



South West Forest and Landscape Grouping (SWFLG)

# Roundtable Experience Sharing Workshop on Participatory Forest Management

September 19th, 2014  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia



<http://wetlandsandforests.hud.ac.uk> | [www.ewnra.org](http://www.ewnra.org)



Ethio-Wetlands and Natural Resources Association

University of HUDDERSFIELD



**SWFLG** is an informal grouping of organisations which are interested in the development of an ecologically sound and socio-economically sensitive approach to the management of the south west landscapes of Ethiopia. The members of the grouping to date are: University of Huddersfield (UK), Ethio-Wetlands & Natural Resources Association, and Sustainable Livelihood Action/Wetland Action EEIG (the Netherlands). They have been partners in projects funded by the EU and several other international donors since 1996 and have built up specific expertise in the areas outlined above.

Other organisations are encouraged to join the Grouping.

**Contact:** Prof Adrian Wood: [a.p.wood@hud.ac.uk](mailto:a.p.wood@hud.ac.uk)

# Contents

Introduction .....	1
Summary of presentations .....	2
Participatory forest management learning paper - reflections on key lessons, challenges and recommendations. Drawing on the experiences of the NTFP – PFM project in Southwest Ethiopia...	2
Impact of PFM on livelihood, forest conditions and equity – experiences of SWFLG .....	4
Experiences on forest management institutions – experiences of SWFLG.....	6
Statements from community representatives .....	8
Main points of discussion .....	14
Recommendations / Next Steps .....	18
Annexes .....	19
Annex 1: Opening speech .....	19
Annex 2: Workshop programme .....	21
Annex 3: List of Participants.....	22



## Introduction

The roundtable ‘Experience Sharing Workshop on Participatory Forest Management (PFM)’ was organized to share experiences of PFM best practices, challenges and lessons from the rainforests of Southwest Ethiopia. The workshop aimed to contribute to the development of regional forest management policy and strategy as well as the national PFM and forest policy roadmap. This in turn is expected to contribute to the country’s climate resilient green economy strategy.

The roundtable discussion included presentations of a PFM learning paper as well as the experiences of impacts of

PFM and institutional arrangement from the South West. To enrich the technical presentations with practical experiences, short testimonials were presented by community representatives (leaders of Forest Management Associations at woreda level).

Representatives of government institutions, local communities, NGOs and a technical working group on PFM from the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), took part in the discussion. These proceedings summarize the presentations and key discussion points.



## Summary of Presentations

### **Participatory forest management learning paper - reflections on key lessons, challenges and recommendations. Drawing on the experiences of the NTFP – PFM project in Southwest Ethiopia.**

*By Peter O'Hara, PFM advisor*

Participatory Forest Management (PFM) increases the value of forests for local people through tenure, legal use rights and sustained supply of products for home consumption and sale. There is a tradeoff for government, allowing local control and legal use of the forest in return for community maintenance of the forest cover and wise management in return.

In PFM, Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) is the result of granting forest users rights on a solid foundation of secure forest tenure. The devolved forest management equation states that forest tenure security together with productive and profitable forestry results in community driven sustainable forest management.

Work with communities in the South West confirms that after PFM is implemented, feelings of ownership, levels of income from forest products and levels of responsibility for the forest within communities have all increased

significantly. The fact that PFM grew from this real understanding of what motivates people to manage the forest is its strength, unlike other approaches such as Biosphere Reserves where actions are based on the initially untested theory of delinking and buffering communities to protect forests.

Key principles of PFM include:

- devolution of forest control to communities who identify with the forest,
- strengthening links between customary forest users and forest resources,
- allowing use of forest resources legally and wisely, and
- applying PFM agreements between government and communities – this includes the potential loss of rights to the forest by communities if they use the forest illegally and in an uncontrolled manner outside that agreement.

Further, it is important to develop government trust in communities - that they will not abuse their new rights and will fulfill their responsibilities; and trust by communities in government - that they will respect their new roles.

Key challenges identified in South West Ethiopia include gaps in tenure, user

rights and forest-based enterprise development support. The legislation does not clearly, consistently and sufficiently incentivize PFM and this is reflected in weak PFM agreements. Communities are given a greater level of control but responsibilities without commensurate user rights has and will lead to community fatigue. Continued criminalizing of wood use for sale from indigenous trees will lead to demotivation of communities and limit opportunities for enterprises and consumers to buy sustainably produced wood. Further, another important challenge is identified as professionals' reluctance to fully embrace devolved forest management. Professional practices are skewed towards a conservationist mode of dealing with natural forest. Insufficient trust by government that communities will be able to use natural forests sustainably and reluctance to relinquish real power over the natural forests to communities are both major challenges.

The following key recommendations are given:

- PFM should not only be scaled-up on the ground but also integrated better within government, policy, legislation and institutional roles and responsibilities. This includes

mainstreaming of PFM and professional re-orientation.

- The term “PFM” should be changed to “devolved forest management”. This is to avoid confusion over the levels of participation in forest management. Changing the name will enable professionals to see PFM as a government programme based on legislation, rather than simple community based projects.
- Voice of communities in PFM needs to be strengthened. PFM organizations need to have voice at regional and federal levels of government. They also need to become self-financing and appropriate processes, platforms and forums created for exchanges between community members and key decision makers.
- Support for forest enterprises, marketing and active forest management needs to be strengthened. Decriminalization of a broad range of PFM forest products is needed to release the value of the forest and ensure the forest does not become manipulated to only have few species. Legal PFM-linked enterprise development and marketing that will motivate communities to manage PFM forests needs to be supported. This can be initiated at a controlled pilot scale.

## Impact of PFM on livelihood, forest conditions and equity – experiences of SWFLG

*By Ahmid Said*



South West Forest and Landscape Grouping (SWFLG) is implementing PFM in Oromia and Southern National Nationalities and Peoples' Regional State (SNNPRS) over a forest area covering 895,251.70 ha, in the range of 900 – 2600 masl. The national and international importance of these forest areas is high, demanding a concerted effort for their management.

The core problem in the Sout West is insecure forest tenure leading to open access. This has led to community members losing the will to invest in forest management and rationally deciding to convert the forest to agriculture land. The fact that there is no certification for forest land similar to agricultural

lands has exacerbated the rate of this conversion. SWFLG is working to address this concern and has so far succeeded in securing communal forest land certification for 73 forest management / user groups (FMGs).

To date, the impacts of PFM on forest conditions included:

- a decrease in forest destructive activities such as encroachment, settlements, forest fire and illegal harvesting,
- increased regeneration of indigenous trees, and
- regulated NTFP harvesting.

PFM has resulted in an increase in income from forest products, as well as an increase in skills and knowledge on sustainable utilization and business management. Communities have started collective harvesting which has resulted in reducing price risks. Evidence from a household survey conducted in 2013 showed that forest based income increased 145% from 4967 ET Birr/ annum to 12193 ET Birr/annum and income from honey and spices increased 30 & 10 fold respectively over the previous 5 years. These increments were partly attributed to the marketing development support provided by the project.



Through PFM, evidence-based policy support to the regional government has resulted in legal recognition of community forests and the rights of communities to use non timber forest products. Active participation of women and marginalised groups has also increased as bylaws of CBOs have clearly addressed issues of gender bias and participation of marginalised groups.

- for natural resources management,
- the establishment of the new Ministry of Environment and Forest, the existence of regional proclamations supporting PFM (e.g. Oromia and SNNPRS) and
- the REDD+ initiatives that support carbon offset schemes for community forests.

Key challenges identified include:

- low incentives obtained from the forest as compared to the increased efforts needed for active forest management,
- allocation of forest land for investment (coffee and tea) which remain a threat to PFM communities,
- limitations on work done to harmonize different PFM approaches, and
- lack of institutional memory in government institutions, especially at the woreda level, due to frequent staff turnover and re-structuring.

On the other hand, there are opportunities that can be used to address the challenges faced including:

- the commitment of federal and regional governments to apply PFM

## Experiences on forest management institutions – experiences of SWFLG

*By Anteneh Tesfaye*

PFM benefits both communities and government while ensuring forest lands are sustainably managed. Communities benefit when they have secure legal user rights over forests and have access to markets for the forest products they produce. Therefore, community-led marketing organizations are needed to increase options of market outlets for forest products. On the other hand the government benefits as PFM ensures that forests are no longer open access; this reduces the costs of controlling mechanisms and various transaction costs of forest management.

There is no readymade single institution that best fits PFM and so it needs innovative thinking to look for a better

organizational arrangement. When such institutions are established legal backing is important to build accountability and trust between communities and government. There needs to be a clear understanding and balanced rights and responsibilities. When establishing such institutions support is needed for building community capacity to manage forests and build self-sustaining institutions, and government capacity to support forest management groups.

Forest-based enterprise development is a remedy for the uncertainty surrounding the costs and benefits of forest management. It enhances the competitiveness of the forest sector by promoting innovation and entrepreneurship. To develop lucrative and sustainable community-based forest enterprises it needs strong organization with members having competitive business skills.

SWFLG projects have followed a bi-institutional arrangement. This is essential to balance forest management efforts by establishing legal institutions - associations - which are able to take on the work of forest management, with economic development led by entrepreneurs establishing forest product marketing cooperatives. Such



separation increases specialisation and efficiency, while offering chances for interaction and collaboration with each other to achieve goals of forest management and livelihood. A diversified institutional arrangement will reduce the complexity of forest management by dividing up the roles and responsibilities and avoiding confusion in the roles of the different institutions.

Establishment of community institutions must be a context-specific process that allows the local stakeholders to develop different scenarios which best fit the local conditions. PFM should be built upon the existing knowledge base while fending off elite capture practices to ensure equity over resource use. Gender mainstreaming is also a key for the success of equitable PFM.

As a result, the institutional arrangements promoted by SWFLG projects have been Gott-level FMGs as branches of legally registered Forest Management Associations (FMAs), (for forest management), and separate entrepreneur-led cooperatives for trade in forest products. Based on this model, 6 cooperatives and 4 woreda FMAs are now actively engaged in business and forest management responsibilities in the NTFP-PFM Project area; while a

further 6 cooperatives have recently been formed by the REPAFMA Project. Gender mainstreaming is evidenced through the establishment of women-led cooperatives, and having them in the general assembly and on the forest management committees.

## Statements from community representatives

### Tekalign Shadeno, Andracha Woreda, FMA leader

Tekalign stated that PFM has expanded in his woreda since this project started with piloting in 2 gotts in 2006. In Andracha Woreda today, there are 47 FMGs and to support these FMGs at woreda level a Forest Management Association has been established, which he is leading. According to Tekalign, the association represents these FMGs at all levels from promoting their work to dealing with legal issues. It also follows up the activities of the FMGs to ensure the communities are fulfilling their contractual agreements. To sustain the association 10% of the income from the cooperatives goes to the association, while membership fees are also contributed by the PFM Group members.

Despite this progress, a number of key challenges faced in Andracha are summarized by Tekalign as follows:

- ***Economic benefit from the forest***

The community members are benefiting well from NTFPs. However, there is increasing demand for explanation of why wood products cannot be utilized sustainably by the community, when timber is like a crop and can be harvested and regrown. These demands are further exacerbated when the communities observe investors given the right to cut down trees on the lands they have been given while communities are not even allowed to take out dead trees.



- ***Absence of regulations and guidelines***

Even though the region's proclamation acknowledges community forests, there is no regulation or guideline that can be used on a day to day basis. The FMA's do not have any guidance on what to do when faced by challenges even from the woreda government itself because it is not clear what rights they have and where they need to take up their conflicts.

This needs to be resolved immediately, both to address the concern of the communities and ensure that the forest is not mismanaged as a result of the conflict.

- ***Conflict between forest management systems introduced by different non-government actors***

This PFM project and MELCA's biosphere reserve project are operating in the same area in Andracha Woreda. These systems have conflicting approaches that have left the community members in the area frustrated. The community members who were working in PFM groups and managing their forests were suddenly told they are within the core area of the biosphere reserve and cannot continue their activities. This conflict between the two projects is not resolved and has in the meantime left the core zone forest areas open for unsustainable utilization as they are now seen as an open access resource.

### **Shaweno Sharo, Masha Woreda, FMA leader**

Shaweno expressed deep gratitude to have been given the chance to share his experiences and the challenges they are facing in Masha Woreda. His only reservation was that woreda government bodies, who can solve the challenges, are not part of this discussion.

Before PFM came to Masha Woreda, it was stated that forest resources were open access resources for all to use and abuse. A lot of illegal activities and destructions prevailed as there was no ownership. Beneficiaries were also mainly men, with little benefit going to the women headed households. After they became part of the PFM project, however, the benefits and responsibilities became inclusive, income from NTFPs increased as they started planning for both forest management and income generation and women are increasingly being involved in forest management.

Though a number of challenges have been resolved along the way, Shaweno stated that there are still several critical challenges faced that need to be addressed by all concerned.

- ***Government not respecting the agreement it signed***

When the agreements were signed between the government and communities, giving the communities rights to carry out PFM, they were celebrated as a big achievement. However, the local government does not seem to be bound by the agreement that was made with the community. Since that time, 2,000 ha of forest land that belonged to an FMA was taken back and given to another investor. The communities do not deny the fact that the government has the right to take the forest land but if this is applied, it should be done firstly with negotiation and agreement and secondly with the right compensation. This situation has left the community members in a dilemma as to what guarantee they have over the forest land that they were given to manage. For this reason, he believes, it is essential to have these kinds of discussions in the presence of woreda government bodies and if possible high level decision makers for the zone and region.

- ***Lack of technical training and support***

The community members need to have good training on silviculture. Currently they do things without the right training but he believes the results of their work will be much better if the appropriate training is provided by the project, with continuous technical support from the woreda development agents.

Further, he expressed his excitement to learn today that a Ministry of Environment and Forest is established. He believes this is a good start to have a body that is directly responsible for the forests of the country.

### **Birhane Geremew, Andracha Woreda, FMA general assembly member**

Birhane said how happy she is to be present here representing the women of Andracha. She stated that women were forgotten as contributors to development and were not part of many activities. Now, however, their significant role is acknowledged and they are part of the forest management groups from the gott to woreda level. They join hands with development agents to ensure the forests in the area are sustainably managed.

- ***Growing involvement of women***

The key challenges that are faced in the woreda have been stated by her colleagues; therefore Birhane stated she came here to share information on the level of women's involvement in the woreda. Women are more and more becoming independent and being organized as groups. The number is steadily increasing and currently 54 women are in cooperative groups while 55 women are FMA members.

Birhane has been working in activities related to PFM for a number of years now. She stated that it was not easy

to get the participation of women in the earlier days as it was not the norm. However, now, more young women are joining and Birhane considers this a big success in PFM. She further stated that “we have realized that we, women, are the ones that will suffer more when wood and water get scarce so we need to work harder and join hands in this effort”.



## **Dachu Zitu, Sheko Woreda, FMA Chairman**

Dachu stated that a lot has been done in the last several years. The biggest success, he states, is the creation of a sense of ownership in the community. Out of the 24 kebeles in the woreda, the focus so far has been on the 6 kebeles with the most forested land. A lot of awareness creation work has been done and through the years it was agreed to establish a woreda level association to support the different gott level FMGs. Currently 9362 ha of forest land and 8104 ha of coffee forest are under the PFM management, and the woreda association has a membership of 2362 individuals. According to him, the major challenges in the woreda are:

- ***Lack of technical support from woreda experts***

The FMA members are working hard to protect, develop and sustainably use the forest land that has been handed over to them. However, for proper management of the forest, the groups need to get technical support from the government. This, however, is lacking and this is discouraging. This situation needs to change.

- ***FMA rights not respected by woreda government***

The woreda level takes and gives rights as it pleases, without the proper negotiation and compensation procedures, as stated in the PFM agreement contract as well as in the country's constitution. As stated by his colleagues earlier, it is not clear what rights the communities have despite the signed agreements. He stated that the Forest Management Association has demanded to have a discussion on this with the woreda but their request is completely ignored as it was not considered a priority. The FMA needs support to clarify this concern.

## Main points of discussion

The main discussion points focused on key challenges that need solutions at the national level after 20 years of PFM experience in Ethiopia. How to take advantage of available opportunities to solve these challenges were also discussed and agreed upon.

It was acknowledged that a number of successes have been witnessed as a result of PFM. These include:

- acceptance of PFM as a forest management system by the government,
- high level of community engagement in forest management as well as enterprise development, and
- social issues that include the change in the social status of marginalized community groups such as the Manja communities.

Discussions on key challenges are summarized below.

### **Harmonization of forest users' group institutions**

A lot has been done in identifying various forms of institutions for PFM by different actors. The consensus is that there is no single institution recognized by law that perfectly fits PFM and addresses both the forest management and sustainable income aspects.

Currently the government of Ethiopia is revising its forest regulation. Now PFM is accepted as a management tool for natural forests, inputs on what kind of institutional arrangement is required are necessary. This is a great opportunity for all actors to pull together their resources and discuss this to come up



with a list of critical elements of an ideal forest institution. It was agreed that the recommendation does not need to be a fixed statement on what PFM institutions need to be but rather a list of key critical elements that need to be in place to establish a strong and sustainable forest users' group institution.

### **Forest certification and secured ownership**

Experiences in the South West clearly showed that forest management agreements do not guarantee secure ownership to the community groups. Urgent discussion and clarification on the legality of current forest management agreements is needed and what needs to be done to ensure local government respects the groups' rights. Further, it needs to be known how binding the forest certification that is being exercised in the South West is and if that can be a solution. It will be beneficial to assess and learn from the agriculture land certification process whether this can also be applied to forest certification.

### **Boosting economic value of PFM**

Despite the acceptance of PFM as a forest management tool, it still is not bringing sufficient tangible benefits to the communities. Hence, it is still hard to argue that keeping the forest is more

valuable than converting it to agricultural land when in reality more money is made by farmers and investors who convert these forest lands to other land uses. There needs to be a way to show the value of forests if it is going to be considered as more valuable than agricultural land. Therefore, forest management plans need to incorporate sustainable timber harvesting. Timber harvesting is actually practiced in some parts of Oromia as part of PFM. For example, in Doddola PFM groups can harvest timber from the natural forest as per their management plan. On the other hand only NTFP use is allowed in the SNNPRS. Therefore, PFM actors need to convince the federal government to consider this as a national policy which may initially be tested as a pilot. If PFM is to be truly used as a management tool then it is essential to develop full trust in the communities' ability to manage forests sustainably and really devolve power to them.

**Example from another country:** *In Nepal PFM meetings will normally have community members as half of the participants while the other half are government institutions, NGOs and other actors. Communities voice their issues openly and get a solution. It is good that community representatives have started participating in national meetings in Ethiopia but it is not yet a platform where communities can voice their concern directly to the responsible authority.*

## **Redefining PFM**

As stated in the presentations, participants agreed that it is time to redefine PFM to clearly understand its real meaning in the context of Ethiopia. A consensus needs to be reached as to what is meant by participation and how much power has actually been given to communities. Key questions include:

- Has PFM totally devolved all forest use rights to communities?
- What level of participation is being practiced?

These questions need to be answered. Understanding exactly what we mean by PFM will make it easier to identify what is the level of implementation we are looking for in Ethiopia and what needs to be done to fully embrace PFM.

## **Resolving conflicts between different forest management systems**

As clearly indicated by community representatives and as most of the practitioners in the discussions confirm, a number of conflicts are being faced as a result of implementing PFM and Biosphere Reserve approaches on the same forest sites. This has been witnessed in Bonga (Farm Africa and NABU) and in Masha (SWFLG and MELCA). This is creating instability and

confusion among communities. This was identified as a problem created by the government who gave the mandate to two different projects to apply totally different approaches on the same forest land. It was agreed that there is no problem in having different management approaches being applied in different areas in the country, but implementing them at the same spot will have a disastrous result. Communities have already stated that such forests are going back to their open access status because of these conflicting initiatives. This is something that needs to be addressed and resolved by the government urgently.

## **Revising/developing forest regulations and guidelines**

As agreed earlier the federal level forest policy revision is an opportunity for PFM actors to contribute practical inputs. There is a good chance that the federal policy will recognize community forests which will give the SNNPR proclamation more strength. As stated by the community members, though the SNNPR proclamation acknowledges community forests, it is meaningless without regulations and guidelines. Hence SWFLG will now push further its pending support to ensure the regional regulations and guidelines are developed to support local PFM actors, while the wider PFM actors

need to pull together their resources to contribute to the federal level policy revision.

### **Understanding the role of the Ministry of Environment and Forest (MEF)**

It was agreed that it a big step for Ethiopia to have a Ministry responsible for forests as this ministry will hopefully address the identified policy gaps. However, it has been over a year since the ministry was established and the structure has not yet gone down even to the regional level let alone to the grassroots level. There needs to be some sort of structure at the ground level that ensures policies and regulations are translated into practice.

The ministry will also need to be involved in investment decisions. Currently the Ministry of Agriculture approves investment lands but when forest lands are given for investment MEF needs to have a stake.

MEF, as a ministry, needs to be strong in its support for PFM so this is mainstreamed as the key forest management system. It will need to address the institutional gap at the local government level where budget and skilled manpower are not in place to continue the PFM projects that have started in different areas with different sources of support, including NGOs.



## Recommendations / Next Steps

The current revision of the forest proclamation/policy is identified as a rare opportunity for PFM actors to provide critical technical support. Hence the following points are considered a priority and assigned to institutions for follow up.

**SWFLG and Farm Africa to immediately coordinate a follow up meeting that will focus on the following points and provide input to the national team responsible for the policy revision.**

- Harmonization of forest users' group institutions – What critical elements need to be in place?
- Forest certification and secured ownership – How to ensure forest management agreements are respected?
- Boosting economic value of PFM – How to ensure timber harvesting becomes part of PFM?
- Redefining PFM – Clear understanding of what is meant by PFM.

**Considering the need for government intervention, MEF needs to take the responsibility for resolving the following points and communicating to stakeholders**

- Resolving conflicts between different forest management systems – How to address the current PFM-Biosphere Reserve conflicts and how to avoid it going forward?
- Clarifying the role of the Ministry of Environment and Forest – Sharing with stakeholders how the ministry's role will influence ground level implementation.

The meeting concluded with Dr. Melaku, PFM study team leader, stressing the limited time left to make sure the right/ quality inputs are given to support the forest policy revision. He stressed that after practicing PFM for over twenty years, we need to ensure that genuine forest management, better economic incentives, and better capacitated community and government experts who are able to sustainably manage our forests are in place. He emphasized that this is a rare opportunity for all practitioners to contribute to the nation's forest management vision and should be taken seriously to provide the required input on time.

## Annexes

### **Annex 1: Opening speech, Afework Hailu, EWNRA, Executive Director**

*Invited guests from Ministry of Environment and Forest; PFM study team members  
Delegates from civil society organizations;  
community Forest Management Association Leaders; and members who are here with us from Andracha, Masha, Gesha and Sheko Woredas*

Invited guests; Colleagues; Ladies and Gentlemen. On behalf of South West Forest and Landscape Grouping, Ethio Wetlands and Natural Resources Association and myself, I warmly welcome you to this experience sharing on PFM.

The South West Forest and Landscape Grouping is a grouping that has been formed by Huddersfield University from UK, Ethio Wetlands and Natural Resources Association (EWNRA) from Ethiopia and Sustainable Livelihood Action (SLA) from the Netherlands. These three organizations have jointly organized this roundtable experience sharing event. The main objective of this event is to share the experiences that we have on PFM from our field intervention in South West Ethiopia.

Since July 2003, Huddersfield University, EWNRA and SLA have worked on

interventions in South West Ethiopia in the area of forest management, mainly in five woredas, namely, Andracha, Masha, Gesha, Sheko and South Bench woredas of SNNPRS through implementing a project entitled Non Timber Forest Products Research and Development Project Phase I. The NTFP Phase I project was implemented over four years with an objective of promoting the improved production of NTFPs and creating a market link for those NTFPs. The NTFP Phase I project also had a component in it to introduce and test PFM activities, although that was in a very small scale in limited kebeles. However, lessons learnt from the NTFP Phase I project on PFM served as a base to scale up PFM into the five woredas throughout NTFP-PFM phase II project. During the life span of NTFP-PFM phase II project PFM was scaled up in all of the forested kebeles of those five woredas. Through the NTFP-PFM phase II project, which was focused fully on PFM, an enormous number of lessons in the area of PFM have been generated.

The NTFP-PFM Phase II experiences on PFM have helped in designing and implementing another third project, namely Wild Coffee Conservation (WCC) through PFM project, which has a major objective to conserve *Coffea arabica* wild

genetic resource in the forests of Sheko mainly in Kontir Berhan and Amora Gedel. These two forest blocks were identified as coffee genetic hotspots by CIP IV project and were recommended for conservation for the important coffee genetic value they contain.

Based on the experience gained from the implementation of those projects EWNRA currently has scaled up PFM work into Nonosele Woreda of Oromia Regional state, one of the largest forested woreda in the South West even it might be in the whole country. This is the REDD+ PFM project, REPAFMA.

In summary a total of more than a quarter million of hectares of forested land has been brought under participatory forest management in the nine woredas of the two regional states through implementation of the various projects of the grouping.

The PFM approach to forest management by SWFLG in this area is different in its institutional setup from that of PFM implemented in other parts of the country by other PFM practitioners. The institutional setup in areas where the group is implementing PFM, with the exception of Nonosele wereda, is characterized by having two different institutions but with an ultimate goal of

promoting forest resource management which will benefit local, forest-dependent communities who are given the full responsibility of forest management. This form of institutional arrangement is characterized by got level branches of registered woreda level Forest Management Associations for forest resources management and multi-kebele, entrepreneur led cooperatives for forest-based product trading. The gott level PFM groups establish a woreda level association and this is legalized by the responsible government authority. The main benefit of such arrangement is to separate forest management responsibility from that of forest product trading and to avoid the danger that forest product trading could misdirect the work of forest protection and development by the community.

There are community representatives with us who are practicing such arrangements and they will share with us their experiences on this. The major reason for the grouping to establish such arrangements is due to a lack of an institutional arrangement options that are available in the law to implement PFM. I hope the presentations and the discussion we will have today from our experience will help in designing better institutional arrangements that enable us



all to implement PFM better in the years to come.

With this please allow me to thank those community representatives who have traveled as far as from Masha, Andracha, Gesha and Sheko to share their experience with us.

I would like also to point out at this junction that there is an interest in the Ministry of Environment and Forest to learn from all the diverse experience with forests in the country over recent years. That is a big incentive for us who are currently involved in forest management within the country.

We in SWFLG are happy to contribute to that process as are the donors who have supported us in our work with SNNPRS and Oromia: these organizations being the EU, the Netherlands and Norwegian Embassies, NORAD and the British Government through the Darwin Initiative.

And I would also like to appreciate our partners – the SNNPRS Bureau of Agriculture and BoFED, the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute, Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise, the Development Fund of Norway and HoAREC.

May I thank those who have also traveled as well from Wondo Genet College to be with us here today to share their experience as well and contribute for the discussion we will have. I would like also to thank those who have worked hard to make this event to be successful. Thank you Peter to be with us here and share the experience you have. Thank you all for listening to me. Thank You!

## Annex 2: Workshop Programme

**Program facilitator:** Mr. Girma Shumi

**Chair persons:** Dr. Mulugeta Limenih and Dr. Habtemariam Kassa

**Reporter:** Arsema Andargatchew

Time	Activity	Responsible	Chairperson	
8:30 –9:20	Registration, workshop material distribution and program introduction	SWFLG staffs at Addis		
9:20 – 9:30	Welcoming participants and opening remarks	Mr. Afework Hailu, EWNRA- executive director		
9:30 – 10:10	Participatory Forest Management learning paper - reflections on key lessons, challenges and recommendations. Drawing on the experiences of the NTFP – PFM project in South west Ethiopia	Mr. Peter O’hara	Dr. Mulugeta Limenih, Farm Africa	
9.10-10.30	Questions and discussion	All participants		
10:30 -10:50	Tea break	SWFLG		
10:50- 11:20	Presentation on impact of PFM on livelihood, equity, conflict resolution/ management and forest resource conservation – Experience of SWFLG	Mr. Ahmid S.		
11.20 -11.35	Questions and discussion	All participants		
11:35 – 12:10	Presentation on PFM institutional arrangement- Experience of SWFLG	Mr. Anteneh T.		
12.10 – 12:30	Questions and discussion	All participants		
12:30 -14:00	Lunch	SWFLG		
14:00-14:10	PFM experience from Andracha woreda	Mr. Tekalign -FMA leader		
14:10- 14:20	PFM experience from Masha woreda	Mr. Shewano- FMA leader		
14:20-14:30	PFM experience from Andracha	Ms. Birhane- FMA member		
14:30-14:40	PFM experience from Sheko woreda	Mr. Dachu Zitu- FMA chairman		
14:40 – 15:30	Reflection on key lessons and challenges identified	All Participants		Dr. Habtemariam Kassa, CIFOR country director
15:30 – 15:40	Tea Break	SWFLG		
15:40 – 17:00	Discussion continued	All Participants		
17:00 -17:15	Recommendations / way forward	All Participants		
17:15- 17:30	Rap-up	Dr. Habtemariam K		
17:15-17:30	Closing remark	Dr. Melaku Bekele, WGCF, PFM study team leader		

### Annex 3: List of Participants

No	Full name	Organization	Tel	Email
1	Dr. Habtemariam Kassa	CIFOR, country director	0911910911	habtekassa@yahoo.com
2	Dr. Melaku Bekele	WGCF, PFM study team leader	0911917424	bekelemelaku@yahoo.com
3	Dr. Yemiru Tesfaye	WGCF, PFM study team member	0911475278	tyemiru@yahoo.com
4	Mr. Hussien Kebede	MoA, PFM study team member	0911331404	kebede_hussein@yahoo.com
5	Mr. Fekadu Tefera	OFWE, PFM study team member	0910118691	fteferra@gmial.com
6	Mesafint Tilahun	MEF, Forest policy carbon/ expert	0934471153	messafintt@yahoo.com
7	Dr. Selomen Zewdie	REDD+ secretariat	0913072267	zew172@yahoo.com
8	Mr. Tiruneh Chaka	MEF, Community forestry expert	0911988929	tirunehchaka@yahoo.com
9	Dr. Mulugeta Lemenih	Farm Africa	0912066839	mulugetal@farmafrica.et.org
10	Dr. Motuma Tolera	WGCF	0911797142	motumatolera@yahoo.com
11	Mr. Peter O'Hara	International PFM Adviser	-	peterohara@participatorynrm.com
12	Mr. Afework Hailu	EWNRA, executive director	0911635720	ethio.wetland@gmail.com
13	Mr. Hamid Said	EWNRA-REPAFMA project, PC	0935168533	hamidsaid06@yahoo.com
14	Mr. Anteneh Tesfaye	EWNRA- ICB, Marketing specialist	0911315685	antetesfaye@yahoo.com
15	Amdemichael Mulugeta	WCC-PFM project, Acting PC	0911748309	amdemichael123@gmail.com
16	Mr. Dawit Biru	WCC-PFM project, PFM officer	0913115973	sifendawit@yahoo.com
17	Mr. Yidnekachew Habte	EWNRA, PFM officer	0932213721	yidnekachewbiza@gmail.com
18	Mr. Shewaye Deribe	EWNRA-Program director	0911330419	shewawetland@gmail.com
19	Mr. Melese Argaw	SWFLG- LES	0911659843	melese.argaw@yahoo.com
20	Mr. Girma Shumi	SWFLG- SFLA	0910088811	gshumi@yahoo.com
21	Mr. Shaweno Sharo	Masha FMA, leader	-	-
22	Mr. Tekalign Shadero	Andracha FMA, leader	-	-
23	Ms. Birhane Geremew	Andracha FMA, general assembly member	-	-
24	Mr. Dachu Zitu	Sheko wordeda FMA, chairman	-	-
25	Ms. Arsema Andargatchew	Reporter	0911243396	arsemitti@yahoo.com





**For more information contact:**

Centre for Sustainable and Resilient Communities (CSRC)  
University of Huddersfield  
Queensgate  
Huddersfield HD1 3DH  
United Kingdom

**Tel:** +44 (0) 1484 47 1367

**Email:** [csrc@hud.ac.uk](mailto:csrc@hud.ac.uk)