national and international researchers in climate change; Asia Forest Partnership; CGIAR Inter-Centre Working Group n climate change; government departments dealing with climate change issues, forest and land use planners in Indonesia, Burkina Faso, Mozambique and Central America	<p>Criteria and indicators for adaptive management of tropical forest developed and tested</p> <p>Wider adoption of practical and useful information on adaptive forest management to reduce vulnerability</p> <p>Increased capacity of developing country researchers in climate change adaptation research tools and methodologies</p>	Increased resilience and reduced vulnerability of forests and societies to climate change

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 3:	Guidelines and methods for rehabilitation of degraded forest landscapes		Forest Landscape Restoration Network; Asian Forest Partnership; Asian (Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines, China) and Latin American (Peru, Brazil) governments and donor projects investing in rehabilitation efforts; ITTO; FAO; forest managers in Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines, China, Peru and Brazil; researchers; development agencies; International and national conservation NGOs; local communities in test sites; forest industry	Wider use of guidelines and methods in forest rehabilitation to increase forest cover and productivity of degraded forest lands	Production of multiple environmental benefits and improved local livelihoods through more effective rehabilitation of degraded lands
Output Targets 2007	Guidelines for planning, implementing and evaluating forest rehabilitation projects Methods for rehabilitating logged-over forests and for site management of degraded lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Book: Cross-site synthesis published and disseminated • Guidelines published and disseminated 	Asian (Indonesia, Vietnam, Philippines, China) and Latin American (Peru, Brazil) governments and donor projects investing in rehabilitation efforts; ITTO; FAO; Forest Landscape Restoration Network;	Better integration of rehabilitation into national and regional environmental conservation strategies Improved quality of rehabilitation and reforestation projects.	Landscape restoration designed to help communities and restore the forest products and services they need
Output Targets 2008	This output is merged with the output 1 of the project 3 after 2007				

Project 4: Governance of Multistakeholder Forested Landscapes

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 1:	Analysis of decentralisation policies and practices in selected countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America		National, sub- nationals and local government, community forest networks/ federations, forestry bureaucracies, planning and development agencies; forestry research and training institutes, international environmental and advocacy organizations; donors agencies	Use of materials and adoption of recommendations lead to more effective decentralized forest management and enhanced forest resource access and benefits for local communities	Effective decentralization creates incentives for more sustainable forest use and generate increased benefits from forest under different forms of local, community management
Output target 2007	Analyses and syntheses of constraints to decentralization, approaches to multi-stakeholder forest management at different scales and their implications for forests and human well-being in selected countries (Nepal, Indonesia, Philippines, Brazil, Bolivia, Cameroon, Burkina Faso and others)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edited volume on status and issues in forestry decentralization in Asia Pacific region • Set of publications on the role of property rights and collective action in sustainable forest management and implications for health and well-being • Scoping of community forestry, tenure and policy reform issues in 6 countries 	National, sub- nationals and local government, community forest networks/ federations, forestry bureaucracies, planning and development agencies; forestry research and training institutes, international environmental and advocacy organizations; donors agencies; Rights and Resource Initiative; International Model Forest Network	Legislation and regulations governing decentralization are improved so as to result in more participatory institutional arrangements for collective resource management	Forest derived benefits are distributed more equally due to improved decision-making regarding collective resources
Output target 2008	Review of forest concession systems and their impacts on stakeholder rights and access to forest resources; Assessment of capacity of major stakeholder groups for negotiation for access rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on concession systems in selected countries, cross-country synthesis report on state of community rights and access to forest resources • Policy briefs, data bases, networks and collaborative forums for key actors and stakeholders established • Training materials, general lessons and strategies; media communication materials based identified priority needs for capacity building 	Government and non-government institutions at national, regional and international levels, donor agencies Federations of communities and grassroots forest networks Forest bureaucracies, research and training institutions	Concession policies are improved so as better balance access rights of different stakeholder groups.	Reformed concession policies remove constraints, provide incentives for more sustainable forest use, and generate increased benefits from forest under different forms of local, community management
Output target 2009	Assessment of approaches for effective decentralization and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An edited volume on key findings on conditions for 	Rights and Resources Initiative partners and their networks at	Grassroots movements use improved collaborative	Reformed policies and practices remove

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended users	Outcome	Impact
	engagement with forest-related grassroots movements in selected countries Analysis and synthesis of relevant tools, methods and strategic approaches for forest tenure policy reforms	effective decentralization and engagement with forest-related grassroots movements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods manual; policy briefs and targeted recommendations for forest tenure and policy reforms in key countries; • Presentations and media communications materials derived from above products 	national, regional and international level; international forestry forums; International Model Forest Network, national, local governments and local communities in selected countries	decision-making modalities to more effectively manage collective resources	constraints, provide incentives for more sustainable forest use, and generate increased benefits from forest under different forms of local, community management
Output 2:	Analyses, tools and recommendations for effective stakeholder collaboration, forest-related conflict mitigation, and institution building for collaborative forest management		International forestry organizations and forums, development agencies, donor organisations, concerned companies and operators; national and local governments in study sites, local communities, conservation NGOs and border security agencies	Increased attention to conflict-prone forest areas; improved methods for coordination and joint action; better coordinated policy responses	Reduced conflict, greater stakeholder collaboration and increased security of forest-dependent people in conflict prone areas
Output target 2007	Global review of forest-related conflict and mitigation strategies; assessment of transboundary dynamics and prospects for transboundary collaborative forest management in selected sites (Papua, Indonesia-Malaysia and Cameroon-Nigeria border areas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report to UNFF Secretariat on strategies and recommendations for forest conflict mitigation • Analysis of dynamics of transboundary forest trade and management in conflict-prone areas (Papua, Indonesia-Malaysia and Cameroon-Nigeria border areas); • Case studies reports, journal articles; policy briefs on transboundary timber trade and forest management 	UNFF; international donors and development agencies; conservation organizations; border security agencies; concerned companies and operators; national and local governments, communities and stakeholders in study sites	Governments have enhanced understanding of dynamics of forest-related conflicts, and prospects for transboundary collaboration in management of forests and protected areas results in increased attention to conflict-prone areas, particularly in border zones, and possible strategies for their secure, equitable and sustainable management.	Improved management of transboundary areas reduces conflict, improves security, and allows for more sustainable and productive forest management that benefits the poor.
Output target 2008	Analyses of general strategies and mechanisms for coordinated transboundary policies and management options	Case study reports, journal articles; policy briefs; presentations; training materials providing options for conflict mitigation, policy coordination and trans boundary forest management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional, national and local governments and key stakeholders in study sites; • International donors, development agencies and forestry forums. 	Analyses guide development of new mechanisms for coordinated transboundary and protected areas that reflect innovative approaches for policy	Improved management of transboundary areas reduces conflict, improves security, and allows for more sustainable and productive forest

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
				coordination and conflict mitigation.	management that benefits the poor.
Output target 2009	<p>Approaches, guidelines and tools for multi-stakeholder collaboration and conflict mitigation.</p> <p>Assessment of institutional capacity of key stakeholders and forest users for conflict mitigation and transboundary forest management in selected regions;</p>	<p>Publications; media products; policy briefs; presentations; stakeholder dialogues and capacity building workshops on multi-stakeholder collaboration, conflict mitigation and transboundary forest management</p>	<p>Policy makers at regional, national and local levels; key stakeholders and forest users in study countries;</p> <p>international and national donors; international academic and scholarly community</p>	<p>Adoption and implementation of negotiated options and recommendation and strengthening institutions for transboundary resource governance</p> <p>Enhanced capacities and strengthened institutions for cross border governance and more effective management of transboundary forests and protected areas</p>	<p>Improved management of transboundary areas reduces conflict, improves security, and allows for more sustainable and productive forest management that benefits the poor.</p>

Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability

	<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets</i>	<i>Intended Users</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Impact</i>
Output 1:	Analyses of legal timber verification methods, and policy-relevant forest trade scenarios with assessment of implications for forest sustainability, economic development and human well-being, especially among the forest dependent poor		Government policymakers and planners; private sector and state-owned forest and wood processing companies; forest trade federations; financial institutions; civil society organizations; donor agencies; multilateral development banks; and participants in multilateral initiatives such as FLEG, Asia Forest Partnership, ITTO, etc.	Increased awareness and strengthened capacity of policymakers and other stakeholders in leading forest consumer and supplier countries to anticipate likely scenarios and take action to avoid negative implications through appropriate investment and regulation.	Actions and interventions of key actors in consumer and supplier countries transform forest trade in Asia-Pacific and key countries in West/Central Africa and other regions in ways that promote more sustainable forest management, more secure access and equitable distribution of forest benefits
Output Targets 2007	<p>Methodology for assessment of supply-demand trends and forest transitions in selected countries in the Asia-Pacific region and West/Central Africa and their impacts on forest dependent poor</p> <p>Analyses of major forest transitions and trade scenarios in Asia-Pacific region related to China's growing demand for wood pulp</p> <p>Assessments of legal timber verification systems in select countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report describing methodology for assessment of trade scenarios and forest transitions in the Asia-Pacific region 3 seminar presentations on forest transitions and trade scenarios in the Asia-Pacific region Article on supply-demand trends and scenarios related to China's growing demand for wood pulp Report on legal timber verification systems in Central/West Africa and selected countries in Asia and Latin America Report on strategic lessons from TNC-WWF Alliance on forest/timber certification 	Government policymakers and planners; private sector and state-owned forest and wood processing companies; forest trade federations; financial institutions; civil society organizations; donor agencies; multilateral development banks; and participants in multilateral initiatives such as FLEG, Asia Forest Partnership, ITTO, etc.	Key actors in key timber consuming and producing countries use information and methods to ensure that supply-demand shortfalls are mitigated through appropriate investment and regulation.	Better planned and regulated timber flows allow for more sustainable forest use, greater equity and improved benefits from forest commerce and trade, especially for forest-dependent poor
Output Targets 2008	Medium-term scenarios for trade and forestry transitions in the Asia-Pacific region summarizing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on major supply-demand trends, forest transition processes, and medium-term 	Government policymakers and planners; private sector and state-owned forest and	Key actors in key timber consuming and producing countries use information	Better planned and regulated timber flows allow for more

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
	<p>anticipated impacts on forests and the poor of major trends and identifying policy options for more sustainable and equitable outcomes</p> <p>Exploratory study on the role of select countries in West/Central Africa and Latin America to supply growing demand for wood-based products in the Asia-Pacific region, and assessment of the role of informal trade and credit networks in selected countries</p>	<p>scenarios in the Asia-Pacific region</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenario analyses and policy options for select supplier and consumer countries in the Asia-Pacific region, including China, Indonesia, PNG, and others, to mitigate adverse impacts on forests and forest-dependent poor. Policy briefs, presentations, and workshops on forest transitions and trade scenarios in the Asia-Pacific region Analyses of the dynamics and implications on forests and the poor of legal and illegal logging and trade in Cameroon and Indonesia Exploratory study on the role of informal trade and credit networks in selected countries in Asia and Africa and implications for use of market-based instruments for regulating forest products trade 	<p>wood processing companies; forest trade federations; financial institutions; civil society organizations; donor agencies; multilateral development banks; and participants in multilateral initiatives such as FLEG, Asia Forest Partnership, ITTO, etc.</p>	<p>and methods to ensure that supply-demand shortfalls are mitigated through appropriate investment and regulation.</p>	<p>sustainable forest use, greater equity and improved benefits from forest commerce and trade, especially for forest-dependent poor</p>
Output Targets 2009	<p>Policy options and recommendations for government policymakers and planners in select Asia-Pacific supplier and consumer countries based on participatory assessment of scenarios by key stakeholder groups</p> <p>Medium-term scenarios of trade and forestry transitions in select countries in West/Central Africa and Latin America, and policy options for more sustainable and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participatory workshops focusing on assessment of trade scenarios and forest transitions in Asia-Pacific by key stakeholder groups Policy options and recommendations to assist policymakers and planners in select Asia-Pacific supplier and consumer countries to achieve more sustainable and equitable outcomes Reports, presentations, and policy briefs summarizing key components of Asia-Pacific forest 	<p>Government policymakers and planners; private sector and state-owned forest and wood processing companies; forest trade federations; financial institutions; civil society organizations; donor agencies; multilateral development banks; and participants in multilateral initiatives such as FLEG, Asia Forest Partnership, ITTO, etc</p>	<p>Key actors in key timber consuming and producing countries use information and methods to ensure that supply-demand shortfalls are mitigated through appropriate investment and regulation.</p>	<p>Better planned and regulated timber flows allow for more sustainable forest use, greater equity and improved benefits from forest commerce and trade, especially for forest-dependent poor</p>

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
	equitable outcomes	transitions and trade scenarios <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports, presentations, and policy briefs summarizing key components of forest transitions and trade scenarios in West/Central Africa and Latin America 			
Output 2:	Analysis, guidelines, strategies and approaches for improved regulations and business practices of corporate entities involved in forestry-related transactions and operations in tropical developing countries		Private and public sector financial institutions; government financial regulatory agencies; participants in relevant global and regional initiatives (i.e. Equator Principles, FATF, Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering; FLEG, ITTO), civil society organizations; donor agencies; law enforcement agencies	Key actors and agencies take appropriate action to increase transparency, accountability and social responsibility of corporate entities involved in forestry-related transactions; improve risk assessment and due diligence in forest-related investments; and reduce financial flows to illegal activities and forest-related crimes	Significant reduction in forest-related crimes and corruption; increased socially and environmentally responsible forestry investments leading to reduced forest loss, increased state revenues for poverty alleviation and more secure livelihoods for forest-dependent people
Output Targets 2007	Analyses of approaches for socially and environmentally responsible business practice, and recommendations to mitigate forest crimes and improve due diligence of institutions involved in forestry-related transactions, Review of anti-money laundering protocols and their possible use for forest crimes with focus Asia-Pacific countries, especially Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations on risk analysis, due diligence and safeguards for forest-related investments • Case analysis of financial flows and/or money laundering associated with illegal logging and other forest related crimes, and their implications for forests and forest dependent poor, focusing on Indonesia • Design of general anti-money laundering protocols to address forest crimes, with emphasis on application to Asia Pacific region 	Private and public sector financial institutions; government financial regulatory agencies; participants in relevant global and regional initiatives (i.e. Equator Principles, FATF, Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering; FLEG, ITTO), civil society organizations; donor agencies; law enforcement agencies	Key actors and agencies adopt improved protocols for transparent and accountable investment to improve corporate practices, and reduce non-viable investments that are likely to lead to forest crimes and other unanticipated negative social and environmental externalities.	Significant reduction in forest-related crimes and corruption; increased socially and environmentally responsible forestry investments leading to reduced forest loss, increased state revenues for poverty alleviation and more secure livelihoods for forest-dependent people
Output Targets 2008	Assessment of the potential uses of anti-money laundering laws and instruments for international cooperation to curtail illegal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tools and methods for analysis and assessment of forest-related business practices to characterize due diligence and 	Private and public sector financial institutions; government financial regulatory agencies;	Use of analytical tools and methods in international initiatives to reduce forest crime and encourage	Significant reduction in forest-related crimes and corruption; increased socially and

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators of Output Targets	Intended Users	Outcome	Impact
	<p>logging and trade in West/Central Africa and Latin America</p> <p>Assessment of effectiveness of legal and regulatory framework for corporate social responsibility in Indonesia</p>	<p>socially and environmentally responsible behaviour;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication assessing options and instruments for bilateral and multilateral cooperation to reduce money laundering and forest-related crimes • Report and derivative publications and presentations on effectiveness of legal and regulatory framework for corporate social responsibility in Indonesia, with comparison to select countries 	<p>participants in relevant global and regional initiatives (i.e. Equator Principles, FATF, Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering; FLEG, ITTO), civil society organizations; donor agencies; law enforcement agencies</p>	<p>responsible forest-related investments</p>	<p>environmentally responsible forestry investments leading to reduced forest loss, increased state revenues for poverty alleviation and more secure livelihoods for forest-dependent people</p>
Output Targets 2009	<p>Analyses of tools and options for multilateral cooperation and international initiatives to reduce forest-related crimes and promote environmentally and socially responsible business practices</p> <p>Guidelines and tools for risk assessment, social-environmental safeguards, and legal compliance of investments in the forestry sector</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies analyzing necessary conditions, incentives and constraints to environmentally and socially responsible forest-related business practices, and their implications for forest-dependent poor • Reports, guidelines and presentations on forest-related risk assessment, social environmental safeguards and legal compliance in strategic forums and workshops, 	<p>Private and public sector financial institutions; government financial regulatory agencies; participants in relevant global and regional initiatives (i.e. Equator Principles, FATF, Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering; FLEG, ITTO), civil society organizations; donor agencies; law enforcement agencies</p>	<p>Appropriate international agreements and institutions are enacted to regulate international financial flows for financing illegal forestry activities.</p>	<p>Significant reduction in forest-related crimes and corruption; increased socially and environmentally responsible forestry investments leading to reduced forest loss, increased state revenues for poverty alleviation and more secure livelihoods for forest-dependent people</p>

Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators*	Intended User	Outcome	Impact
Output 1:	Analyses and case studies of conservation-development initiatives (including payment for environmental services (PES) schemes) that result in methods, options and strategies for improving pro-poor outcomes		Conservation and development agencies, researchers, policy makers, buyers and sellers of environmental services	Better policies and practices adopted by conservation and development agencies, including new approaches to PES	Significantly improved benefits from conservation-development initiatives that deal with poverty alleviation and landscape management (water, land, forest resources, including biodiversity)
Output Targets 2007	a) Comprehensive review and critique of current approaches to Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDP's) and PES completed. b) Testing of PES "best practice" principles in Colombia, Venezuela and Bolivia completed.	a) Special Issue of Ecology and Society on principles and approaches to conservation published, b) Special Issue of Ecological Economics: "PES in developed and developing countries: methods and design compared" c) Major presentation at Katoomba Conference d) Information forums for exchange of research results with major conservation and development agencies; e) Contribution of global landscape analysis in terms of conservation and development trade-offs within ICRAF/CIFOR Biodiversity Platform project: "Landscape mosaics: tools for integrating management and biodiversity conservation in tropical landscapes"	Conservation and development agencies (IUCN, WWF, GTZ), universities, buyers and sellers of environmental services.	Conservation and development agencies influenced in the manner they select interventions for different contexts; buyers and sellers of environmental services use information to make better choices about PES; and universities use the framework in teaching the next generation of professionals.	Improved implementation of ICDPs and PES to maximize total benefits from conservation and development initiatives
Output Targets 2008	Critique of institutional and policy context for PES and ICDP implementation.	a) Forum on community-based land tenure in Amazonia evaluating conservation & livelihood outcomes, and elaboration of a comparative report, and a policy brief, b) Journal paper on global comparison of landscape project, e) Book on extractive reserves in Brazil published, f) policy brief on PES: "lessons learnt from developed and developing	Conservation and development agencies (IUCN, WWF, GTZ), national and regional policy makers.	Adoption of improved policies and institutional arrangements that increase the likelihood of success for ICDPs and PES.	Improved implementation of ICDPs and PES to maximize total benefits from conservation and development initiatives

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators*	Intended User	Outcome	Impact
		countries."			
Output Targets 2009	Testing of hypotheses regarding "win-win" approaches for ICDP implementation for conservation and development outcomes initiated in the Mekong (Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam) and the Tri-National Sangha (TNS) regions with partner institutions.	a) Paper on testing conservation and development outcomes in Mekong and TNS published; b) Diagnosis of project intervention in terms of "lessons learnt" disseminated.	Conservation and development agencies (IUCN, WWF, WCS, GTZ) national and regional policy makers.	Integration of identified "win-win" approaches into ICDP initiatives.	Improved implementation of ICDPs and PES to maximize total benefits from conservation and development initiatives
Output 2:	Concepts, methods, and analysis, at the landscape scale, of the socio-economic and physical determinants of the role and potential of forests in livelihoods and livelihoods improvement		International and national development and conservation agencies (e.g. IFAD, World Bank) and government agencies involved in natural-resources management and rural development.	More focused and strategic policy- and project-level interventions, at the landscape level, for forest-based poverty alleviation.	Improved development outcomes for forest dependent people and reduced forest loss through better-targeted and more appropriate interventions
Output Targets 2007	Global, national and sub-national analyses of landscape-scale forest-poverty relationships, to identify the conditions under which forests play an important role in livelihoods.	(a) CIFOR publication on forest-poverty relationships globally, drawing on case studies for various countries (e.g. Indonesia, Vietnam) (b) sub-national studies (e.g. for districts in Indonesia and project sites in India) published in peer review papers. (c) national study in Bolivia published locally and in peer review paper.	National and provincial governments in India, Indonesia, Bolivia, World Bank, IFAD and other NGOs, donors and development agencies.	Development agencies and governments develop improved understanding of the multiple factors that determine livelihood strategies and adjust their policies and programming accordingly.	Improved development outcomes for forest dependent people and reduced forest loss through better-targeted and more appropriate interventions
Output Targets 2008	A scientifically-based set of principles articulated that link landscape dynamics, local livelihoods, broad social changes and policies.	(a) A summary peer-reviewed paper prepared for a top international journal; (b) Lessons for conservation and development agencies prepared and disseminated in their in house journals (c) a book assessing the interactions existing among agrarian transformations, local livelihoods and landscape dynamics based on selected cases studies in the Amazon.	Conservation and development agencies, spatial planning agencies, advocacy groups, policy makers (especially those outside the forest sector), media.	Influence multiple users to better assess policy impacts on forests and people, and influence policy makers to make better policies and decisions.	Improved development outcomes for forest dependent people and reduced forest loss through better-targeted and more appropriate interventions
Output Targets 2009	This sub-theme is expected to be completed in late 2008.				

Project 7: Protecting and Improving Human well being through Forests

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators*	Intended User	Outcome	Impact
Output 1:	Analysis of the conditions and factors that facilitate successful small enterprise development and secure safety nets from forest biodiversity		Community based organizations, educational and extension authorities, health providers, private companies, traders, local NGOs, policy makers	Intended users of the outputs implement policies, practices and programs that favour the interests of the forest-dependent rural poor.	Forest biodiversity enhances the livelihoods of the forest-dependent poor, through improved local practices, more secure safety nets and improved natural product markets
Output Targets 2007	Analysis of markets for NTFPs and identification of methods and opportunities for sustainably producing those products through case studies in India, Nepal, Cameroon, and Guinea.	(a) Document on principles related to enterprise development (Cameroon & Guinea). (b) Manual on disseminating research results to local communities (Brazil).	Small farmers and extension, training, and aid services that support small producers in Cameroon, Brazil, Nepal, India, Guinea.	Extension and support systems are more effective in helping small farmers gain access to NTFP markets and information on sustainable forest management practices.	Incomes of small producers improve as result of accessing new markets or improving existing markets, and markets sustained through attention to sustainable production practices.
Output Targets 2008	Safety net roles of forests determined through an analysis of links between forests and human health.	(a) Book by Carol Colfer on forests and health. (b) Book by Edmond Dounias on the health of forest dwellers in Indonesia in the context of sedentarization of their farming practices.	Public health community, donors, and foresters.	Forest policies that address the links between human health and forests, and health policies and practices that better reflect contributions of forests to health.	Improved health for forest dwellers and society at large resulting from improved policies.
Output Targets 2009	Longitudinal studies in Cameroon, Ghana, Nigeria and Brazil which improve understanding of trade-offs and the complex role of forest resources in rural livelihoods as source of game, fruits, fiber and timber.	(a) A socially-differentiated overview of the importance of NTFPs in rural communities in Cameroon, Ghana, and Nigeria. (b) Long-term valuation of the impacts of logging on consumption of forest products (game, fruits, fibers) by smallholders in Amazonia. c) Policy brief and technical training materials on multiple use forest management.	Development, training and educational agencies and national institutions in Cameroon, Ghana, and Nigeria, Brazil and Bolivia.	Policies and forestry curriculum which are based on better consideration of multiple uses and values in forest management.	Multiple use forest management results in improved total social benefits as a result of implementation of policies that better balance multiple forest values.
Output 2:	Guidelines, strategies and policy recommendations to improve involvement of poor people in timber and natural product industries.		Forest companies, natural product companies, NGOs, development agencies, smallholders, local traders and processors, local nurseries/seed suppliers, research organizations, and policy makers.	Forestry and natural product companies adopt strategies leading to improved social responsibility. Smallholders adopt practices leading to the development of viable	Increased and more profitable engagement by small-scale private and community participants in the market for industrial forest and natural products, leading to

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators*	Intended User	Outcome	Impact
				farm forestry and/or viable harvesting and management of natural products. Policies adopted to facilitate smallholders and local traders and processors getting involved in forest industry.	increased income and/or increased employment.
Output Targets 2007	Analysis of conditions that lead to increased capacity in smallholders to engage in mutually beneficial partnerships with forest companies in Southern Africa and Southeast Asia.	(a) Proposal for capacity building and organizational development for local producer organizations (b) Specific training of stakeholder groups (e.g. community forest leaders, forestry agency staff, local NGOs) on how to create & negotiate beneficial partnerships (c) Best practice smallholder-forest company partnership guidelines modified and finalized on the basis of capacity building initiatives and new research findings.	Forest companies, NGOs, development agencies, smallholders, local traders and processors, forestry agencies.	Guidelines adopted by smallholders, forest companies and development agencies that improve partnerships between poor people and companies.	Improved capacity of smallholders, to form associations and build effective alliances that increase their bargaining power to negotiate fairer and more beneficial partnership contracts with companies/forestry agencies.
Output Targets 2008	Guidelines developed for improving incentives for smallholder involvement in forest industries through analysis of risks, benefits, land tenure issues and other opportunities and constraints currently faced by smallholders.	(a) Guidelines for institutions that address the factors that restrict the involvement of the poorest groups and women in forest industries, (b) Research report on 'why farmers plant trees' based on lessons from Vietnam, Ethiopia and Sweden.	Forest companies, natural product companies, NGOs, development agencies.	Guidelines and strategies adopted by forest companies, natural product companies and development agencies that encourage engagement of poor people in forest industries.	Increased involvement leading to increased benefits for smallholders, local traders and local processors in production, processing or trading in products feeding into forest industries.
Output Targets 2009	Strategies and policy recommendations identified for removing impediments to the engagement of poor people in forest industries, including simpler procedures in timber marketing and streamlined regulations for natural product production and marketing.	(d) Thematic papers on farm-based silvicultural management, financing and marketing mechanisms, and the policies that encourage production of high value natural products in Indonesia; (e) Research report providing an overview of policies promoting small scale involvement in the forest industry.	Forest companies, NGOs, development agencies, policy makers.	Strategies and policies adopted that facilitate sustainable forestry and greater involvement of smallholders, local traders and local processors in the forest industry.	Increased benefits for poor people resulting from policies that create a favourable environment for smallholder involvement in forest and natural product industries.
Output 3:	Recommendations for poverty alleviation policies, strategies and programmes that take into account forests and forestry in a way that promotes rural livelihoods.		Researchers, national economic planning agencies, development agencies.	New ideas, approaches and policies adopted that take into account the role of forests in poverty alleviation, resulting in important poverty	Protection or improvement of the well being of poor people through policies and programs that are founded on sound

	Outputs	Verifiable Indicators*	Intended User	Outcome	Impact
				mitigation roles being recognized and protected (or compensated), and natural-resource-based poverty reduction opportunities realized.	knowledge of the role of forests in meeting basic needs, providing emergency or stop-gap income, and in some cases, lifting people out of poverty.
Output Targets 2007	Preliminary analysis and policy recommendations on how to improve poverty assessment and the poverty alleviation performance of government and NGO forestry interventions (e.g., introduced community forestry, land tenure transfer initiatives, improved incentives and reduced regulations for product marketing arrangements, etc.)	(a) 20 PhD students in the Poverty and Environment Network (PEN) apply detailed forest-poverty methods and produce research reports (b) Tools for assessment of livelihood status and change based on Jharkhand case study. (c) Preliminary analysis and policy recommendations on the poverty alleviation performance of community forestry in Cambodia, Lao-PDR, and Vietnam. (d) Assessment of the role of miombo woodlands in poverty alleviation in southern Africa completed and policy impediments identified.	(a) Researchers in the field of poverty and forests. (b) National economic planning agencies, development agencies, forestry ministries (e.g. ADB, Jharkhand state forestry department.)	(a) Increased use of forest-poverty methods that capture income flows that are generally invisible or under-estimated. (b) Improved design and implementation of community forestry policies.	Policy planners understand that existing poverty alleviation policies inadequately address forest issues and revise their assumptions.
Output Targets 2008	Analysis of factors that lead to successful forest-based poverty alleviation projects based on case studies of past and potential forestry interventions in Nepal, India, China, Burkina Faso, Zambia and Ethiopia.	(a) Lessons learnt and appropriate support identified for pro-poor forest projects in Nepal, India and China. (b) Lessons learnt for specific forestry project interventions in Burkina Faso, Zambia and Ethiopia.	Development agencies, researchers, forestry ministries, national economic planning agencies.	Improved incorporation of forest and other natural resources in poverty alleviation project activities.	Poor benefit from improved project performance (for forest-based poverty alleviation projects.)
Output Targets 2009	National-level policy analysis and recommendations on how to improve the role of forests in poverty alleviation based on in-depth studies in Africa, South America and Asia.	(a) Global and regional critiques of the role of forests and forestry in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) and other policies. (b) A minimum of 10 case studies from PEN research on policy constraints to forest-based poverty alleviation.	National economic planning agencies, development agencies, researchers, forestry ministries.	Improved policy alleviation policies that take into account the role of forests resources as a safety net, gap filler, subsistence income, source of savings and investment, and occasional path out of poverty.	Forest-based incomes of the poor increase, cease decreasing, and/or are more protected and of higher quality, e.g. participants in community forestry projects begin to get a greater share of forest income than in the past.

Financial Tables

Table 1. CIFOR-Cost Allocation: Allocation of Projects Cost to CGIAR System Priorities, 2005-2009 (in \$ million)

Project	System Priorities	2006 (estimated)	2007 (proposed)	2008 (plan 1)	2009 (plan 2)
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests	Priority 3D	1.033	1.113	1.016	1.013
	Priority 4A	1.069	1.055	0.853	0.953
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.102	2.168	1.869	1.966
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes	Priority 3D	0.645	0.711	0.794	0.813
	Priority 4A	0.633	0.697	0.787	0.801
	Priority 5B	0.131	0.142	0.147	0.159
	Priority 5C	0.195	0.185	0.221	0.227
	Priority 1B	0.186	0.207	0.232	0.236
	Priority 5D	0.116	0.153	0.127	0.150
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	1.906	2.095	2.308	2.386
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services	Priority 3D	0.353	0.397	0.514	0.433
	Priority 4A	1.224	1.424	0.973	1.242
	Priority 4C	0.159	0.164	0.411	0.251
	Priority 5D	0.462	0.565	0.571	0.549
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.198	2.550	2.469	2.475
Project 4: Governance of Multi-stakeholder Forested Landscapes	Priority 3D	0.170	0.100	0.107	0.104
	Priority 4A	0.296	0.355	0.315	0.265
	Priority 4D	0.024	0.015	0.019	0.012
	Priority 5A	0.359	0.451	0.420	0.338
	Priority 5B	0.100	0.164	0.127	0.107
	Priority 5C	0.680	0.627	0.597	0.523
	Priority 5D	1.620	1.384	1.268	1.171
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	3.249	3.096	2.853	2.520
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability	Priority 3D	0.312	0.202	0.270	0.271
	Priority 4A	0.165	0.085	0.118	0.127
	Priority 4D	0.031	0.034	0.039	0.024
	Priority 5A	0.173	0.155	0.145	0.163
	Priority 5B	0.226	0.381	0.411	0.351
	Priority 5C	1.085	0.573	0.685	0.809
	Priority 5D	0.459	0.245	0.291	0.344
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.451	1.675	1.959	2.089
Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods	Priority 3D	0.359	0.354	0.347	0.354
	Priority 4A	0.552	0.506	0.593	0.552
	Priority 5B	0.503	0.487	0.557	0.517
	Priority 5C	0.675	0.586	0.643	0.637
	Priority 1B	0.278	0.315	0.372	0.324
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.367	2.248	2.512	2.384
Project 7: Improving Human Well-being through Forests	Priority 3D	0.568	0.579	0.568	0.618
	Priority 4A	0.530	0.498	0.489	0.547
	Priority 5B	0.669	0.668	0.634	0.710
	Priority 5C	0.636	0.636	0.610	0.678
	Priority 1B	0.294	0.287	0.329	0.327
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.697	2.668	2.630	2.880
TOTAL BY CENTER		16.970	16.500	16.600	16.700

Table 2. CIFOR-Undertaking, Activities and Sectors, 2005-2009 (in \$ million)

Undertaking, Activities and Sectors	2006 (estimate d)	2007 (propos al)	2008 (plan 1)	2009 (plan 2)
Increasing Productivity	5.073	5.211	5.134	5.183
Germplasm Enhancement & Breeding	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Production Systems Development & Management	5.073	5.211	5.134	5.183
Cropping systems	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Livestock systems	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Tree systems	5.073	5.211	5.134	5.183
Fish systems	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Protecting the Environment	3.617	3.602	3.347	3.206
Saving Biodiversity	2.872	3.010	3.145	3.212
Improving Policies	3.664	3.457	3.564	3.603
Strengthening NARS	1.744	1.220	1.410	1.496
Training and Professional Development	0.076	0.080	0.078	0.075
Documentation, Publications, Info. Dissemination	1.668	1.140	1.332	1.421
Organization & Management Counselling	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Networks	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
TOTAL BY CENTER	16.970	16.500	16.600	16.700

Table 3. CIFOR-Cost Allocation: Allocation of Projects Cost to CGIAR Regions, 2005-2009 (in \$ million)

Project	Regions	2005 (actual)	2006 (estimated)	2007 (propos al)	2008 (plan 1)	2009 (plan 2)
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests						
	SSA	0.642	0.763	0.905	1.381	1.113
	Asia	1.257	0.978	0.812	0.126	0.457
	LAC	0.498	0.361	0.451	0.362	0.396
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.397	2.102	2.168	1.869	1.966
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes						
	SSA	0.434	0.471	0.523	0.480	0.686
	Asia	1.176	1.074	0.955	1.142	0.993
	LAC	0.514	0.361	0.617	0.686	0.707
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.124	1.906	2.095	2.308	2.386
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services						
	SSA	0.505	0.687	0.688	0.665	0.667
	Asia	1.180	0.979	0.872	0.966	0.906
	LAC	1.015	0.532	0.990	0.838	0.902
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.700	2.198	2.550	2.469	2.475
Project 4: Governance of Multi-stakeholder Forested Landscapes						
	SSA	1.103	0.921	0.935	0.807	0.738
	Asia	1.647	1.818	1.424	1.259	1.137
	LAC	0.548	0.510	0.737	0.787	0.645
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	3.298	3.249	3.096	2.853	2.520
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability						
	SSA	0.464	0.407	0.375	0.235	0.350
	Asia	1.874	1.590	0.962	1.519	1.427
	LAC	0.332	0.454	0.338	0.205	0.312
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.670	2.451	1.675	1.959	2.089
Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods						
	SSA	0.613	0.879	1.033	1.179	1.233
	Asia	1.096	1.146	0.827	0.974	0.902
	LAC	0.282	0.342	0.388	0.359	0.249
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	1.991	2.367	2.248	2.512	2.384

Project 7: Improving Human Well-being through Forests						
	SSA	0.894	1.227	0.954	1.248	1.278
	Asia	1.145	1.053	1.105	0.919	1.046
	LAC	0.465	0.417	0.609	0.463	0.556
TOTAL BY PROJECT		2.504	2.697	2.668	2.630	2.880
TOTAL BY CENTER		17.684	16.970	16.500	16.600	16.700

Table 4. CIFOR-Expenditures, 2005-2009 Object of Expenditure, (in \$million)

Object of Expenditures	2005 (actual)	2006 (estimated)	2007 (proposal)	2008 (plan 1)	2009 (plan 2)
Personnel	7.456	8.029	7.965	8.030	8.080
Supplies and services	3.432	2.826	2.504	2.454	2.462
Collaboration/ Partnerships	5.309	4.825	4.783	4.877	4.870
Operational Travel	1.142	0.874	0.873	0.851	0.868
Depreciation	0.345	0.416	0.375	0.388	0.420
TOTAL BY CENTER	17.684	16.970	16.500	16.600	16.700

Table 5. CIFOR-Financing: Members/Non Members Unrestricted Grants, 2005-2007 (in \$ million)

Members/Non Members	2005 (actual)	2006 (estimated)	2007 (proposal)
MEMBERS			
Australia	0.217	0.189	0.189
Canada	0.548	0.365	0.385
China	0.010	0.010	0.010
Finland	0.395	0.402	0.429
France	0.089	0.090	0.096
Germany	0.323	0.294	0.314
Indonesia	0.050	0.054	0.054
Israel	0.050	0.050	0.050
Japan	0.137	0.140	0.147
Netherlands	1.329	1.010	1.075
Norway	0.984	1.014	1.150
Philippines	0.007	0.008	0.007
Sweden	0.399	0.370	0.403
Switzerland	0.414	0.390	0.412
United Kingdom	1.102	1.096	1.180
United States	0.725	0.617	0.544
World Bank	0.900	1.050	1.050
TOTAL MEMBERS	7.679	7.149	7.495
NON MEMBERS			
TOTAL BY CENTER	7.679	7.149	7.495

Table 6. CIFOR-Financing: Allocation of Members/Non Members Grants to Projects, 2005-2007 (in \$ million)

Project	Members/Non Members	2006 (estimated)	2007 (propos al)
Project 1: Sustainable Use of Forests	MEMBERS		
	Brazil	0.020	0.000
	European Commission	0.412	0.529
	France	0.135	0.135
	Germany	0.040	0.144
	Netherlands	0.020	0.023
	UNEP	0.125	0.215
	World Bank	0.020	0.000
	TOTAL MEMBERS	0.772	1.046
	NON MEMBERS		
	CIRAD	0.354	0.209
	International Tropical Timber Organization	0.017	0.000
	RSCI - Peruvian Secretariat	0.062	0.000
	Tropical Forest Foundation	0.092	0.092
	Unidentified	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.525	0.301
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.297	1.347
	Unrestricted + center inc	0.805	0.821
TOTAL BY PROJECT		2.102	2.168
Project 2: Biodiversity in Fragmented Landscapes	MEMBERS		
	European Commission	0.778	0.832
	Finland	0.061	0.110
	Switzerland	0.279	0.403
	TOTAL MEMBERS	1.118	1.345
	NON MEMBERS		
	Unidentified	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.000	0.000
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.118	1.345
	Unrestricted + center inc	0.788	0.750
TOTAL BY PROJECT		1.906	2.095
Project 3: Forest Ecosystem Services	MEMBERS		
	European Commission	0.574	0.851
	Japan	0.190	0.250
	Netherlands	0.062	0.070
	Spain	0.149	0.308
	Sweden	0.071	0.000
	World Bank	0.007	0.000
	TOTAL MEMBERS	1.053	1.479
	NON MEMBERS		
	Unidentified	0.043	0.000
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.043	0.000
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.096	1.479
	Unrestricted + center inc	1.102	1.071
TOTAL BY PROJECT		2.198	2.550

Project 4: Governance of Multi-stakeholder Forested Landscapes	MEMBERS		
	Australia	0.106	0.032
	Canada	0.040	0.000
	Ford Foundation	0.330	0.411
	IDRC	0.425	0.696
	Italy	0.039	0.044
	Japan	0.060	0.002
	Korea, Republic of	0.148	0.148
	Netherlands	0.084	0.096
	United Kingdom	0.216	0.000
	United States	0.045	0.000
	World Bank	0.020	0.000
	TOTAL MEMBERS	1.513	1.429
	NON MEMBERS		
	IFPRI	0.055	0.000
	Swiss Agency for Environment, Forests and Landscape	0.078	0.000
	Unidentified	0.035	0.155
	World Resources Institute (WRI)	0.064	0.000
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.232	0.155
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.745	1.584
	Unrestricted + center inc	1.504	1.512
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	3.249	3.096
Project 5: Forest Finance and Trade, Law Enforcement and Corporate Accountability	MEMBERS		
	Ford Foundation	0.044	0.000
	Germany	0.513	0.349
	Japan	0.060	0.002
	Netherlands	0.101	0.090
	United Kingdom	0.239	0.000
	United States	0.014	0.000
	World Bank	0.000	0.025
	TOTAL MEMBERS	0.971	0.466
	NON MEMBERS		
	CORDAID	0.309	0.040
	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	0.050	0.025
	The Nature Conservatory	0.048	0.000
	UNFF	0.000	0.040
	Unidentified	0.035	0.155
	World Resources Institute (WRI)	0.041	0.000
	World Wildlife Fund	0.032	0.000
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.515	0.260
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.486	0.726
	Unrestricted + center inc	0.965	0.949
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.451	1.675

Project 6: Managing Landscapes for Sustainable Livelihoods	MEMBERS		
	Canada	0.023	0.000
	FAO	0.109	0.000
	IFAD	0.222	0.151
	Sweden	0.158	0.118
	United States	0.235	0.500
	World Bank	0.126	0.030
	TOTAL MEMBERS	0.873	0.799
	NON MEMBERS		
	Conservation International Foundation	0.075	0.000
	International Tropical Timber Organization	0.169	0.185
	IUCN	0.015	0.000
	MacArthur Foundation	0.000	0.045
	SANREM	0.029	0.000
	Unidentified	0.000	0.023
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.288	0.253
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.161	1.052
	MEMBERS		
	Unrestricted + center inc	1.206	1.196
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.367	2.248
Project 7: Improving Human Well-being through Forests	MEMBERS		
	Australia	0.026	0.162
	Belgium	0.058	0.000
	Canada	0.000	0.058
	European Commission	0.059	0.059
	FAO	0.040	0.000
	France	0.037	0.088
	IFAD	0.169	0.196
	Netherlands	0.146	0.149
	Sweden	0.158	0.177
	United States	0.270	0.000
	World Bank	0.068	0.076
	TOTAL MEMBERS	1.031	0.965
	NON MEMBERS		
	MacArthur Foundation	0.024	0.072
	Overbrook Foundation	0.075	0.063
	Unidentified	0.021	0.023
	TOTAL NON MEMBERS	0.120	0.158
	TOTAL MEMBERS + NON MEMBERS	1.151	1.123
	MEMBERS		
	Unrestricted + center inc	1.546	1.545
	TOTAL BY PROJECT	2.697	2.668
	TOTAL BY CENTER	16.970	16.500

Table 7. CIFOR Staff Composition: Internationally and Nationally Recruited Staff, 2005 - 2009

Staff Type	2005 (actual)	2006 (estimated)	2007 (proposal)	2008 (plan 1)	2009 (plan 2)
Internationally-Recruited Staff (IRS)	38	49	48	48	48
Other Staff	142	149	149	146	146
TOTAL BY CENTER	180	198	197	194	194

Table 8. CIFOR-Financial Position: Currency Structure of Expenditures, 2005-2007 (in \$ million)

Currency	2005 (actual)			2006 (estimated)			2007 (proposal)		
	Amount	US\$ Value	%Share	Amount	US\$ Value	%Share	Amount	US\$ Value	%Share
Euro (EUR)	0.860	1.060	5.994	0.848	1.018	5.999	0.773	0.988	5.988
Pound Sterling (GBP)	0.094	0.172	0.973	0.098	0.170	1.002	0.086	0.165	1.000
Indonesian Rupiah (IDR)	31976.56	3.284	18.570	29662.86	3.224	18.998	28191.09	3.063	18.564
	0			1			1		
Others (Others)	0.000	1.516	8.573	0.000	1.527	8.998	0.000	1.413	8.564
US Dollar (USD)	11.477	11.477	64.900	10.861	10.861	64.001	10.708	10.708	64.897
Zimbabwe Dollar (ZWD)	2772.958	0.175	0.990	16829.09	0.170	1.002	16210.00	0.163	0.988
				2			1		
TOTAL BY CENTER		17.684	100.000		16.970	100.000		16.500	100.000

Table 9. CIFOR Statement of Activities for the Year Ending December 31, 2005 (in \$million)

	Unrestricted	Restricted Temporary	Challenge Programs	Total 2005	Total 2004
Revenue and Gains					
Grant Revenue	7.679	9.167	0.000	16.846	14.951
Other revenue and gains	0.473	0.000	0.000	0.473	0.226
Total revenue and gains	8.152	9.167	0.000	17.319	15.177
Expenses and Losses					
Program related expenses	5.751	9.167	0.000	14.918	13.187
Management and general expenses	3.427	0.000	0.000	3.427	2.590
Other losses expenses	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Sub Total expenses and losses	9.178	9.167	0.000	18.345	15.777
Indirect cost recovery	-0.661	0.000	0.000	-0.661	-0.494
Total expenses and losses	8.517	9.167	0.000	17.684	15.283
Net Surplus / (Deficit) from ordinary activities	-0.365	0.000	0.000	-0.365	-0.106
Extraordinary Items	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)	-0.365	0.000	0.000	-0.365	-0.106
Object of Expenditures					
Personnel	4.215	3.241	0.000	7.456	7.578
Supplies and services	2.293	1.139	0.000	3.432	2.492
Collaboration/ Partnerships	1.134	4.175	0.000	5.309	4.020
Operational Travel	0.530	0.612	0.000	1.142	0.887
Depreciation	0.345	0.000	0.000	0.345	0.306
TOTAL BY CENTER	8.517	9.167	0.000	17.684	15.283

Table 10. CIFOR Statements of Financial Position as of December 31, 2005 (in \$ million)

	2005	2004
A S S E T S		
Current Assets		
Cash and cash equivalents	8.876	10.237
Accounts receivable		
Donor	3.906	2.838
Employees	0.274	0.297
Others	0.728	0.699
Prepaid expenses	0.314	0.370
Total current assets	14.098	14.441
Non-Current Assets		
Property, Plant and Equipment	1.648	1.698
Other Assets	0.046	0.000
Total Non-Current Assets	1.694	1.698
TOTAL ASSETS	15.792	16.139
LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS		
Current Liabilities		
Accounts payable		
Donor	4.017	4.265
Others	0.049	0.053
Accruals	0.946	0.685
Total current liabilities	5.012	5.003
Non-Current Liabilities		
Accounts payable		
Employees	2.294	2.285
Total non-current liabilities	2.294	2.285
Total liabilities	7.306	7.288
Net Assets		
Unrestricted		
Designated	3.003	3.003

Undesignated	5.483	5.848
Total Unrestricted Net Assets	8.486	8.851
Total net assets	8.486	8.851
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	15.792	16.139

Appendix I: Progress report on implementation of CGIAR approved EPMR recommendations

EPMR Recommendations	Summary of CIFOR's Board and Management Response	Implementation		
		Milestones	Progress Achieved	Date of Completion
1 CIFOR should evolve its current grouping of research activities into a framework that links more closely and clearly its research activities and their outputs to CIFOR's mission and to the broad thematic needs implied by it.	Accepted: The Board and Management recognized that the existing grouping of research activities was not optimal, and that there were too many separate projects. They said that they wanted to re-organize the center in a way that was demand-driven and not based on disciplines.	Regroup research activities into three programs, focusing on livelihoods, environmental services and sustainable use of forests, and forests and governance	Reorganization completed	2003
2 CIFOR should develop a more formal, transparent and systematic priority setting process that includes an explicit set of criteria for (1) judging exclusion or inclusion: appropriateness to mission, cost-effectiveness, international public goods contribution; and (2) setting priorities among the group of included project activities and among projects.	Accepted: The Board and Management agreed with the need to increase the clarity and transparency of the allocations between projects. Yet, the Board said it was not sure whether it would be possible to allocate resources between or within projects on the basis of ex-ante impact assessments in a rigidly quantitative way.	Clarify priority setting and resource allocation procedures	CIFOR held a workshop to do a formal priority setting exercise in 2000. It generated a healthy discussion but failed to produce a set of priorities for reasons noted in the management response.	Intended for 2007
3 The BOT should seek Trustees who, between them, have broad managerial and financial competencies, familiarity with the CGIAR System, and with the private sector.	Accepted: The Board and Management accepted this recommendation and the Board agreed to seek additional members to enhance its skills in these areas.	Appoint board members with greater familiarity with the CGIAR System, the private sector, and financial procedures.	Relevant appointments include Angela Cropper (2000), Walter Falcon (2001) and Andrew Bennett (2002). Drs Falcon and Bennett have much CGIAR experience. Dr. Bennett also brings a private sector perspective.	2002
4 CIFOR should carefully consider re-establishing the link between performance evaluations and salary increases	Accepted: The Board and Management accepted this recommendation, and said it would develop a reward structure to reward scientific results.	Develop a reward structure for scientific performance	Each program and division director now gives merit increases based on their evaluation of staff performance.	2001
5 Management should implement an organisational arrangement that (a) filters all potential and present projects and their component activities through an organising framework to ensure consistency with CIFOR's mission and strategic objectives; and (b) maintains the essential underpinnings of good management processes	Accepted: The Board and Management agreed that project leaders need to have a clearer role, accountability had to be clarified and that project leaders needed to have sufficient authority to permit them to meet their objectives. It was also important and appropriate to have a management model partially based on self-motivating work groups.	Clarify management processes and establish organizing framework for filtering potential and present projects.	CIFOR reduced the number of research programs, hired full-time program directors, and strengthened their authority to ensure that research staff were adequately supervised and mentored. A Programme Development Unit was established to improve proposal quality.	2003

Appendix II: Glossary of Acronymns

ACM:	Adaptive Collaborative Management
AFP:	Asian Forest Partnership
AI:	Amazon Initiative
ASB:	Alternatives to Slash and Burn Consortium
ASB:	Association of Southeastern Biologists
BBC:	British Broadcasting Corporation
BOT:	Board of Trustees
CARE International:	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CATIE:	Centro Agronómico Tropical de Investigación y Enseñanza
CBD:	Convention on Biodiversity
CDM:	Clean Development Mechanism
CECADESU:	Center for Education and Training in Sustainable Development
CGIAR:	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CI:	Conservation International
CIAT:	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIFOR:	Center for International Forestry Research
CIRAD:	Agricultural Research for Developing Countries
CLIFS:	Congo Livelihood Improvement and Food Security
CNBC:	Consumer News and Business Channel
CONAFOR:	Mexican National Forestry Commission
CPF:	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CSIRO:	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization
DRC:	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAG:	External Advisory Group
EMBRAPA:	Empresa Brasileira de Pesquisa Agropecuária
eNRIC:	Electronic Natural Resources Information Center
EPMR:	External Programme and Management Review
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FATF:	Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering
FLEG:	Forest Law Enforcement and Governance
FORDA:	Forestry Research and Development Agency Indonesia
FSC:	Forest Stewardship Council
GEF:	Global Environment Facility
GFIS:	Global Forestry Information System
GSG:	Global Steering Group
GTZ:	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
ICDPs:	Integrated Conservation and Development Programmes
ICRAF:	International Center for Research in Agroforestry
IFAD:	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IICA:	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
INRM:	Integrated Natural Resource Management
IPAM:	Instituto de Pesquisa Ambiental da Amazônia
IPCC:	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IRD:	Institut de Recherche pour le développement
ITTA:	International Tropical Timber Agreement
ITTO:	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN:	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IUFRO:	International Union of Forest Research Organizations
IUFRO:	International Union of Forest Research Organizations
IWGCC:	Inter-Center Working Group on Climate Change

IWMI:	International Water Management Insitute
LULUCF:	Land use, Land-use Change and Forestry
MA:	Millennium Assessment
MDGs:	Millennium Development Goals
MEA:	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MIGA:	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
MTP:	Medium Term Plan
NEPAD:	New Partnership for African Development
NGOs:	Non-Governmental Organizations
NRM:	Natural Resource Management
NTFP:	Non-Timber Forest Product
PEN:	Poverty Environment Network
PEP:	Poverty Environment Partnership
PES:	Payment for Environmental Services
PPATK:	Indonesian Financial Intelligence Unit
PROCYMAF:	Mexican Community Forestry Project
PRSPs:	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
R&D:	Research and Development
RIL:	Reduced Impact Logging
SEA:	South East Asia
SEMARNAP:	Mexican Ministry of the Environment
SFM:	Sustainable Forest Management
SLIMF:	Small and Low Intensity Forest Management
TCP:	Technical Cooperation Project
TNC:	The Nature Conservancy
TroFCCA:	Tropical Forests and Climate Change Adaption
UN:	United Nations
UNCCD:	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNEP:	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC:	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF:	United Nations Forum on Forests
WCS:	Wildlife Conservation SocietyP
WHO:	World Health Organization
WWF:	World Wide Fund for Nature

Appendix III: CGIAR System Priorities

Priority area 1: Sustaining biodiversity for current and future generations

Priority 1A: Conservation and characterization of staple crops

Priority 1B: Promoting conservation and characterization of under-utilized plant genetic resources to increase the income of the poor

Priority 1C: Conservation of indigenous livestock

Priority 1D: Conservation of aquatic animal genetic resources

Priority area 2: Producing more and better food at lower cost through genetic improvements

Priority 2A: Maintaining and enhancing yields and yield potential of food staples

Priority 2B: Tolerance to selected abiotic stresses

Priority 2C: Enhancing nutritional quality and safety

Priority 2D: Genetic enhancement of selected high-value species

Priority area 3: Reducing rural poverty through agricultural diversification and emerging opportunities for high-value commodities and products

Priority 3A: Increasing income from fruit and vegetables

Priority 3B: Income increases from livestock

Priority 3C: Enhancing income through increased productivity of fisheries and aquaculture

Priority 3D: Sustainable income generation from forests and trees

Priority area 4: Poverty alleviation and sustainable management of water, land, and forest resources

Priority 4A: Integrated land, water and forest management at landscape level

Priority 4B: Sustaining and managing aquatic ecosystems for food and livelihoods

Priority 4C: Improving water productivity

Priority 4D: Sustainable agro-ecological intensification in low- and high-potential areas

Priority area 5: Improving policies and facilitating institutional innovation to support sustainable reduction of poverty and hunger

Priority 5A: Science and technology policies and institutions

Priority 5B: Making international and domestic markets work for the poor

Priority 5C: Rural institutions and their governance

Priority 5D: Improving research and development options to reduce rural poverty and vulnerability