



GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPATORY FOREST MANAGEMENT

Experience Applying the WRI's GoF Initiative
Assessment Methodology and Indicator
Framework in Malawi

PERFORM

Lilongwe, Malawi
September, 2015



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Why Assess Forest Governance?

- It is easier to manage things that can be measured
- Challenges in measuring forest governance impede efforts to strengthen it

The GFI Indicator Framework contributes to addressing both challenges by:

- ✓ Providing a clear model for identifying what to assess, and
- ✓ Providing a qualitative assessment approach that is systematic and replicable



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Background

- ❖ With support from WRI, PERFORM applied the GFI Indicator Framework to conduct PFG assessments in two PERFORM pilot sites:
 - ❖ Mzimba (Perekezi FR, and surroundings)
 - ❖ Machinga (Liwonde FR, and surroundings)
 - ❖ And later...Ntchisi (Ntchisi FR, and surroundings)
- ❖ **Goal**
 - ❖ to analyze strengths and weaknesses of PFM implementation in Malawi—in the FRs, VFAs and in traditional lands...
 - ❖ ...to inform the design and implementation of forestry interventions in each site



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The GFI Framework

Was designed for application globally, across ecosystems types—and as such contains 122 indicators (each with key questions)

- organized into six thematic areas, and
- further divided into subthemes in order for users to easily identify and prioritize indicators based on their assessment objectives
- To apply the indicator framework you pick relevant indicators, and pick (adapt) the subset of questions (PERFORM selected a subset of 19 GFI Indicators)



GFI Indicator Structure

Forest tenure	Land use	Forest management	Forest revenues	Cross-cutting: institutions	Cross-cutting: issues
Forest ownership and use rights	Land use planning	Forest legal and policy framework	Forest charge administration	Legislature	Public participation in decision-making
Tenure dispute resolution	Land use plan implementation	Forest strategies and plans	Forest revenue distribution	Judiciary	Public access to information
State forest ownership	Sectoral land use	Forest monitoring	Benefit-sharing	Executive agencies	Financial transparency and accountability
Concession allocation	Forest classification	Forest management practices	Budgeting	Private sector	Anticorruption measures
		Forest law enforcement		Civil society	



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Guidance

As a companion to the Indicator Framework, The GFI Guidance Manual helps the user navigate decisions about how to design and implement a governance assessment using the GFI indicators. The manual also includes detailed indicator-by-indicator guidance and worksheets to support the data collection process

http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/gfi_guidance_manual.pdf

1

TITLE

A short phrase that summarizes the scope of the indicator

Legal recognition of forest tenure rights

DIAGNOSTIC QUESTION

A question that summarizes the qualitative scale of assessment

To what extent does the legal framework recognize a broad spectrum of existing forest tenure rights and rights-holders?

ELEMENTS OF QUALITY

Three to six qualitative elements that are the focus of data collection and help the user answer the diagnostic question in a structured manner

ELEMENTS OF QUALITY

Individual rights. The forest tenure rights held by individuals and households are recognized in the legal framework.

Communal rights. The forest tenure rights collectively held by local communities and other relevant groups are recognized in the legal framework.

Traditional rights. The forest tenure rights traditionally held by indigenous peoples and other groups with customary tenure systems are recognized in the legal framework.

Rights of women. The legal framework does not discriminate against the forest tenure rights of women.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Tools Used

First...

- Semi-structured FGDs with state actors (DoF, RFO, DFO) on co-management; forest law enforcement, monitoring, benefit sharing
- Semi-structured FGD with non-state actors (BMC) on co-management; forest law enforcement, benefit sharing
- Community FGD on management of Village Forest Areas

Then...

- Multi-Stakeholder Workshop



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Findings

- ✓ Inadequate information base for a management plan (given the lack of science, cannot inform sustained use), and use largely unregulated
 - Liwonde:
 - 1.7% of the FR cleared between 2001 and 2013
 - 26% of the buffer zone cleared between 2001 and 2013
 - Perekezi:
 - 2.2% of the FR cleared between 2001 and 2013
 - 8.7% of the buffer zone cleared between 2001 and 2013
- ✓ Marked lack of trust between State/non-State “co-management partners”
- ✓ The co-management approach lacks clear roles & responsibilities for TAs/GVHs/VHs—so support/buy-in may be compromised
- ✓ Management of VFAs generally better than FR (tied to “ownership” and “stronger leadership”)
- ✓ Inadequate implementation, monitoring, evaluation
- ✓ Lack of transparency and accountability in revenue sharing scheme—deepening distrust (no documented systems or procedures)
- ✓ Monitoring, evaluation and law enforcement



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Conclusions

While...

- a supportive policy and legal framework for PFM exists, and
- important progress has been made with its implementation (FMSLP)

This assessment identified specific challenges for PFM:

- appropriate technical parameters for SFM are not generally reflected in co-management plans.
- The complexity of the plans limits their understanding, uptake and implementation (by all stakeholders).
- ineffective efforts to engage communities in joint development of plans (limited by capacity, information, etc.)
- design/roll-out of PFM has introduced complexity in terms of the relationship between BMCs and TAs.
- roles and responsibilities for implementation and monitoring are generally unclear and not complied with.
- there are a lack of clear and functioning mechanisms to resolve conflicts between stakeholders involved in co-management activities.
- implementation of benefit sharing mechanisms face numerous challenges: transparency; contribution to SFM; contribution to livelihood improvement