Report of APFNet's Workshop on Community Forestry in the Context of Climate Change

(6-17 June 2011)

Sponsored by:

Asia- Pacific Network for Sustainable Forest Management and Rehabilitation (APFNet)

Organized by:

National Plateau Wetlands Research Center (NPWRC)
Southwest Forestry University (SWFU)
Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity

June 2011
Kunming, China

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

The Asia-Pacific Network for Forest Rehabilitation and Sustainable Management (APFNet), the National Plateau Wetlands Research Center (NPWRC) , Southwest Forestry University (SWFU) and the Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity (YAB) wish to express their heartfelt gratitude to all the people who contributed their time and efforts to make the workshop a success. Special thanks go to Professor Shen Lixin and his team for their dedication and valuable assistance throughout the classroom portion of the workshop and the field trip. We are also grateful to the officials of the county, the forestry bureau, and the communities for their support and willingness to share ideas and experiences during the visits onsite.

Last but not least, we would like to convey our sincere appreciation to the participants whose support and insights were invaluable in our collective efforts to understand the importance of community forestry not only in improving the livelihoods of rural poor people but also in adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change. With the support of APFNet, we are looking forward to meeting you again as we pursue our common goal to achieve sustainable forest management in the Asia-Pacific region.

APFNet

NPWRC

SWFU

YAB

Preface

The workshop on Community Forestry in the Context of Climate Change, as an integral component of APFNet's capacity building program, was held in Kunming City, P. R. China, from June 6 to 17, 2011. Participants consisted of sixteen senior officers from government and non-government organizations in the region. The National Plateau Wetlands Research Center (NPWRC), Southwest Forestry University (SWFU) and Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity (YAB) organized and implemented the session, with guidance and full funding from APFNet.

By means of presentations, case studies, field tours and interactive discussion among participants and invited speakers, the workshop provided a regional overview of community forestry; highlighted its potential contributions to climate change mitigation and adaptation; and described the benefits that communities gained from practicing sustainable forest management. The venue also served as an effective forum for decision-makers and other experts to share experiences, practices, knowledge and lessons. Thanks to the concerted efforts of all participants, organizers and collaborators, objectives were met.

This workshop is part of APFNet's efforts to build regional capacity for sustainable forest management over the medium and long terms. This report summarizes the goals, themes, key activities, and outputs of the meeting. Recommendations on the design and planning of future training programs are also presented.

APFNet

June, 2011

1. Introduction

Although community forestry has been practiced for many generations, government involvement in its implementation is more recent. In the last few decades, many countries have enacted supportive legislation, are strengthening institutional capacity to address issues, including benefit-sharing, and are providing incentives for rural people to manage resources sustainably. The importance of forests in mitigating climate change is increasingly being recognized, as is the need for taking measures to help these resources adapt to the growing threats associated with this problem.

As part of APFNet's series on forest resources management under its capacity building programme, outcomes of this workshop will pave the way for future research and case studies. Suggestions from participants and invited speakers on course design, training methods, and outputs, for example, are appreciated. APFNet will use this information to improve subsequent training initiatives.

1.1 Objectives

The workshop aims to share best practices and highlight successful models that can be replicated more broadly. It also seeks to identify key challenges and opportunities in the Asia-Pacific region for the future development of community forestry, given the new forest-related mechanisms which are emerging to address climate change. Based on the exchange of views, experiences, and lessons learned among participants, recommendations will be made to address issues of common concern.

1.2 Participants

Sixteen representatives (4 female and 12 male) from 15 developing APFNet member countries in Southeast Asia participated in the session: Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao P.D.R., Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Viet Nam. Participants were selected according to APFNet application procedures after country coordinators issued announcements of the event.

Most participants were senior officials from forestry departments, while others came from non-government organizations (see Annex 2 for a detailed list).

2. Training themes and key activities

2.1 Training themes

The 12-day workshop was conducted in English and course modules combined classroom lectures, case studies, country presentations and a field trip. Consistent with the objectives, lectures covered the development of community forestry in the region and its role in addressing climate change. A field excursion to several sites provided the opportunity for participants to interact with local forest managers and community leaders.

Thematic presentations

In addition to the topics noted above, presentations, followed by discussion, were given on the participatory aspects of community forestry; how its practice had the potential to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+); reform of forestland tenure and community forestry in China; and community-based forest rehabilitation and sustainable management.

Field excursion

A 3-day field excursion to various points of interest in Qiubei County was organized to showcase how communities were engaging in sustainable forest management in Yunnan Province. Highlights included a visit to the Chongtou Forestry Farm to see a nursery and view a system which intercropped pecan trees with Taxus yunnanensis. Participants also toured a demonstration garden of forestry science and technology, in addition to observing the operations of a community forest in Puzhhei and learning about the conservation and utilization of wetlands in the area.

Interactive discussion among participants

Each participant reported on the development and status of community forestry in his or her country, highlighting areas/issues of particular interest in relation to climate change. This sharing experiences and practices provided yet another opportunity for participants to increase their knowledge. As a final exercise, they completed an evaluation of the different aspects of the workshop and made recommendations on ways to improve future sessions.

2.2 Workshop materials

Upon arrival, participants were given copies of the country reports and powerpoint presentations which were submitted to APFNet prior to the workshop. They also received an overview of the programme, including the schedule of presentations and field visits, a profile of the resource persons, the list of participants, and background on the workshop and Kunming City. Details of the excursion and sites to be visited were also provided, in addition to a description of the support and coordination to be given by county forestry officials and communities.

2.3 Speakers and facilitators

Based on the topics to be covered during the workshop, the organizers selected well-qualified speakers to present and facilitate the sessions. Experts came from the Center for People and Forests - RECOFTC (Bangkok, Thailand), the Yunnan Academy of Social Sciences, the United Nations University (Tokyo, Japan), the Ecosystem Development - ECODEV - Group (Myanmar), Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi, India), the Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity, and the Royal Forest Estate (Het Loo, the Netherlands).

3. Summary of topics and main activities

3.1 Opening ceremony

Professor Yang Yuming, Vice-President of Southwest Forestry University (SWFU) and Director of the Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity, chaired the opening ceremony and warmly welcomed participants to Kunming City.

Professor Chen Baokun, Chair of the University Affairs Committee, added his welcome to the forestry experts and resource persons. He indicated that Yunnan Province was a tourist destination, known for its unique climate and rich biodiversity. It leads the country in terms of forest cover and, due to significant reforestation and afforestation, forest area is increasing. The Province is also the source of the Mekong River and, therefore, has an intimate relationship and frequent communication with countries in Southeast Asia. As the only forestry university in southern China, SWFU has many ties with regional and international organizations - ties which allow it to make important contributions to forest management and biodiversity protection, not only in the area, but also throughout southwest China.

He noted that, by drawing on extensive experiences to date, China has established comprehensive

systems to survey forest resources, monitor progress toward SFM, provide technical support, and ensure stakeholder participation. However, Professor Chen also pointed out that China can learn much from neighboring countries. He emphasized that this workshop will help to improve forest management in the region and to strengthen collaboration on a range of issues. He also expressed his gratitude to the APFNet, the sponsor of this workshop, the People's Government of Qiubei County and the Qiubei Forest Department for their significant contributions to the planning of the meeting. Finally, he wished participants a safe and enjoyable stay in Kunming City and successful outcomes of their upcoming discussions.

Ms. Wang Qian, the APFNet representative, then thanked SWFU, the National Plateau Wetlands Research Center and the Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity for their valuable assistance in organizing and hosting this workshop. She noted that it was an integral part of APFNet's capacity-building program under the theme "forestry and rural development", the purpose of which was to share best practices, explore possible solutions, as well as identify key challenges and opportunities associated with community forestry in the region, especially in the face of climate change. She expressed her appreciation to participants for their continued support to the activities of APFNet and hoped they would learn a great deal from each other over the coming days.

3.2 Overview of topics

In addition to country presentations, the workshop covered the following topics related to community forestry: its development in the region; its role in addressing climate change, including to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; participatory aspects; reform of forestland tenure and community forestry in China; and community-based sustainable forest rehabilitation and management.

The development of community forestry in the Asia-Pacific region

Dr. Yurdi Yasmi, Manager for the Capacity Building and Technical Services Unit at the Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC), gave an overview of forests and forestry in the region. He noted that 18% of the world's forests (740 million ha) are located in Asia-Pacific and that the area is increasing by 0.5 million ha per year, mostly due to China's extensive reforestation programme. Local people have been managing community forests for generations, including for spiritual and cultural values. Thus, the concept is not new. However, the involvement of governments and international partners is more recent - only about 40 years.

The notion of community forestry differs from social forestry, a term which was introduced in India in 1976 to describe a programme that encouraged people to produce their own supply of fuelwood

and other forest products. in this regard, government officials initiated action to ensure benefits accrued to people who relied on forests for their basic needs and livelihoods. While there is no single definition of community forestry, all variations enshrine elements of local participation and engagement. In 1992, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) identified 3 core aspects of community forestry: provision of fuelwood and other essential goods at the village level; provision of food and a stable environment for food production; and the generation of income and employment. RECOFTC characterizes the term more broadly to mean the inclusion of all aspects, initiatives, sciences, policies, institutions and processes that aim to increase the role of local people in governing and managing forest resources.

Some of the reasons for the expansion and growing popularity of community forestry include the recognition that governments cannot effectively oversee vast expanses of forests on their own. The call for social justice has also influenced its development, as has the belief that local people and local knowledge are prerequisites to sound forest management. Another critical dimension in the evolution from state management (with local participation) to community management/ownership is the granting of secure tenure. In this regard, trends in the Asia-Pacific region are encouraging - ranging from 15 years in Cambodia to perpetual rights in Nepal - but still present a challenge. Other issues are a lack of community capacity to take charge of operations, weak civil society, and the continuing debate over whether these forests act as safety nets or poverty traps.

The goals of community forestry are changing as well. In response to new imperatives, the focus is shifting from the production of fuelwood only to the rehabilitation of degraded land as a means to increase food security and reduce poverty. The expansion of community forestry would provide additional opportunities for local people to manage more forests sustainably and for greater networking through APFNet and the Asean Social Forestry Network, for example. With new and emerging mechanisms such as REDD+, community forestry also has significant potential to mitigate and help forests adapt to the effects of climate change.

The development of community forestry in China

Professor Zhen Baohua, Director of the Rural Development Institute at the Yunnan Academy of Social Sciences, reviewed the history of community forestry in China, noted some of its characteristics and practices, presented two case studies and outlined current challenges. He explained that, during the learning phase from the late 1980s to mid 1990s, different terms were used to describe the concept: rural forestry, participatory forestry and farmer forestry, among others. The Ford Foundation funded the first pilot in 1991 and the first book on social forestry was published in 1992. The extension of demonstration sites to other provinces was facilitated by China's unique ownership and tenure arrangements - 60% of forestland in the country belongs to collectives. The figure is higher (80%) in the pilot areas.

In Professor Baohua's view, social forestry is broader than community forestry and is the

reason people engage in forestry development. Community forestry is the force that drives this development. With regard to research and practices, China not only learns from other countries but also from local knowledge. The Chinese Academy of Forestry Sciences plays a lead role in facilitating networking and information sharing on the subject, including through a number of publications.

Based on a study of the management of a village forest in Yulong Province under the "gongshan" system of collective user rights, success is attributed to the fact that villagers consider forests as an integral part of their life, in the same way as mother's milk sustains children. Management rules are effective, forest guards are responsible, and essential support is provided by village leaders and local government. In the second study, the collection of mushrooms reached unsustainable levels after a series of actions and decisions discouraged wise practices. New methods to contract rights and to share benefits improved management to the point where output increased more than 1.5 times and prices rose by more than 15%.

Lessons to be drawn from both cases include the need to allow communities to make their own decisions and to choose how they want to implement policies. The provision of legal and policy support from local and national governments is also important. In terms of challenges, the development of community forestry in China is hindered by the fact that social forestry is not yet national in scope because the concept and its core values are not well understood; advocacy is weak; pilot and demonstration sites are funded by international partners and, thus, are viewed as externally driven. Moreover, forests are not linked to the needs of people to the extent they should be because authorities tend to give more importance to technical aspects such as tree planting rather than to the well-being of people and communities. Another issue stems from unclear and contradictory forest policies, for example, incomplete ownership and user rights arising from a flawed harvesting quota system. Finally, it is difficult to attract investment in forestry due to long production cycles, high risk, low prices, taxes and fees, as well as inadequate support compared to other sectors.

The role of community forestry in addressing climate change

Dr. Luohui Liang from the Global Change and Sustainability Section of the Institute for Sustainability and Peace, United Nations University, highlighted ways in which the management of forests by communities can help to address climate change.

He noted that the phenomenon referred to changes in the means and variability of climate properties over extended periods due to both human activities and natural processes. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) makes a distinction between anthropogenic causes which alter the atmosphere's composition and natural events which affect climate variability.

Carbon dioxide has been increasing steadily since the mid 1970s and now accounts for close to 80% of total emissions. Therefore, the carbon cycle is an important part of the climate change debate, including the role of forests. On the one hand, mitigation measures aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and enhance sinks. On the other hand, adaptation involves reducing the vulnerability of natural and human systems against the effects of climate change. Examples include raising the

height of dikes and substituting plants that are sensitive to temperature with those that are more shock resistant.

The world's forests store more than 650 billion tonnes of carbon: 44% in biomass, 11% in dead wood and litter, and 45% in soil. Between 2005 and 2010, deforestation resulted in the annual loss of an estimated 0.5 Gt. Insofar as using forests to mitigate climate change, 2 strategies are emerging. The Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol (CDM) allows industrialized countries to meet part of commitments by carrying out afforestations and reforestation in developing countries. Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) helps developing countries to protect and enhance standing forest carbon stocks that would otherwise be lost or degraded. A third option, although still under question, is the establishment of plantations to produce biofuel. The potential competition between food and fuel, in addition to the potential expansion into valuable ecosystems are two of the concerns being expressed.

In terms of using community forestry to mitigate climate change, Dr. Luohui described how the Bulang people in Manjing, Yunnan Province, harmonize tea cultivation with forest ecosystems by planting trees to improve tea quality, store more carbon, and enhance biodiversity. In addition to having a similar number of species in tea forests compared with natural forests (244 vs 241), tea from agroforests fetch a much higher price than that grown on terraces: 100-200 RMB per kilogram instead of 20-30 RMB. In terms of strengthening the resilience of forests to climate change, communities must take urgent action to maximize landscape connectivity for seed dispersal and migration; increase genetic and species diversity of seedlings; use seed sources that are adapted to expected future climate; and widen buffer strips and fire breaks.

Participatory aspects of community forestry

Mr. Win Myo Thu, Co-founder and Managing Director of the Ecosystem Development Group (ECODEV), based in Myanmar, presented a field school model for participatory community forestry. Based on his experience, several aspects need to be considered when establishing such initiatives, for example, the primary purpose (production or conservation); the nature of operations (subsistence or commercial); the products to be harvested (wood or non-wood); the groups involved (village or individual households); the location (degraded forest or healthy forest); and the management approach (traditional or scientific). He summarized the key principles on which the model is based: productivity, leadership, accountability/ transparency, cohesion and equity.

He also noted that one of the main obstacles which hinder the development of community forestry is the stringent requirement to formulate detailed management plans when neither forestry officials nor non-government organizations have the resources to assist all communities that need help. In the site which piloted the field school in 2006, participatory tools were used to foster dialogue throughout the formulation of plans and to determine the procedures. The selection of members of the user group was done by social ranking, a system which identified people who were food insecure and landless. An assessment of the relationship between stakeholders in terms of power

and influence was undertaken as well. Mapping, including the use of GIS, was then carried out and boundaries were confirmed by way of a transect walk. Soil was classified, overlays were prepared to determine the most suitable land use (e.g., forest farm, plantation, agro-forestry, conservation), priority forest products were identified, and terms for sharing benefits were decided.

In 2010, the project surveyed 128 households to test the assumption that participation will increase if communities are well informed. Findings showed that 90% knew the purpose, 85% understood their responsibilities, 66% took part in planning, 95% were involved in implementation, and 85% of households benefited. Illegal logging was controlled for the first time and collaboration with forestry authorities was strengthened. As a result, forests are healthier, survival rates are higher, the needs of shifting cultivators are met, and people feel more food secure.

The main challenges are that the process is time-consuming, taking as long as 18 months to develop a forest management plan; finding skillful and committed facilitators is difficult; participation of women in training and management is weak; leaders are over-burdened; and the ratio of people to forest area is still high.

Community forestry and REDD+

Professor K.G. Saxena, from the School of Environmental Sciences at Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi, India, spoke to participants about the potential of community forestry to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation. He noted that the complexity and unpredictability of climate change force scientists and policy makers to make decisions based on incomplete information. Along similar lines, community forests must determine whether to adopt REDD+ in spite of the uncertainty surrounding the concept. Although many times solutions are not perfect, informed decisions can minimize negative impacts because they are known beforehand.

What is important to retain is that decisions can be challenged and, like policy, should be changed as new information comes to light. In the case of the Millennium Development Goals, leaders arbitrarily set them, determined timeframes and then decided they cannot be achieved as planned. Although the numbering system implies an order of priority, the reality is that all goals are interlinked and inter-dependent. Reaching one can help to reach another but the reverse is also true. For example, a sustainable environmental will not necessarily reduce poverty.

REDD+ is based on the premise that carbon stored in forests has a monetary value and provides an incentive to maintain or enhance stock. Developing countries must reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation but provisions are silent on the need for industrialized countries to do the same. Regardless, developing countries should take advantage of the opportunities REDD+ offers to achieve sustainable forest management and reap the benefits associated with this approach.

Given that resources are limited, some gains and some losses are inevitable. For example, REDD+ can mitigate the effects of climate change, increase forest cover and alleviate poverty. However, developed countries lack incentives to reduce their own emissions; deforestation can shift to

another developing country; insecure tenure increases the inequity and uncertainty of people who depend on forests; and biodiversity is lost through monoculture plantations.

Although climate change and REDD+ are fraught with unknowns, efforts must continue to reduce uncertainties, promote dialogue and learning, resolve conflicts, engage in comprehensive planning, and minimize the disappointment that comes with high expectations. REDD+ will introduce new challenges that must be dealt with through intensive research on causes, consequences and solutions. Findings must then be translated into understandable language so that decision-makers can respond.

In terms of effective interventions, community forestry has much to offer, including a rich natural capital and generations of accumulated indigenous knowledge of many diverse ecosystems. On the down side, rural forested communities are often unfamiliar with western science, new governance structures, and modern issues such as hydro electricity, carbon sequestration, money markets, globalization and REDD. Another problem is that forests are generally defined based on a combination of tree height, cover and area. A significant omission for REDD+ purposes, therefore, are trees outside forests such as in home gardens and coconut plantations which store vast amounts of carbon below ground.

Reform of forestland tenure and community forestry in China

Professor Shen Lixin, Deputy Director of the Yunnan Academy of Biodiversity, provided an overview of forestland tenure reform in China and described progress in Yunnan Province. Historically in China, it took place in four phases:

Early 1950s to 1958: Land and forests were allocated to households but rights of ownership, use and benefits were unclear - a situation which provided little incentive to sustainably manage resources.

- 1958 to early 1980s: This collective period was characterized by highly centralized management which saw much forestland converted to agriculture.
- 1982 to 2008: Forestland was allocated to individual households under a contracted responsibility system. Collective forest management improved but people were still confused about the concept of forest tenure and protection of their benefits had no basis in law.
- 2008: Rural collective forest tenure reform was launched nation wide. It involves 4 types of rights: to information; to manage forests independently; to transfer use rights; and to benefit economically from forest resources.

The objectives of the reform are to increase the confidence, initiative, and capacity of communities to manage forest sustainably. It also aims to clarify and transfer forestland tenure and ownership of forests to individual households by issuing certificates, valid for 70 years. All collective commercial forests and waste hills/fallow suitable for forestation are targeted but nature reserves and protected forests are excluded. Clear, transparent and participatory processes are used, where all villagers discuss details of the reform and at least two-thirds agree to implementation.

As far as progress in Yunnan Province is concerned, certificates covering 290 million mu of community forestland (96.7% of the total) were issued. Professor Shen Lixin then gave examples of issues to be addressed:

- The equitable allocation of forestland to individual households is difficult due to the different quality of land and the different value of the trees. Thus, some farmers received better parcels of land than others.
- Villages where collective forests are designated as nature reserves and protected forests do not benefit as much as others, despite government compensation for the ecological functions these resources provide. (RMB75/per ha/year is low.)
- Holy hills and sacred forests are irreplaceable in terms of cultural and spiritual values for indigenous ethnic communities. Traditionally, they are owned by the community and considered a shared resource but current emphasis on individual management and use rights may undermine these arrangements.

Minority ethnic groups traditionally used the slope fallow or swidden fields for shifting cultivation so that the distinction between forestland and farm land was not made. However, the current reform recognizes many slope swidden fields as forestland and, as a result, they cannot be reclaimed for farming. Only reforestation is allowed.

Community-based sustainable forest rehabilitation and management

Dr. Jaap Kuper, Director of the Royal Forest Estate in Het Loo, the Netherlands, described the passive rehabilitation techniques used in this area of his country. He then highlighted the potential for similar treatments in the many forest remnants and fallow/bare lands in Yunnan Province.

Dr. Kuper stated that his country was rich in forests 1,000 years ago but sheep rearing degraded the soil to the point that broadleaf species could no longer grow. They were replaced with even-aged monocultures of scotch pine which then became susceptible to fire and disease. Today, long-term investment in forestry is made for 3 reasons: to earn income, support biodiversity, and provide recreation areas. In response to society's demand for diversified ecosystems, outdated practices to regenerate forestland have given way to passive rehabilitation where natural processes yield a combination of open spots and mixed species. Selective felling is then used to balance thinning with the regrowth of timber - a method that is cheap, allows harvesting to continue, and is ecologically stable.

Because governments are often far from rural areas and lack resources to rehabilitate all the forests that need it, this system is ideally suited to communities. However, it will only work if communities are disciplined and if they can effectively control both land use and users. This approach also requires management on a small scale because of the need for frequent visits and frequent use in order to maintain mixed stands - the best solution to climate change. In summary, passive rehabilitation increases forest cover, provides cheap commodities, creates a healthy environment, and benefits communities.

3.3 Field excursion

Following the classroom segment of the workshop, a three-day field trip took place from 14-16 June 2011. Participants journeyed to Qiubei County where they visited sites of interest. Qiubei is home to 0.47 million inhabitants, comprised of 7 ethnic groups: Han, Zhuang, Yi, Miao, Hui, Bai and Yao. It covers an area of about 0.5 million ha, more than half of which is forested (52.43%). In 2010, the forest sector contributed 0.4 billion RMB to the local economy and earned farmers an average of 2646 RMB.

At the Chongtou Forestry Farm, which changed from a logging operation in the 1980s to one which now focuses on afforestation, protection and sustainable utilization, they observed how the intercropping of a cash tree (Carya illinoensis) with a rare species (Taxus yunnanensis) combined conservation with economic development. This farm also breeds seedlings to meet the high demands of afforestation, including in the karst mountainous region in Xindiandadong where stony desertification is severe but survival rates and growth of Cupressus sp. are impressive.

Another highlight was a visit to Nijiao and Dalongtan where farmers are converting their farmland to forests. By planting multipurpose trees and cash trees, they reap greater benefits while protecting the environment at the same time. Participants also toured a demonstration garden which the country forestry department operates to help farmers learn about and understand forestry science and technology. In addition to research on breeding rare plants and cash trees, the garden provides valuable lessons on how to construct nurseries and establish forest enterprises. In the communities of Puzhehei, large plantations of camellia, walnut, grapes and nectarines were seen, along with measures that farmers are taking to balance the conservation and utilization of wetlands.

3.4 Communication among participants

During the workshop, participants described various aspects of community forest management in their country and answered questions. This rich exchange of information highlighted similarities but also underscored vast differences - differences which confirm the need for national legislation, policies and measures to be based on specific contexts and unique circumstances.

4. Monitoring and evaluation

A questionnaire was distributed at the end of the workshop to assess the level of communication and understanding among the participants and to obtain their feedback and suggestions on the organization and design of activities (topics, field tour and communication), preparation of materials, arrangements for the field trip, accommodation, and secretariat services, for example.

Findings showed that participants were very satisfied with the field tour, course design, materials and logistics. All indicated they learned a great deal from each other, from the resource people and from the secretariat staff. They also expressed an interest in receiving regular updates from APFNet. As requested, they made the following suggestions to improve future workshops:

- hold classroom portion closer to where forest activities take place
- increase number of presentations from CF experts, including on policies and legislation
- offer more case studies and discussion in working groups
- provide feedback on major issues, future implications, strategies and approaches after each country presentation
- cover climate change aspects in greater detail
- spend at least 3 days in the field and visit 3 different areas
- send schedule, presentations and country reports earlier
- distribute all workshop material in CD format
- organize the next workshop in a different place/city

In conclusion, this workshop was successful because of the concerted efforts of the attendees, organizers and sponsor. Participants expressed their thanks to APFNet for such an excellent training opportunity. Many committed to put the knowledge they acquired into practice upon their return home.

ANNEX 1: Workshop Schedule

Part 1: Indoor session

Date	Time	Contents	Resources/Comments
5 June	Whole day	Transport service and registration	**MODERATOR:** NPWRC/SWFU
Day 1 6 June	8:30-9:30	**Opening Ceremony** Introduction of the workshop	**MODERATOR:** APFNet/NPWRC/SWFU
	9:30-10:00	Tea break and group photo	**MODERATOR:**NPWRC/SWFU
	10:00-11:30	**Lecture 1**: A review of community forestry development in the Asia-Pacific region	**Resource person:** Dr. Yurdi Yasmi **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:30-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 2 7 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 2**: Community forestry development in China	**Resource person:** Prof. Zhen Baohua **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 3 8 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 3**: The role of community forestry in addressing climate change	**Resource person:** Dr. Liang Luohui **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 4 9 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 4**: Participatory Aspects of Community Forestry	**Resource person:** Dr. Win Myo Thu **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 5 10 June	Whole day	Free day	
Day 6 11 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 5:** Community Forestry to Support Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)	**Resource person:** Prof. K.G Saxena **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 7 12 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 6:** Reform of Forestland Tenure and Community Forestry in China	**Resource person:** Prof. Shen Lixin **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell

Date	Time	Contents	Resources/Comments
Day 8 13 June	8:30-11:00	**Lecture 7:** Community-based Sustainable Forest Rehabilitation and Management	**Resource person:** Dr. Jaap Kuper **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
	11:00-12:00	Q&A and group discussion	
	14:30-17:00	Country reports	**Presentation:** 35 minutes **Discussion:** 20 minutes **MODERATOR:** Ms. Rosalie McConnell
Day 9-11 14-16 June		Field trip (see schedule part 2)	**MODERATOR:** NPWRC/SWFU
Day 12 17 June	9:00-10:30	Workshop Evaluation	**MODERATOR:** Ms Rosalie McConnell , APFNet
	11:00-12:00	**Closing Ceremony** - Farewell remarks by participants, NPWRC/SWFU and APFNet - Presentation of training certificates	**MODERATOR:** NPWRC/SWFU, APFNet
	13:00-17:30	VISIT TO SWFU	
Day 13 18 June		Departure	

Part 2: Field Trip (Qiubei County, 14-16 June, 2011)

Date	Time	Contents	Resources/Comments
Day 9	8:00	Departure from hotel	MODERATOR: NPWRC/ SWFU
	13:00-15:00	Chongtou Forestry Farm -Pecan and Taxus yunnanensis intercropping system -Nursery	MODERATOR: Local forestry department NPWRC/SWFU
	15:00-18:00	- Afforestation in karst mountainous region, Xindiandadong - Conversion of farmland to forests in a community of Nijiao - Cash tree planting in Dalongtan community	
	18:00-18:30	CHECK-IN	
	18:30-	WELCOME DINNER hosted by County Government	
Day 10 15 June	8:30-10:00	Garden for forestry science and technology	MODERATOR: Local forestry department NPWRC/SWFU
	10:00-12:00	Community forestry in Puzhehei	
	13:00-18:00	Wetlands conservation and utilization, Puzhehei	
	19:30-21:00	CULTURE NIGHT	
Day 11 16 June	8:30-10:30	-Afforestation in an urban waste landfill -Private sector investment in forestry development in a local community	MODERATOR: Local forestry department NPWRC/SWFU
	10:30-11:30	Qiubei Forestry Department	
	14:30-18:00	Departure for Kunming	MODERATOR: NPWRC/ SWF

ANNEX 2: List of Participants and Resource Persons

2.1 Participants

Mr. Nirmal Kumar Paul
Deputy Conservator of Forests
Forest Department
Bangladesh
Email: paulnirmalbgd@hotmail.com

Mr. Haji Muhammad Faisal bin Haji N ordin
Forest Officer
Forest Department
Brunei Darussalam
Email:mfnn72@gmail.com faisal. nordin@forestry.gov.bn

Mr. Mohamad Rozizan Bin Mohd Maslin
Junior Forest Assistant
Forest Department,
Brunei Darussalam
Email: ygadi_846@yahoo.com

Ms. Chan Ratha
Forestry Administration Officer
Department of Forest and Community F orestry,
Forest Administration
Cambodia
Email: ratha_rua@yahoo.com

Mr. Singgih Mahari Sasongko
Head of Legal Affairs and International Technical Cooperation Division
Directorate General of Watershed Mana gement and Social Forestry Developme nt
Ministry of Forestry
Indonesia
Email: smaharisasongko@yahoo.com

6) Mr. Phirasack Sengrath
Deputy Director
Planning Division, Department of Forest ry
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lao PDR
Email: phirasack@yahoo.com

Ms. Farahazfa Binti Mohd Sapari
Assistant Secretary
Biodiversity and Forestry Management Division
Ministry of Natural Resources and Envir onment
Malaysia
Email: farah_azfa@nre.gov.my

Ms. Gerelmaa Batchuluun
Manager of Foreign Affairs
Mongolian Forest Society
Mongolia
Email:gerelmaa.b@gmail.com

Mr. Ba Kaung
Assistant Director, Dry Zone Greening Department
Ministry of Forestry
Myanmar
Email: bakaung69@gmail.com

Mr. Akhileshwar Lall Karna
Regional Programme Manager
Biodiversity Sector Programme for Siwali k and Tarai (BISEP-ST)
Nepal
Email: karna_al@hotmail.com

Mr. Angel Alejandro Salazar Vega
Head of the Office for Scientific and Technic al Cooperation
Peruvian Amazon Research Institute (IIAP)
Peru
Email:legna_razalas@hotmail.com, asalazar@iiap.org.pe

Mr. Fredelito A. Cirilo
Forest Management Specialist
Forest Management Bureau
Philippines
Email: fred_cirilo@yahoo.com

Mr. Warea Andasua
Technical Forester
PNG Forest Authority
Papua New Guinea
Email: wandasua@gka.pngfa.gov.pg

Ms. Sundarpperuma Mudiyanselage Susantha Lakshmi Wickramasinghe
Assistant Conservator of Forests
Department of Forest Conservation
Sri Lanka
Email: dfokan@yahoo.com

Mr. Komsan Rueangritsarakul
Technical Forest Officer,
Royal Forest Department
Thailand
Email: komsan.r@hotmail.com

Mr. Dinh Duc Thuan
General Director of MBFP
Director of ADB Project
Management Board for Forestry Projects
Viet Nam
Email: thuanthau@yahoo.com

2.2 Resource Persons

Dr. Yurdi Yasmi
Manager, Capacity Building and Technical Services
RECOFTC
Email: yurdi@recoftc.org

Dr. Liang Luohui
Academic official, United Nation University (UNU)
Email: Liang@hq.unu.edu

Dr. Win Myo Thu
Executive director, ECODEV, Myanmar
Email: winmyothu@gmail.com

Prof. Zheng Baohua
Director of rural economic institute of Yunnan Academy of Social Science
Email: zhengbh64@163.com

Prof. K.G Saxena,
School of Environmental Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India
Email: kgsaxena@mail.jnu.ac.in

Dr. Jaap Kuper
Chief conservator, Dutch Royal Forests, Nerthlands
Email: J.Kuper@kroondomeinhetloo.nl

Ms. Rosalie McConnell
International Consultant
APFNet
Email: mcconnellrosalie2@gmail.com

Asia- Pacific Network for Sustainable
Forest Management and Rehabilitation

APFNet Secretariat
16 North Street Hepingli
Beijing, China 100013
Tel: +86 10 8421 8108
Fax:+86 10 8421 6958
Website: www.APFNet.cn