

Report

**EU Chainsaw Milling Project (phase I)
Final Evaluation**

'From the big stick to listening'



**Submitted to:
Tropenbos International**

**Prepared by:
Topperspective bvba**



A project funded by
the European Union



A project implemented by
Tropenbos International

Word of Thanks

The evaluation mission was carried out by the undersigned as lead evaluator. I like to thank Mr Francis K. ODOOM and Ms Audreyanna THOMAS who acted as co-evaluators in Ghana and Guyana respectively, for their valuable insights, support and good company.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the support provided by International Project Coordinator Ms Marieke Wit, National Project Coordinators, Mrs Rohini Kerrett (Guyana), Mr James Parker (Ghana) as well as Mr Godfrey Marshall, Director of the Forestry Training Centre Inc. (Guyana), and for their valuable comments on the draft report. Lastly, I like to thank all other TBI and project staff, partners and resource persons who allowed for frank exchanges of experiences, views and concerns.

Brussels, 05/04/2013

Egbert G. Topper

Disclaimer

Topperspective bvba has been contracted by *Tropenbos International* to carry out an independent evaluation. Views and opinions expressed in this Report are those of the expert and do not necessarily reflect views and opinions of *Tropenbos International* or of the *European Union*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Introduction1**
 - 1.1 Background and Context1
 - 1.2 Project design and objectives.....2
 - 1.3 Evaluation objectives and scope3
 - 1.4 Evaluation Methodology5
 - 1.5 Structure of the report5
- 2 On Relevance.....6**
- 3 On Design8**
- 4 On Efficiency.....8**
- 5 On Effectiveness9**
- 6 On Impact.....13**
- 7 On Sustainability.....16**
- 8 On Coherence and Collaboration17**
- 9 Conclusions and Lessons Learned18**
- 10 Recommendations20**

Annexes

- Annex 1: Country Mission Reports, Ghana and Guyana22
- Annex 2: Names of the Evaluation team members31
- Annex 3: Methodology and Work Plan32
- Annex 4: Evaluation matrix.....37
- Annex 5: Logical Framework Matrix (Original).....40
- Annex 6: List of Persons/Organisations Consulted.....46
- Annex 7: Main Documentation Consulted51

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BAC	Business Advisory Centre
CSM(P)	Chainsaw Milling (Project)
DOLTA	Domestic Lumber Traders Association (Ghana)
EC	European Commission
NREG	Natural Resources and Environmental Governance (Ghana)
EU	European Union
EUTR	EU Timber Regulation
FC	Forestry Commission (Ghana)
FTCI	Forest Training Centre Inc. (Guyana)
FLEGT	Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
GFC	Guyana Forestry Commission
JMRM	Joint Monitoring and Review Mechanism (VPA implementation)
LAS	Legality Assurance System (VPA)
LCDS	Low Carbon Development Strategy (Guyana)
MSD	Multi Stakeholder Dialogue
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NR (M)	Natural Resources (Management)
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PMT	Project Management Team
REDD	Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RMSC	Resource Management Support Centre (Ghana)
SC	Steering Committee
SLA	Small Loggers Association (Guyana)
SFP	State Forest Permit
TBI	Tropenbos International
TIDD	Timber Industry Development Division (FC, Ghana)
TUC	Timber Utilisation Contract
UN	United Nations
UNFCCC	UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
VPA	Voluntary Partnership Agreement

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project under evaluation ‘*Developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw lumbering through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Ghana and Guyana*’ (hereafter abbreviated as CSMP – chainsaw milling project, phase I) focuses on forest governance in countries with a high incidence of chainsaw lumbering. Its total budget amounts to €2,732,513, with an EU contribution equivalent to 80% or €2,186,010, over an implementation period of 6 years starting on 09/03/2007 and ending on 09/03/2013.

Geographically, the action focuses on **Ghana and Guyana** as two countries where chainsaw lumbering is widespread, generates frequent conflict and is of high economic importance for rural people; otherwise, the two countries present very different realities, and it is expected this would allow for extensive lesson learning. The project is implemented by Tropenbos International, based in the Netherlands, in collaboration with four partners: the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG) and the Forestry Commission (FC) in Ghana, and the Forestry Training Centre Incorporated (FTCI) and *Iwokrama* International Centre for Rain Forest Conservation and Development in Guyana.

The CSMP’s **Overall Objective** is (1) *Poverty reduced and viable livelihoods promoted in forest-dependent communities*; (2) *The occurrence of illegal logging reduced* and (3) *Conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests in developing countries promoted*. The **Project Purpose** (or Specific Objective) is ‘*To reduce the Level of Conflict and Illegality related to Chainsaw Lumbering*’. Indirectly, the project is also expected to support the implementation of the FLEGT Action Plan, as Ghana has been involved in a VPA development process since 2008, while Guyana has just entered negotiations in the end of 2012. There are six **expected results**: (R1) *Causes and consequences of chainsaw lumbering and its links with illegality understood*; (R2) *International best practice determined to address chainsaw lumbering*; (R3) *Multi-stakeholder learning forums established to discuss chainsaw lumbering issues*; (R4) *National consensus achieved in Ghana and Guyana about issues regarding chainsaw lumbering using an institutionalised mechanism for permanent dialogue between stakeholders*; (R5) *Communities dependent on chainsaw lumbering producing timber in a regulated and sustainable way*; and (R6) *Action managed effectively*.

Overall, the project has **performed well**; it has achieved its purpose as well as most of the expected results. It has been very influential in ‘getting issues on the table’, creating space for less vocal stakeholders, and identifying solutions, though implementation of solutions is still rather weak. The project is considered to be **highly relevant**, both by the donor (European Union) and the partner countries. From the EU’s perspective, it provides valuable support to the rather complex VPA development processes by addressing illegal activities and domestic market issues, which are particularly challenging governance issues for VPA development and implementation in general.

In Ghana, it responds to a very **real and urgent need**, as the project was introduced at a time when the FC was trying to find a solution to a long standing problem with regard to illegal Chainsaw milling. Consequently, the FC showed a very cooperative and open minded attitude. In Guyana, the project seems to respond to a less urgent need, partly because chainsaw milling is not illegal in the first place. Still, the project came in support of a national drive for enhanced governance and increased legal compliance in view of Guyana’s adoption of a Low Carbon Development Strategy. In this context, the project represents an important opportunity to improve forest sector performance and stakeholder dialogue as key objectives of the LCDS.

The project is considered to be **well designed**; its rationale is for research work (R1, R2) to feed into a well-structured multi-stakeholder dialogue in the two target countries (R3, R4), and to support community-level actions putting policies and strategies into action (R5) in a well-managed action (R6). It focuses on the role of multi-stakeholder dialogue as a mechanism to reduce conflict, adjust perceptions of the problems and create shared views of solutions. Despite the hugely different realities in the two countries, a number of cross-country learning events have been organised, such as the annual IPCC meetings, international workshops or a study tour of the Ghana team to Guyana (re. Case 1 on page 7). This has allowed for exchanges on domestic markets, on log tracking systems, the MSD process and VPA implementation, primarily to the benefit of the two countries involved. Moreover, explicit attention to CSM in two continents has helped generate attention for the issues at a global level.

The choice to **partner with the Forestry Commissions** in both countries is considered to be strategically correct. While it may not be easy to work through the Forestry Commissions, it is likely to be the only way in which perceptions and behaviour can be changed, and long-term change can be instilled. In Ghana, the FC has been highly receptive to change, while in Guyana important changes are limited to community and regional level, for the time being. In this regard, the evaluator opines that the project has a **high level of ambition**; while research work and facilitation of stakeholder dialogues are relatively easy to organise, influencing the policy process requires dealing with more stubborn realities. Still, it is expected that project outcomes will feed into the national level policy processes, in particular in the context of the starting VPA negotiation process in Guyana as well as ensuring domestic trade in legal lumber in the case of Ghana.

The project is managed in a highly **cost-effective** manner, producing a high number of valuable outputs at a relatively low cost. Time management is less strict, and **multiple delays** have been incurred throughout the implementation process. On the other hand, project management has displayed the necessary **flexibility** to operate in a highly dynamic and evolving environment and yet stay focused on its core 'mission'. In particular, bringing the stakeholder dialogue down to the District and Regional levels, in collaboration with regional Forest Services has proven to be a valuable adjustment to the initial concept. Project reporting could benefit from **more analysis** and reference to expected outcomes and objectives and indicators identified in the logical framework for the action. For the sake of clarity, it is also recommended that progress reports for the two countries be presented in separate sections, while including a short summary for the overall project.

The project is considered to have achieved its expected results regarding **studies and identification of best practice** (R1, R2). Lessons have been learnt, documented and extensively shared that assist international policy makers – in particular in the FLEGT/VPA arena - to effectively consider the role of chainsaw lumbering in efforts to reduce illegal logging and improve local livelihoods. Still, further study seems to be required to look into the viability of and constraints to the various management modalities (single operators, loggers' associations and communities) of chainsaw milling and portable milling, both in Ghana and in Guyana, to help identify bottlenecks and guide future support activities, as **weak leadership and unequal benefit distribution** still obstruct effective group management.

In both target countries, **successful Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue** (MSD) processes (R3+4) are considered to be the most important project outcome. The creation of an MSD platform accepted by previously antagonistic stakeholders on chainsaw milling issues (i.e. those involved in chainsaw mill-

ing/trade and the regulatory agency) is a major accomplishment. It has resulted in a change in perception and attitudes of Forestry Commission staff in both countries, resulting in their opening up to considering options that would previously have been considered 'off limits'. Regardless of their direct benefits, the MSDs are also seen as irreversible processes of democratic decision-making, good governance and transparency. They have made an important contribution to achievement of the project purpose **of reducing and solving conflicts** in the sector and, as such, serve as an example for further use and replication in- and outside the sector. While stakeholders in both countries would still like to see Tropenbos International play its 'independent brokering role' for a few more years to come, possibilities for **institutionalisation** of the valuable MSD processes should be further explored.

Consensus on ways to address the CSM challenges (R4) has more or less been reached in Ghana; though many details related to policy 'option 2' are yet to be worked out. In Guyana, on the other hand, no consensus has been reached as yet on recommendations coming from the MSD, which are not fully agreed upon by the Guyana Forestry Commission. In the evaluator's view, the project must take the necessary action to restore effective collaboration with the Forestry Commission and invest more in strategic partnerships with Development Partners such as FAO. In a second stage, it must identify the more contentious issues (such as the proposed independent arbitration body) and devise ways to move the dialogue on these issues forward.

R5 (**communities practising legal and sustainable timber production**) is the result area where least impact has been made, despite significant inputs. The project timeframe set for this result was probably less realistic, partly because outputs from the MSD process (R3, R4) had to be awaited, and partly because community level processes take time. Still, community level activities could have had higher priority and more resources could have been mobilised in order to achieve the desired impact. The mission recommends an **increased focus on the wood sector** and on the opportunities for systematic marketing and value addition. There is still ample room for improved practice and profit margins, but more expertise needs to be mobilised and investments made to have the pilots 'take off'. In the case of Ghana, this should also include **reforestation activities** to help strengthen the timber resource base, besides creating alternative livelihood systems. In Guyana, alternative livelihood opportunities are mostly benefiting women and help increase household income, but do not contribute much to decreasing pressure on the forest. They too should be more based on market research, business planning and tangible support to start up new businesses, either through CSMP project support or through linkages with relevant service providers.

In this context, the evaluator recommends a **mid-term review of the second phase**, focusing specifically on achievements in the pilot sites, and on best ways to support the newly experimented practices, in terms of technical assistance and of funding. It is crucial for the project to establish a number of successful pilots to serve as models for replication in and outside the two countries.

Prospects for sustaining project results are good, as processes are largely **owned by local and national stakeholders** (including Forestry Commissions). In Guyana, more effort is required to ensure convergence of purpose between the project and the Forestry Commission. The recently initiated VPA negotiation process is likely to contribute to such convergence as the MSD process has the potential of making important contributions to the VPA process, in terms of engagement with stakeholders, review of the Legality Definition and development of (community-based) chain of custody systems.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context

1. The action focuses on the broad theme of forest governance in countries with a high incidence of chainsaw lumbering. In many forest dependent communities, chainsaw lumbering is an important component of livelihoods. Yet, the level of conflict and illegality associated with chainsaw lumbering is generally high and increasing attention for illegal logging is putting pressure on this mode of logging. While international attention (such as in the context of the FLEGT Action Plan) focuses on the behaviour and trade of large companies, there is a risk that well-intended measures to regularise the forest industry will lead to a crackdown on small-scale loggers with potentially negative livelihood consequences for poor people in forest dependent communities.
2. There would therefore be a considerable benefit to designing policy measures that address the negative aspects of chainsaw lumbering, while maintaining its positive socio-economic effects. The action was designed in this context; the Chainsaw Milling Project (CSMP) aims to find sustainable solutions to the problems associated with the production of lumber for local timber markets by involving all stakeholders in dialogue, information gathering and the development of alternatives to unsustainable chainsaw milling practices.
3. It focuses on the role of multi-stakeholder dialogue as a mechanism to reduce conflict, adjust perceptions of the problems and create shared views of solutions. This dialogue would be based on participatory analysis of information that would help identify and accept the issues surrounding chainsaw lumbering and reduce the controversies. A broadly supported agenda of actions would be agreed and implemented, including actions at the national level (to address the conditions that promote illegal chainsaw lumbering) and the local level (to transform current chainsaw milling strategies into more acceptable and sustainable forms). At the same time, lessons learnt would assist international policy makers to effectively consider the role of chainsaw lumbering in efforts to reduce illegal logging and improve local livelihoods.
4. Geographically, the action focuses on Ghana and Guyana as two countries where chainsaw lumbering is widespread, generates frequent conflict and has a high economic and social importance for rural peoples. At the same time, the two countries present very different realities, and provide each other with lessons in tackling particular challenges. Moreover, in these countries, Tropenbos could build on existing programmes and networks.
5. The project comes in support of implementation of the FLEGT Action Plan, in particular of the component 2 'Trade in timber / VPA's'. Ghana has been involved in a VPA development process since 2008, while Guyana has just entered negotiations at the end of 2012. Ghana – like some other VPA countries – has decided on the legal reform of the domestic timber market in the scope of the VPA. This has significantly increased the relevance of and opportunities for the project, which came along 'at the right time'.
6. In Ghana, the VPA implementation process is ongoing. 4 JMRM have been held and a fifth is planned for April 2013. An annual work plan exists and the FLEGT regulation has been passed by

Parliament. Legal standards have been defined and verification protocols are now under development (a draft protocol is currently being reviewed) and a contract with a new Wood Tracking System has been concluded in Dec 2012. It is important to realise that legality verification is as much about verifying behaviour – whether or not in compliance with national laws (such as labour laws) - as about wood tracking. The first is more of a ‘one-off’ check that needs to be done regularly, while wood tracking is a continuous activity (per consignment). While common practice in sustainable forestry certification, in the context of VPAs and a nation-wide Legality Assurance System it is as yet unclear how these verification activities can best be combined in order to produce FLEGT (legality) licenses.

7. In Guyana, the first round of negotiations has started in December 2012. A Roadmap has been prepared, expressing the ambition to conclude the VPA in 2014. It seems that effective civil society input might constitute one of the main challenges.

1.2 Project design and objectives

8. The full name of the project under evaluation is “Developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw lumbering through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Ghana and Guyana” with number ENV/2007/133-003. Its total budget amounts to €2,732,513, with an EU contribution equivalent to 80% or €2,186,010, over an implementation period of 6 years starting on 09/03/2007 (ref. Special Conditions). An addendum (No.2) to the contract foresaw a budget neutral extension of the implementation period from 60 to 73 months (6 years and 1 month) up to 09/04/2013.
9. A second project, building on the momentum and the achievements of the project under evaluation is the “*Supporting the integration of legal and legitimate domestic timber markets into Voluntary Partnership Agreements*” (with number ENV/2010/220-198). Its budget amounts to € 2.5M, over an implementation period running from 2011 to 2015. It started in March 2011. Therefore, phases I and II have an overlapping period of two years.
10. The CSMP’s Overall Objective (OO) is (1) *Poverty reduced and viable livelihoods promoted in forest-dependent communities;* (2) *The occurrence of illegal logging reduced and* (3) *Conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests in developing countries promoted.* The Project Purpose (or Specific Objective) is ‘*To reduce the Level of Conflict and Illegality related to Chainsaw Lumbering.*’
11. There are 6 expected results: (R1) Causes and consequences of chainsaw lumbering and its links with illegality understood; (R2) International best practice determined to address chainsaw lumbering; (R3) Multi-stakeholder learning forums established to discuss chainsaw lumbering issues; (R4) National consensus achieved in Ghana and Guyana about issues regarding chainsaw lumbering using an institutionalised mechanism for permanent dialogue between stakeholders; (R5) Communities dependent on chainsaw lumbering producing timber in a regulated and sustainable way; and (R6) Action managed effectively.
12. TBI has four formal partners for implementation of the project. In Ghana, the project is implemented in collaboration with the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana (FORIG) and the

Forestry Commission (FC), while in Guyana the Forestry Training Centre Inc. (FTCI), the Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC) and Iwokrama are the implementing partners.

13. A first rider concerned an increase in the number of local facilitators whose capacities would be built under the project, and further specified the number of 'milestone' meetings in Ghana and Guyana to be organised. A second rider extended the contract from 60 to 73 months.

1.3 Evaluation objectives and scope

14. As per the Terms of Reference, at the end of phase I, TBI together with its project partners, want to evaluate the project with the following objectives:

1. To know how the action has performed. Key questions: what was supposed to happen? / what actually happened? / what went well? / what did not go so well? / what are the key lessons (specific actionable recommendations)?
2. To know how our intended target groups and beneficiaries perceive the action: to what extent is the project addressing their needs (MSD participants, and community level beneficiaries).
3. A check on our main assumptions: will our action indeed lead to the intended result (and why not).
4. A check on how the action's impacts can be sustained beyond its duration – sustainability issues, and a feedback on how to increase the likelihood of post-project impacts.

15. The evaluation is intended to provide staff and management of the Action with insights on the performance of the project and give recommendations for effective implementation of the Action. It is expected to help better address stakeholder expectations and sustain the action beyond its duration. The evaluation will also be used to facilitate improvements in the implementation of the second phase, for revision of its logframe and for drafting the final report of phase I.

16. In particular, the following aspects are to be addressed:

(a) Project Design and Relevance

Are activities supported by the CSM appropriate with respect to the project's objectives?

- Analyse if the project correctly identified the problems, the context at national levels, and the appropriateness of the tools and initiatives; Assess the Project design and the logical links between the objectives, purpose, results and activities, as well as the validity of the assumptions and how the assumptions have affected the Project's achievements.

(b) Efficiency:

Are resources converted in efficiently into activities?

- Assess how the inputs and resources have been converted into activities and the quality of results achieved. This will include assessment of the institutional, organisational and managerial arrangements put in place to reach the Project objectives. The assessment

will include structures, internal implementation procedures, allocation of staff, reporting relations and tools;

- Means and Cost - Review the utilisation of project funds and personnel quantitatively and qualitatively. This will lead to an assessment of the utilisation of the resources. This exercise will help determine if the activities of the Project have been correctly prioritised in order to achieve the desired objectives/impact/results and whether or not there has been a correct balance/weighting of effort and resources.

(c) Effectiveness

To what extent has CSM achieved its objectives and expected results?

- Assess the contribution made by each specific result to the achievement of the Project purpose. This will include an assessment of the benefits accruing to the beneficiaries.

(d) Impact

What is (the prospect for) impact of the Project?

- Evaluate the impact of the Project in the respective national contexts, in terms of its contribution to the wider policy objectives and describing any long-lasting effect of the Project on the beneficiaries and on the wider context;
- Examine the appropriateness of the indicators and mechanisms that have been defined to measure benefit and impact.

(e) Sustainability

What are the prospects for sustainability of the Project?

- Assess the likelihood of the positive outcomes of the Project to continue. The evaluator will consider the following in assessing the sustainability of the Project's results and in making recommendations to enhance future sustainability:
 - Ownership of Project's components by the direct beneficiaries and other national institutions and their commitment after the funding ends;
 - The achievements of the Project in strengthening the capacities and role of national institutions and other target groups to fulfil their mandate.

(f) Coherence and Complementarity

Is the Project coherent with and complementary to other EU initiatives and donor interventions?

In his proposal, the evaluator proposed adding a sixth evaluation criterion, assessing coordination and collaboration of the project with other donors' activities in the sector, and assess the coherence with EU policies, regarding themes such as REDD and Climate Change.

17. Furthermore, the ToR specify that the evaluation is expected to assess processes, concerning stakeholder participation, communication, planning and problem solving.

18. In terms of geographical scope, the evaluation would take place in Ghana, Guyana and Europe (Brussels, the Netherlands).

1.4 Evaluation Methodology

19. The methodology includes a review of CSMP documentation, discussions with EU and country stakeholders, visits to Ghana and Guyana and the development of reports that address the evaluation requirements. The 21st Illegal Logging Update and Stakeholder meeting, which was held on 7-8 February 2013 at Chatham House (London) was attended as it offered a good opportunity to meet key resource persons (from EC and DFID) and representatives of several stakeholder groups (such as the Ghana Forestry Commission and Ghanaian NGOs).
20. The evaluation focuses on the performance and impact of the project and on identifying lessons learnt, based on the five evaluation criteria set out by the OECD/EC. These criteria have been applied selectively to the actors located at different levels and to the outputs and outcomes the project has produced. For each of these, one clear Evaluation Question (EQ) has been formulated to be answered by the end of the evaluation. Based on the ToR, an Evaluation Matrix was developed, identifying the main issues with regard to each of the evaluation questions. Essentially, the table represents a re-organisation of the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. The Evaluation Matrix is presented in Annex 4.
21. An evidence findings table - structured according to the evaluation matrix was prepared. Data from interviews was processed separately for each of the main stakeholder groups, so as to arrive at an overall perception, by stakeholder group, of the main issues concerning or affecting the project. The main stakeholder groups identified are (1) Tropenbos International, its partners and project team, (2) National, regional and local forest and other authorities, (3) Forest dependent groups (such as Chainsaw milling communities in Ghana), resource owners and rights-holders (such as SFP holders in Guyana, and the formal timber industry operators), (4) International Organisations and decision-makers (such as EC), (5) Other stakeholders such as civil society groups and independent observers.
22. The approach adopted is essentially 'deductive', based on mixed methods for data collection. Data collection tools such as semi-structured individual and group interviews, workshops and focus group discussions made use of pre-formulated templates to support a structured and systematic collection and analysis of information. As far as possible, data collection and analysis draws on multiple sources to ensure that the findings are generalized and not the result of biases or views of any single agency or type of actor involved in the process. Primary data (collected by the consultants) was combined with secondary information (review of the project bibliography) in order to obtain evidence based conclusions.

1.5 Structure of the report

23. In Chapters 2 to 7, main findings and their analysis are presented, according to the six evaluation criteria. The first chapters deal with relevance (2), design (3), outputs and efficiency (management) issues (4), while later chapters look at outcomes, in terms of effectiveness (5) impact (6) and sustainability (7) of results. Chapter 8 deals with the question of coordination and complementarity. Chapter 9 presents conclusions and lessons learnt. Chapter 10, finally, presents recommendations at global project level as well as country-specific levels. Short country-specific mission reports are attached in Annex 1.

2 ON RELEVANCE

24. From the EU's perspective, the project is **very relevant** in support of the rather difficult VPA development processes, especially since it addresses domestic lumber markets and remote 'illegal' operators, which are considered particularly challenging governance issues for the development of Legality Assurance Systems and VPA implementation in general. In Guyana, given the limited number of Development Actors, the project is considered even more relevant and instrumental to the recently started VPA negotiations.
25. The project responds 'spot on' to a **very real and urgent need** in Ghana, and has come up with the right strategy (MSD) to approach the issue. The project was introduced at a time when the FC was trying to find a solution to a long standing problem with regards to illegal Chainsaw milling. Consequently, The FC was open-minded and cooperative, assisting with (1) the choice of the projects pilot sites; (2) secondment of staff to assist with national facilitation and the mainstreaming of the community facilitation processes within its District offices; (3) ultimately, making mobile sawmills available for two pilot sites. Hence, the project activities find a fertile soil, and are clearly strengthened by activities undertaken by the FC. As one resource person stated: *'Without the project, FC would not have any solutions at hand today'*
26. In Guyana, the project seems to respond to a **less urgent need**. In fact, the very project title *'Developing alternatives for illegal chainsaw lumbering'* has been cause for some apprehension as in Guyana chainsaw milling is not illegal. Since the start, there has been limited engagement by the Forestry Commission. At the same time, however, the project came in support of a national **drive for enhanced governance and legal compliance** (stepped up control and law enforcement), driven to a large extent by Guyana's engagement in the LCDS. The Office of Climate Change, which manages the LCDS process, regards the project as an important opportunity to translate Guyana's low carbon development policies into practice on the ground, improving sector performance and stakeholder dialogue as key objectives of the LCDS.
27. In terms of project design, the above mentioned (re. section relevance) limited GFC 'buy in' is also partly related to project institutional set-up, in particular the project's limited independence from the GFC. Project partner FTCI falls under the GFC, and as such the GFC feels co-responsible for outputs, while it is at the same time one of the project's key stakeholders. On a positive note, the GFC being part of the project increases the sense of ownership necessary for long-term sustainability of the project results. There is still a need to manage the GFC's position in the project and the corresponding sensitivities. Nonetheless, GFC's participation in the Project Management Team, during the second phase, has lead to improvements. Also, the VPA negotiation process that Guyana has started engaging in is expected to increase interest in the outputs and outcomes produced by the project.

CASE 1: Domestic Lumber Traders Association (DOLTA), Ghana

The formation of the DOLTA was initiated by the Eastern Regional local lumber traders association based at Asamankese and formed in 2004. It is composed of formerly fragmented regional associations of Chainsaw Millers, local lumber traders as well as all those who are directly or indirectly linked to CSM activities (e.g. carpenters) to form a national body. The membership of the DOLTA is about 30,000 nationwide. It is estimated that those involved directly in chainsaw milling and trade form about 60% of DOLTA.

The creation of DOLTA was supported by the Business Sector Advocacy Challenge (BUSAC) account, funded by the USAID and the EU. The purpose for the formation of DOLTA was to present a united front to defend the interests of the members in the light of the alleged “harassment” by the Task Forces that were formed by the FC to ensure the effective implementation of the L.I. 1649 (1998) – the instrument that banned chainsaw milling in Ghana. Some of the problems faced by DOLTA are: the ban of chainsaw milling via the LI 1649 gave them no alternative to source lumber to supply to the local market; the sawmills that were selected by the TIDD (FC) to supply DOLTA with lumber failed to do so, even when pre-payment for their orders were made; the chainsaw millers have no forest concessions. Hence the only option left to them is to source for raw material illegally to sustain chainsaw lumbering and trade (It is assessed by DOLTA that 16% and 84% of their lumber supplies emanate from the sawmills and chainsaw milling respectively); and that DOLTA had no voice in the formulation of policies that affect their business

DOLTA considers the project to be beneficial to them in that it has (1) assisted them with the improvement of their institutional organisation; (2) “broken the ice” to facilitate their representation and participation in the MSD and its Steering Committee, in addition to their recognition and interaction with the Forestry Commission and other policy makers - that was antagonistic before the project - to discuss areas of concern to them; and (3) assisted them to access the BUSAC funds that has made it possible, for instance, for selected members to undertake trips to Guyana to share lessons, undertake advocacy activities including participation in radio discussions. DOLTA indicates that their proposals to lift the ban on CSM led to the change of CSM to “Artisanal Milling”. Conflicts with the regulatory agencies are reported by the members to have decreased since the inception of the project.

DOLTA has indicated that they are aware of the dwindling raw material base of the wood industry and the potential adverse effects on the future of their business. Some of the measures that the association is contemplating to implement to sustain their business in the future include: (1) importation of logs for artisanal milling and lumber from Guyana to sell; (2) self-regulation of members in line with lessons learnt from study visits to Guyana including (a) the registration of its members in accordance with the requirements of the national Procurement Policy that is meant to promote the utilisation of legal lumber on the local market (b) allocation of potential raw material sources (TUCs outside reserved forests, “left over” FC-allocated yield” in TUCs etc) that will be made available by the FC only to registered members; and (c) the control of members’ exploitation of any FC-allocated TUCs/left over yield in conformity with the sustainable forest management principles as prescribed by the FC.

DOLTA’s has written a proposal to seek support with regards to logistics/resources to facilitate their participation in policy implementation such as awareness creation about the VPA implementation. In addition, they are being assisted by the District Assembly BAC to write business plans to apply for loans from the local rural banks to support their commercial activities.

3 ON DESIGN

28. In the evaluator's view, the project has been **well designed**, with research work feeding into a well-structured multi-stakeholder dialogue, and support for community-level actions to put policies and strategies into action. However, some stakeholders feel that budget distribution across these main activities is not sufficiently balanced; there is a general feeling – both in Ghana and Guyana – that more support is required for field-level implementation of activities and application of newly acquired skills, and that research activities involving local and international consultants could be limited. Apparently, not all stakeholders realise the amount and cost of research needed to inform the MSD processes. The well-structured MSD is considered to be the key to the success that the project is generally acknowledged to have achieved.
29. Despite the hugely different realities in the two countries, a number of cross-country learning events have been organised, such as the annual IPCC meetings, international workshops or a study tour of the Ghana team to Guyana (re. Case 1 on page 7). This has allowed for exchanges on domestic markets, on log tracking systems, the MSD process and VPA implementation, primarily to the benefit of the two countries involved. Moreover, explicit attention to CSM in two continents has helped generate attention for the issues at a global level.

4 ON EFFICIENCY

30. In the evaluator's view, **resources are well managed** and converted cost-effectively into results. However, time management seems to be less strict. In particular in Guyana, project management seems rather 'lax' with little corrective action taken: the mission was surprised to note that the discussion of a key output 'a report on CSM issues' has been allowed to go on for over a year without conclusion. While there may have been a need to 'let things settle' for a while, there is also a clear need for maintaining the momentum. In the mission's view, **limited allocation of human resources** has also contributed to the dialogue getting stalled; both the project coordinator and the MSD Facilitator positions have been left open for a long time.
31. On a positive note, both in Ghana and Guyana, project management has displayed a **high degree of flexibility**, necessary for operating in a highly dynamic and evolving environment and yet stay focused on its core 'mission'. In Ghana, TBI has been able to bring the stakeholder dialogue down to the District and Regional levels, marrying its approach to that of the main stakeholder, the Forestry Commission. In doing so, it could merge a more social 'livelihood' approach to the problem of chainsaw milling with the dominant market and law enforcement approach advocated by the FC. This is resulting in a joint strategy to address the CSM challenge and combined efforts undertaken to develop solutions on the ground.
32. The CSM project has produced an impressive amount of outputs and deliverables. They are generally of good quality; processes are generally well documented and reported to the donor. At the same time, there is a risk of information overflow as results are not always sufficiently analysed. Consequently, **project reporting is found to be relatively unclear**; it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of where the project is today, in terms of expected results, and in comparison with the past situations. Moreover, determination and inputting of baseline indicators was initiated towards the end of Phase I and is still ongoing (in both countries) at 1 month from end-of-project. Reporting is mostly done in function of planned activities, but

provides little information on the state of play concerning the achievement of objectives and main results.

33. Overall, the project **has achieved its expected results** regarding studies and identification of best practice (R1, R2), as well as the multi-stakeholder dialogue (R3). Consensus on ways to address the CSM challenges (R4) is more or less achieved in Ghana, while in Guyana no consensus has been reached as yet on recommendations coming from the multi-stakeholder dialogue. R5 (CSM communities involved in legal and sustainable timber production) is the result area where **least progress** has been made, in the evaluator's view, despite significant inputs. The project timeframe set for this result was probably the least realistic, partly because outputs from the MSD process (R3, R4) had to be awaited, partly because they are the least under project control. However, **community level activities could also have had higher priority and resource allocation** in order to achieve the desired impact.
34. Nonetheless, the CSM project is considered to be making an **important contribution to VPA development** (Guyana) **and implementation** (Ghana). It is generally acknowledged that VPA development is a long process requiring very substantial financial, human resources and political inputs. In this context, the CSMP can be considered a fully justified and relatively cost-effective investment contributing to successful implementation of the VPA, in the case of Ghana, and supporting the negotiation process, in the case of Guyana.
35. A particular challenge is producing one progress report for both countries, which represent such different realities. In the evaluator's view, there is little benefit from combined reporting and it may be worthwhile discussing options to report separately for the two countries, with a short summary assessing overall project progress.

5 ON EFFECTIVENESS

36. In both target countries, the successful **MSD processes** are considered to be the main project achievement. In Ghana, the creation of an MSD platform that has been accepted by previously antagonistic stakeholders on the illegal chainsaw milling issue (i.e. those involved in illegal chainsaw milling/trade and the regulatory agency – the FC) is a major accomplishment. The MSD has led to consensus and recommendation of several strategies to address CSM and a related action plan. The MSD platform has created a space where ultimately separate government-lead and TBI-lead processes to address domestic lumber market issues have converged.
37. In Guyana, observers are generally impressed with the high **quality of the regional-level MSD** dialogue, both in terms of process and of products. The MSD Task Force appears to have well prepared and facilitated dialogue processes in four regions, where community feedback on CSM issues was collected. The Task Force claims to have managed the process carefully, *'trying to heal wounds and not to criticise any one stakeholder in the process'*. The MSD has seen active participation of all relevant stakeholders and resulted in identification of solutions; this bottom-up process has the potential and ambition to feed into the national policy process, but this has not happened as yet. The dialogue process has nonetheless contributed to conflict resolution at local level; In the evaluator's view, it could serve as basis and model for further development of the VPA development process, though it is yet to be confirmed if this opportunity will be seized as such.

38. Secondly, while **awareness creation** among those involved in illegal chainsaw milling/trade is not a project objective or expected result, the evaluator feels this is a major outcome of the MSD processes. In Ghana in particular, the MSD process has made those involved change their mind-sets and provide information on their illegal chainsaw milling practices, explaining in detail how their activity was undertaken to circumvent the regulatory agencies. This has led to a better understanding of the drivers of chainsaw milling in Ghana, and publication of a highly useful synthesis report on all drivers of CSM (R1).
39. It must be highlighted that the project has also achieved a major **change in perception and attitudes** of Forestry Commission staff in both countries, resulting in their opening up to considering options that would previously have been considered 'off limits'. In Guyana, while CSM was and is legal, and was hardly considered to be problematic, the project has helped FC to acknowledge, understand and address problems in this sub-sector. The project has instilled a 'new outlook' in FC staff – which is a big accomplishment in itself; a mentality and behavioral change from enforcement towards dialogue, '*from the big stick to listening*', as one participant put it. As a result, the project has made an important contribution to conflict resolution and prevention related to illegality, which after all is the project's specific objective.
40. While in both countries the project has achieved its objective of better understanding causes and consequences of chainsaw lumbering (R1), and fed the MSD with relevant information, some resource persons feel that further study is required looking into the **viability and constraints of the various management modalities** of chainsaw milling and portable milling, both in Guyana and Ghana. Several resource persons indicated that the schemes run by single operators and by (indigenous) communities are more viable than the operations run by the newly established associations (Small Loggers Associations). Further research should help identify the bottlenecks and guide future support activities. In particular, weak leadership and unequal benefit distribution still seem to be obstacles to effective group management (for example joint management of a portable sawmill) by the associations.
41. A specific point of concern for Ghana is the **position of the mainstream wood industry** (i.e. the Ghana Timbers Association, GTA and the Ghana Timber Millers Organisation, GTMO) as key stakeholders to the project. Their initial perception that the project is promoting the legalisation of CSM – that they consider as being destructive to the timber stocks in their TUC holdings - created inertia with regards to their participation in the project. Nonetheless, participation of the GTA's President in the PAC meetings allowed for a better understanding of the project's purpose and improved their participation in project activities. And recently, one GTMO member in Kumasi has shown willingness to cooperate with the supply of raw material from its TUCs to one of the project's pilot artisanal millers. The firm intends to use such cooperation to minimize illegal logging in the remote parts of its TUC.
42. On R2: *identification of international best practice*, the mission is of the opinion that the project has given proper attention to **sharing and publishing** its experience, through its own website as well as other relevant websites – such as the Illegal Logging website. It also seems to have seized all relevant opportunities to present and discuss its approach and practice, in fora such as the Chatham House meetings on Illegal logging as well as national level meetings on FLEGT/EUTR in

the Netherlands and elsewhere, and to feed the international FLEGT policy processes through the regular FLEGT update meetings in Brussels, among others.

43. In the evaluator's view, both in Ghana and Guyana field/community-level results (*R5 – Communities dependent on chainsaw milling producing timber in a regulated and sustainable way*) are the **least convincing** among the project's results. In Guyana, extensive capacity building, especially of Small Loggers Associations, Amerindian communities and women in the pilot sites has happened, on a range of topics such as Sustainable Forest Management, Safety, Governance, accounting, and technical trainings (sowing, handicraft). There is general appreciation for the fact that the CSMP went beyond information provision and consultation responding to real needs; in some of the pilot sites, it was the first external actor to discuss community development...
44. However, the mission is not convinced that the project has had an important impact in this regard, as yet; legality of operations has increased, but **sustainability of forestry and commercial operations still seems rather limited**. Also, alternative livelihoods are still poorly developed; At field level, the dominant view is that the project has a bit of an academic bias and a lack of tangible outputs; some community representatives expressed their concern that funds spent on consultants *'could have been poured into practical support at community level'*. In Guyana, for example, they would have liked to see a training on use of a board mill. *'If we want to bring about change, we have to offer 'something substantial'*. The evaluator is of the opinion that the funds allocated to 'applied research' are not at all excessive, in view of project objectives, but in relation to the limited community development funds they can easily be considered substantial.
45. In Guyana, several issues seem to constrain impact at local level: (1) Limited market orientation, both for the chainsaw millers' operations (*what do millers and buyers demand?*) and for the alternative livelihood options (a need for better research and analysis of market opportunities) (2) Lack of business plans (*'it is not enough to just take a community to another one to adopt a practice of that other community..'*); (3) Limited value addition as yet in the wood production chains; (4) Limited financial and material support by the project for further development of the new techniques and opportunities. In several cases, new organisational and business skills have been developed but **practical application of new skills remains limited** due to lack of means of the individuals involved and of financial support by, or facilitated by, the project.
46. In the specific case of Ghana, while the project has clearly contributed to a wide consensus on who should supply legal lumber to the domestic market (policy option 2), **many questions** regarding the modalities of such supply chain still remain unanswered. The participation of the sawmills under option 2 poses a potential risk to an assured and adequate supply of raw material to the artisanal millers from the Timber Utilization Contracts (*TUC*) holding sawmills. Therefore, modalities for cooperation between the latter group and the artisanal millers need to be further explored and developed. Possible modes of supply of raw material for artisanal milling by TUC holders include: (i) the TUC holders (concessionaires) logging themselves to supply the artisanal millers with logs outside the TUC areas; and (ii) TUC holders allowing the artisanal millers to undertake logging themselves inside the concessions. Option (ii) appears not to be the preferred option due to the lack of trust between the two parties based on past experiences. In this rather politicized context, there is **still an important role to be played by TBI/the project** as a relatively neutral player for a number of years to come.

CASE 2: Obogu village - Joasu District, GHANA

In 2010, as a result of the District-level Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue, around 60 persons (of whom around 15 female) decided to get organised in an Association (the *Asante Akyem Woodworkers Association*, AAWA) in order to work with TBI and FSD on improvement of their livelihoods. The AAWA not only includes Chainsaw operators (15-20), but also carriers, timber buyers, farmers, carpenters and artisans. Seeing the first progress made by the Association, others also requested to join the AAWA, but this was rejected; before admitting new members, the association first want to get firmly established and function properly.

Members claim that *'the education has gone down well'*, they are very aware they were *'creating havoc, but they had nothing to eat'*. All members have received 2x3 weeks' training courses from the Business Advisory Centre (BAC) in *Joasu*, a Governmental institution under the District Assembly supporting SMEs financed by TBI. The training packages concerned Organisational skills/Group dynamics, and Business and Financial Management. According to the members, this has resulted in *'a complete change'*; For example, they introduced membership fees (5 GHC/month), and now send out invitation letters before meeting and prepare meeting minutes.

The BAC courses also included technical sessions and follow-up by local specialists from Kumasi on the upgrading of the quality of their work (such as better finishing of doors and door frames) that helped to fetch higher prices than before. Costing and pricing was an important course element, which helped the participants become aware of the real cost of the wood products and of their added value. From the day this training was imparted, they raised prices considerably, and the new prices have actually been paid. The BAC is continuing to follow up on the application of course skills through regular visits.

In the meantime, through TBI mediation the Association has acquired land (1 compartment of 102 ha) for rehabilitation of degraded forest with forest plantations to feed the mills in future. They have asked for a Plantation Plan, which is now under preparation by the CSMP project team. AAWA is also in need of *'seed money'* and is asking TBI to pre-finance their operations. Reportedly, TBI first wants to see their commitment; therefore, they have now started selling shares (50 GHC or 25 USD) and are seeking assistance from the BAC to write a business plan to acquire loans for their commercial activities from the local Rural Banks.

Some 15 members who were formerly Chainsaw Operators are engaged in mobile saw milling, using a machine provided by Husqvarna to TBI for demo purposes which was then installed in *Obogu*. A GTA member is providing them with logs of mostly the lesser-used species in his concession outside the forest reserves. Observations during the site visit were that (1) there is no properly laid out log yard; (2) the sawn timber is not covered and stickered to air-dry properly; (3) only one original band saw came with the mill with no spares; (4) the sharpener for the band saws was at the trainer's premises (i.e. FORIG) near Kumasi and not in place; (5) the machine could not be started for reason of several small technical problems.

An important element in the Association's strategy is the creation of lumber depots in each of the Districts' Area Councils (12) which would serve the local markets; the Association's buyers would then sell it within the District. Most members are farmers and will engage in *'taungya'* farming as the project is supporting plantations establishment in a degraded forest reserve close to the pilot site. Others are involved in beekeeping or charcoal preparation from bamboo. The latter activity seems to have good perspectives, with INBAR technical support and potential District financial support for the construction of a factory for bamboo processing.

In conclusion, the mission was impressed with the local level of organisation and commitment, but also feels more efforts must go into technical support and capacity building to make this pilot a success. The wide membership and range of activities provides good scope to work not just on improved saw milling but also on enhancement of the timber resource base (through timber plantation), on improved resource use efficiency (bamboo charcoal) and on establishment of community-based legal timber supply chain control mechanisms, an important element in the VPA.

6 ON IMPACT

47. There is some indication that '*viable livelihoods in poor forest-dependent communities*' (Overall Objective 1) can be developed, based on legal forest exploitation and utilisation, but the **experience is still in a very initial stage**. Financial viability of options is yet to be proven, as markets are shifting. Financial and technical support for piloting of some models of artisanal milling is very necessary but quite limited. Additional funding brought in through an ACP FLEGT (FAO-managed) project has allowed for development of one of the various aspects (community based wood tracking) of legal artisanal milling, but much more financial and technical support for piloting seems to be required. As phase I has ended before viable CSM-based livelihood models could be properly developed and promoted, funding will need to come mostly from phase II, based on an agreed policy framework. However, community development funds budgeted under phase II are quite limited, especially when compared to the research activities at the pilot sites. The current set-up of phase II seems to be essentially an extension of phase I, but does not seem to be fully geared towards full implementation and consolidation of the alternative models under development in phase I.
48. On the other hand, in Ghana the project has been highly instrumental in **facilitation of external support** from the District Assemblies' Business Advisory Centres (BACs) for capacity building in the selected pilot communities on Group Development; Business and Financial Management. In addition, the BACs are providing assistance for the development of business plans to seek financial support for implementation of planned commercial ventures. TBI has also secured funding from the FAO ACP-FLEGT support programme for a complementary project (Jan-Dec 2012) linking local communities and Timber Utilisation Contract (TUC) holders. This has allowed for developing modalities for partnerships between communities and TUC (timber utilisation contract) holders to produce legal lumber, as well as developing a wood tracking system for the domestic market including participatory monitoring arrangements. Thereby the project has helped putting the new artisanal milling (policy) concept into business practice.
49. Collaboration with the Ghanaian Forestry Commission has also resulted in the TIDD **making two mobile sawmills available** for project pilot sites. In the past, there have been failed attempts by the FC to have the formal sawmill industry supply about 20% of their lumber production to the local market (FC directive of March 2001). However, more recent FC initiatives to address the issue together with the GTMO under the NREG programme, coupled with FC's effective participation in the project-lead Multi Stakeholder Dialogue, appear to have resulted in a convergence of purpose with regards to legal domestic lumber supply. This has ultimately resulted in the Forestry Commission (TIDD) supplying 2 mobile sawmills to support the piloting of artisanal milling by the project.
50. A '*reduced occurrence of illegal logging*' (Overall Objective 2) has clearly happened in the pilot areas, where **awareness** has been raised to an impressive level. In Ghana, however, a large part of the country is likely not to have been reached by the Chainsaw Milling 'gospel', though this could not be ascertained by the short-term evaluation mission. In this regard, it seems desirable to give wider publicity to the achievements to date in the two countries, through the organisation of public events and using mass media. For Ghana, the mission considers a proposal

by DOLTA to carry out a nation-wide awareness raising tour an applaudable initiative, which would deserve donor funding - as far as necessary.

51. The project is making an important contribution to '*conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests*' (Overall Objective 3) by focusing on solutions to one of the main bottlenecks to this objective (illegal CSM). However, in the case of Ghana, it should not lose sight of 'the overall picture' in which **timber harvests still largely exceed the FC-prescribed sustainable yield levels**. In this regard, besides solving access to resource issues, sufficient attention must also be given to **increased productivity of the very resource base**.
52. It is interesting observing that the community-based groups in Ghana's pilot sites tend to be composed of not only chainsaw operators, but equally of carriers, lumber buyers and 'ordinary farmers'. Besides artisanal milling, the groups also show an **interest in reforestation activities**, charcoal production from bamboo, or beekeeping. It is encouraging that the wood workers' associations tend to get involved in plantation activities, following FC's allocation of compartments in degraded forest reserves. Therefore, capacity building of these groups would not only allow for increased efficiency in resource use, but also represent opportunities for increasing the timber resource base. Support to such groups can broaden the project scope from a narrower CSM orientation towards a wider sustainable forest management perspective. Still, much more technical and financial support seems required to have such activities take off in a significant manner. This too calls for further strengthening of the pilot activities.
53. At the global level, the CSM Project has helped **develop the tailor-made solutions** that are required by each of the VPA countries in order to address its specific timber market challenges. It has helped address some of the sensitive forest governance challenges related to legal frameworks, conflicts between law enforcement institutions and chainsaw operators, as well as tensions among formal and informal producers. In Guyana, as the project preceded the start of VPA negotiations with the EU, the project helps ensure that key stakeholders can be effectively involved in the process right from the start, thereby enhancing the quality of the process.
54. In Ghana, the project has contributed importantly to the **quality of the VPA implementation** by ensuring that the VPA process be inclusive (by bringing informal actors into the process) and minimising the trade-offs related to increased law enforcement. As such, it has helped ensure that the VPA is not just about the export markets and FLEGT licensing, but as much about addressing forest governance challenges related to the informal sector and to domestic timber markets. Capacity Building activities have also contributed to development of knowledge and skills necessary for effective (joint) monitoring of VPA implementation, eventually.
55. In the case of Guyana, the project has so far rather **contributed to REDD+ development**, by helping to put the LCDS (low carbon development strategy) into practice, through stakeholder consultation and dialogue, and improved forest sector performance.

CASE 3: Ituni Community, GUYANA

The CSMP was introduced to the community of *Ituni* in the Administrative Region Number 10 in Guyana, in 2009. The CSMP, in partnership with the community groups, such as the Community Development Council (CDC), Ituni Small Loggers Association (ISLA), the women's group and religious groups engaged in several activities aimed at Community Forest Management; Community Livelihood Development; Participatory Management Planning; Marketing and Sales; Production of Craft from non-timber forest resources.

While the men are mostly involved (as loggers) in chainsaw milling operations, and were involved in some of the CSMP activities, the women have been particularly supportive and participating. The members of the women's group were exposed to training in sewing, craft, woodworking, marketing, non-timber forest products, small business management and development, and team and partnership building. They took part in exchange visits with a visit to the village of Orealla/Siparuta in Region 6 and a visit from the women from the village of Annai in Region 9 to the Ituni community. Their capacities were built and they are motivated to transition to another level. In their view, two initiatives can contribute significantly to a successful alternative livelihoods programme, namely the woodwork done at the 'Ituni Skills Training Centre' (under construction) and the sewing and craft work done by the women's group.

The Skills Training Centre or woodwork shop, located in the village falls under the administration of the ISLA and the CDC and the members are currently undergoing the process of registering the centre as a legal entity. This would create an organisational structure with better management and accountability, and facilitate access to more resources. As yet, the organisation is still very fragile. The residents involved in this initiative see a market niche in the production of furniture for schools. Actually, they have already started to produce samples of the school furniture.

Sewing and craft are the other initiatives which the residents believe can offer a viable industry for the community. They are currently undertaken by individual women and members of the women's group. While the individuals work from their homes, as a group, the women work out of a section of the local church. The group has three sewing machines - one was donated by the CSMP and the other two by Digicel Guyana. Nevertheless, there are at least seven other women interested in the sewing programme, and the three sewing machines are not enough; they do not allow for production on a larger scale. The women believe that there is a ready market within the community for school clothes and they are currently servicing an order for 250 Tote bags from an organisation in the USA.

Another challenge, the women explained, was the unavailability of materials locally for some of the products ordered, such as materials to produce the safety vests for loggers. This could, in the view of some, be resolved with the development and implementation of a business plan for the women's group. Craft, residents noted, has potential but the market in the community is limited. They indicated the need for further training in craft to improve the quality of their production. Based on impression from their short visit, the evaluators were not convinced of the viability of craft production by this community which has not traditionally engaged in such activity.

All in all, the community demonstrated that there is a will to get organised and explore new ventures for alternative livelihoods to reduce the impact of chainsaw milling and support the men in the community by engaging in other economic activities. However, in order to achieve tangible and lasting results, there seems to be a need for better alignment of the activities within the broader community development agenda and a clearer focus on markets and economic sustainability.

7 ON SUSTAINABILITY

56. Long-term institutional sustainability of project results will primarily depend on the degree of their uptake by the Forestry Commissions in the respective countries. The above sections have pointed at a **high degree of convergence between project and FC objectives** in Ghana, whereas in Guyana increased convergence of purpose between the Forestry Commission and the project is still required, for the valuable results to be endorsed, used and sustained. This will require a particular effort from project management at the highest level, in collaboration with other development partners active in the forest sector.
57. In Ghana, several resource persons in the Forestry Commission are of the opinion that TBI still has an important role to play, as bringing CSM-ers (illegal operators) around the negotiation table would not be an easy task for the Government to take the lead on. TBI has been bridging the divide by **providing a neutral platform**, especially for piloting the concept of absorbing Illegal CSM-ers into the formal system. This process has only just started and needs further consolidation, in particular as it concerns a change in attitude/mentality among concerned government officials and formal operators alike. Many issues still need to be addressed. According to some, TBI's lead role in the process would be needed for another couple of years (5 or so)...
58. In both countries, the question how the MSD can be sustained and **'institutionalised'** isn't fully answered yet. In Ghana, the MSD has been accommodated by the National Forest Forum, which is a more permanent structure, though largely dependent on donor funding (FAO, EU/NREG); how the MSD could self-finance itself is as yet unclear. The MSD Steering Committee (MSD-SC) members feel the MSD should continue to exist as a 'mechanism' that can address contentious issues, such as CSM; in future, it could also deal with other issues as they arise. For now, the MSD has agreed to focus on the four key areas of Legitimacy, Sustainability, Representation and Linkages with other multi-stakeholder platforms, and it is discussing an action plan focusing on these key areas. Some informants in the FC feel that henceforth the FC should run the MSD forum, with TBI just providing inputs (studies). In the evaluator's view, however, at this point in time, FC is not generally seen as an independent actor capable of representing the interest of all relevant stakeholders.
59. In Guyana, there is **no real permanent structure** where the MSD process could be housed and sustained. In absence of a national forest forum, the LCDS consultation mechanism would seem an option, but it is lead by the President, and can hardly be considered an independent forum. Moreover, the process has not really taken off at the national level, and it is as yet unclear how the MSD would relate to temporary structures created in the framework of the VPA negotiation process. In terms of capacities built, participants pointed out that a lot of capacity building has happened 'in the process' of learning by doing. In particular, consensus building and conflict resolution.

8 ON COHERENCE AND COLLABORATION

60. In general, EC officials express their appreciation for the **collaborative attitude** and constructive relationship with Project Management. This has allowed for the project to function as an important action in support of the VPA processes and of FLEGT action in general.
61. In Ghana, the Multi Stakeholder Dialogue is linked to the National Forest Forum – ‘housed’ at the RMSC of the Forest Commission. Reason for this choice is that the dialogue approach fits well with the approach advocated by NFF; moreover, the NFF has legitimacy and is well recognised by government. However, there is some apprehension by some NGOs (e.g. Forest Watch) that this linkage may make it bureaucratic and not allow for an **objective representation of the stakeholders** - especially the forest communities. The evaluation mission’s limited field exposure, however, suggests that forest communities have effectively participated and have not been inhibited by the MSD’s indirect linkage to the Forest Commission.
62. In Guyana, it was found that FAO appears not to be well informed of the project. In June 2013, it will be organising a regional conference on the (Voluntary Guidelines for) Governance of Tenure (land, forests, fishing). It struck the mission that FAO is **not really aware of the MSD process** and the important governance work done under it. At the same time, they showed great interest in this process and offered their mediation in trying to address the current stalemate. After all, FAO has a particular focus on NR governance policies, and can help bring parties around the table. It is also involved in an independent review of the MRV methodology in the context of the LCDS.

9 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Global (project) level :

1. The project has been and continues to be very influential, in helping to 'get issues on the table', and creating space for less vocal and more vulnerable stakeholders. The multi-stakeholder dialogue approach is generally considered to be a valuable instrument for continual discussion and consensus building in and outside the forestry sector. It makes an important contribution to democratisation of processes and conflict resolution.
2. The project has extensively raised awareness among CSM practitioners of the pros and cons of their chainsaw milling practice, and has had many joint initiatives to increase legality of their operations and change their practice.
3. Working with and through the Forestry Commission has not always been easy, but has in the end generated the necessary ownership, and mainstreamed 'dialogue thinking' within the Forest Services. This has started resulting in some behavioural change of forest service staff too.
4. Yet, both in Ghana and Guyana, the project has experienced resistance due to a perceived lack of neutrality in its facilitation of the MSD; it would be biased towards the chainsaw millers (Ghana) or reporting inaccurately, forwarding personal views rather than evidence-based data (Guyana). The importance of managing perceptions is an important lesson for future MSD facilitation.
5. While the project has been effective in working with Administrations, in particular the Forestry Commissions in both countries, political processes still remain largely outside the project's sphere of influence, while they can make or break project achievements. There is much left to be done to find effective ways to influence the political processes.
6. The project has, so far, been less successful in generating alternatives to (illegal) chainsaw lumbering. In Ghana, there is consensus that chainsaw milling should be replaced by 'artisanal milling', using portable sawmills, but no robust experience has been gained as yet. In Guyana too, while there is consensus that chainsaw milling need not necessarily be harmful, conditions and modalities of economically and environmentally viable practices are yet to be defined.
7. The project has been strong at documenting, sharing and discussing its experience, and exposing itself in many high level gatherings. This has helped put CSM on the global forestry agenda.

GHANA specific:

8. There is a strong competition for the lumber produced locally from neighbouring countries which are said to pay better prices for the lumber than local buyers. The conditions for the support being provided by the project for artisanal milling include sales only to the local market. However, past experiences under similar circumstances indicate that powerful market forces make it difficult to regulate the latter. Innovative measures seem to be required to ensure the conformity of the artisanal millers who receive project support with such requirement.
9. The Furniture and Wood Worker Association (FAWAG) has been relying on the cheap illegal chainsaw lumber. The regularisation of CSM into artisanal milling and the VPA implementation will lead to availability of lumber on the local market but probably at a higher price than that of

the illegal CS milled lumber. The FAWAG members do not currently have the capacity to produce high quality furniture or joinery that would fetch good prices, and allow them to pay 'realistic prices' (read: higher prices) for the legal lumber. Without an upgrade of skills and production capacity of the FAWAG members by the project or their linkage to other support services, they may not be able to take full advantage of the legal lumber that is expected to become available on the local market in the future. In this regard, increased participation in initiatives and courses aimed at strengthening processing techniques and the marketing of products is considered essential, alongside a systematic enforcement of legal compliance.

10. According to various resource persons, an important source of legal raw material for artisanal milling is the significant proportion of the yield allocated by the FC to the TUC holders that is generally left standing by the TUC holders as a result of the mainstream wood industry's concentration on species preferences by the export markets. Such "left over" species are made up of mainly the Lesser Used Species (LUS) and the Lesser Known Species (LKS) that are not naturally durable. Studies by FORIG have revealed that over 80 of such species have already been introduced to the local market by illegal chainsaw millers. FORIG may be commissioned to provide easily accessible information to end-users on the appropriate lumber preservative methods and treatment chemicals in the short-term, while the refinement of such recommendations is undertaken in the longer term.
11. Similarly, skills upgrading with regards to appropriate methods of drying and preservative treatment at the artisanal milling pilot sites is crucial so as not to give the LUS and LKS species a bad reputation before they are promoted as part of improved chainsaw milling practices. The project could identify the need that testing and skills upgrading is done so the market would be able to absorb the lesser known species.
12. The leases of most of the TUCs have long expired and are yet to be renewed. The GTA considers this to be a major impediment to their ability to supply legal raw material for artisanal milling if the situation is not rectified on time. The FC should look into this situation.

GUYANA specific:

13. The mission was unable to establish causes of the stalled MSD process in Guyana. One factor may be that NR governance in Guyana is high on the political agenda and the policy framework is highly contentious. It seems the project has been overly optimistic / ambitious about influencing the policy process within the project's timeframe. The initial enthusiasm created in the MSD became entrenched in the political arena, where established interests may have felt they were being encroached upon.
14. Furthermore, in the course of the project (2011-2012), the project's institutional context underwent major changes; Guyana's Forestry Commission became part of the large Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, created in November 2011 when the various natural resource ministries were pulled together under one political head. On top of that, national elections may well have created increased sensitivity to what was being discussed in the MSD, which was then being seen as 'politicized'.

15. Still, the trust building and willingness to negotiate that have occurred is considered impressive by all participants in the process. Even if it did not directly lead to policy change, there is a high degree of agreement 'on the ground' on the issues and how to move forward.

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

In order of priority:

1. At community/Small Loggers Associations/Wood Workers Associations level; an increased focus on development of the wood value chain, based on proper market research (exploration of the demand of sawmills and other processing industries) and development of business plans seems as much needed as development of technical skills. The project needs to invest more to facilitate practical application of newly acquired skills and establish a number of successful pilot experiences. At the same time, in the mission's view, development of 'alternative livelihood' may be limited to the 'minimum necessary' for local support, as the project is hardly in a position to properly facilitate such development; it can however help establish linkages to service providers and projects. Moreover, as alternative livelihood activities are mostly undertaken with women, they do not – at this point in time – reduce pressure on the forest resources.
2. Further investigate the viability and constraints of the various management modalities of chainsaw milling / portable milling, including the single operators, the associations and the (indigenous) community run schemes. Results should help guide future support activities. Besides several technical questions, weak leadership and unequal benefit distribution still seem to be obstacles to effective group management of the associations (for example joint management of portable sawmills).
3. To maintain the MSD processes up and running in both countries; experience has shown that for successful LAS development and implementation, multi stakeholder consultation processes should be sustained, and Private Sector experience should continually feed into the system. While stakeholders in both countries would still like to see Tropenbos International play its 'independent brokering role' for a few more years to come, possibilities for institutionalisation of the valuable MSD processes should be further explored.
4. Detailed analysis and documentation of strengths and weaknesses of the MSD processes is highly recommended for it to serve as model for other countries and sectors. To some extent, the process has already been documented in the form of an attractive country-level publications which collect stories of project staff involved in the processes, but more analysis is necessary.
5. Project reporting could benefit from more analysis and reference to expected outcomes and objectives, and to the indicators for impact measurement. For the sake of clarity and practical use, it is also recommended that reporting on progress in the two countries be done in separate sections, with a short summary for the overall project.
6. In the light of the above observations and the changing contexts, undertake as soon as possible a mid-term review of phase II focusing on the relevance of objectives and expected results, and appropriateness of current budget layouts.

GHANA specific:

7. Strengthen implementation of strategies related to the policy (option 2) of having both sawmills and artisanal millers supply the domestic market. In particular, the 'alternatives to illegal CSM' are yet to be properly developed. This includes:
 - (1) Modalities and scope of association of 'artisanal millers': the broad scope of some of the woodworkers 'associations (which include farmers engaging in reforestation) could be seized as an opportunity to enhance the timber resource base and broaden the project scope towards a sustainable forest management perspective;
 - (2) Modalities of supply of legal saw logs to artisanal millers (by timber contractors or by milling inside the concessions) are yet to be developed;
 - (3) Scope of activities of domestic lumber traders, in particular their role in importing lumber, is yet to be further explored and developed.
8. In view of lessons learning and replication/scaling up of the pilot experiences, the piloting of artisanal milling must be accorded to the necessary practical support so as to ensure profitability and sustained interest of the concerned associations and communities. The mission identified the following issues of concern: acquisition of legal raw material; proper siting and layout of the artisanal mill yard; efficient operation and maintenance of the mobile sawmills and the associated band saws; proper staking and storage of the lumber produced; and efficient marketing of the lumber.
9. Undertake work studies to assess the factors that affect the productivity of the various acquired mobile sawmills under the different pilot site conditions as well as other types of mobile/small mills that may be in operation elsewhere in the country so as to develop robust models that can be adopted for replication.

GUYANA specific:

10. (Inter-)national Project Management should undertake action to restore effective collaboration with the Forestry Commission on the Multi Stakeholder Dialogue. At the same time, invest more in strategic partnerships with Development Partners such as FAO. The mission suggests organization of a high-level public event in which results of the (regional) MSD to date are presented as a highly valuable outcome of a joint process, credits for the good work done are shared and a renewed commitment to take the process further is created. Main donors (EU, WB, and USAID) and development partners (FAO) should be invited. In a second stage, to identify real contentious issues (such as arbitration body) and ways to move the dialogue forward.
11. To the Guyana Forestry Commission: recognize the value and validity of the outcomes of the regional MSD processes and grasp these as opportunities in the context of the VPA consultation process. To build on the ongoing MSD processes for further development of communication and engagement with stakeholder groups, review of the Legality Definition and development of chain of custody mechanisms, in particular for communally managed schemes. The project provides an opportunity for the GoG to demonstrate transparency and openness, features that would increase confidence in the stakeholder consultation process undertaken in the context of the VPA negotiations.

GHANA

Main achievements and strengths

1. The project responds ‘spot on’ to a very **real and urgent need**, in particular in Ghana, and has come up with the right strategy to approach the issue. The project was introduced at a time when the FC was trying to find a solution to a long standing problem with regards to illegal Chainsaw milling. Consequently, project activities find a fertile soil, and are clearly facilitated by activities undertaken by the FC, such as increased monitoring of timber flows and others.
2. The creation of an **MSD platform** that has been accepted by previously antagonistic stakeholders on the illegal chainsaw milling issue (i.e. those involved in illegal chainsaw milling/trade and the regulatory agency – the FC). This has led to consensus and recommendation of several strategies to address CSM and a related action plan. The well-structured MSD is considered to be the **key to the success** that the project is generally acknowledged to have achieved. The MSD platform has created a space where ultimately separate government-lead and TBI-lead processes to address domestic lumber market issues have converged.
3. Effective **awareness creation** among those involved in illegal chainsaw milling/trade has made most of them change their mind-sets and open up to provide information on how the activity is undertaken to circumvent or outwit the regulatory agencies. This has led to a better **understanding** of the drivers of chainsaw milling in Ghana, and publication of a highly useful synthesis report on all drivers of CSM. It has also made a very important contribution to **conflict resolution and prevention** related to illegality, which after all is the project’s specific objective (**SO**). It must be highlighted that the project has also achieved a major change in perception and attitudes of Forestry Commission staff resulting in their opening up to considering options that would previously have been considered ‘off limits’.
4. **Concrete assistance** to those involved in CSM and trade to:
 - a. participate effectively in the MSDs to identify appropriate alternatives to their illegal activities
 - b. seek financial support (BUSAG funds) to organise their members both at the community level and nationally to present a united front to champion their causes (e.g. dialogue with policy makers) as well as undertake study trips to Guyana to learn and share lessons.
5. **Facilitation of external support** from the District Assemblies’ **Business Advisory Centres** (BACs) for capacity building in the selected pilot communities on Group Development; Business and Financial Management. In addition, the BACs are providing assistance for the development of business plans to seek financial support for implementation of planned commercial ventures. TBI has also secured funding from the **FAO ACP-FLEGT** support programme for a complementary project (Jan-Dec 2012) linking local communities and forest concession holders. This has allowed for developing modalities for partnerships between communities and TUC (timber utilisation contract) holders to produce legal lumber, as well as developing a

wood tracking system for the domestic market including participatory monitoring arrangements. Thereby this project has helped putting the new artisanal milling (policy) concept into business practice.

Collaboration with the **Forestry Commission** has also resulted in the TIDD making two mobile sawmills available for the piloting of artisanal milling in the project pilot sites. While there had been failed attempts by the FC to have the GTMO supply about 20% of their lumber production to the local market in the past (FC directive of March 2001), more recent FC initiatives to address the issue together with the GTMO under the NREG programme coupled with FC's effective participation in the project lead MSD appear to have contributed to a convergence of purpose with regards to legal domestic lumber supply.

6. Interestingly, the community-based groups (in pilot sites) tend to be composed of not only chainsaw operators, but equally of carriers, lumber buyers and 'ordinary farmers'. Besides artisanal milling, the groups also show an interest in reforestation activities, charcoal production from bamboo, or beekeeping for example. Therefore, capacity building of these groups would not only allow for increasing efficiency in resource use, but also represent opportunities for **increasing the timber resource base**. Support to such groups can broaden the project scope from a narrower CSM orientation towards a wider sustainable forest management perspective.
7. Besides its direct results, the project is making an important contribution to **VPA implementation** in Ghana by reconciling EU legal timber needs with socio-economic realities of producer countries. More specifically, the project helps create awareness of legality issues and address the domestic market policies and practice, which is commonly considered to be the greatest challenge for implementation of the VPA.
8. Main **factors contributing to success** seem to be:
 - a. **Flexibility** of the project to operate in a highly dynamic and evolving environment and yet stay focused on its 'mission'. In particular, TBI has been able to bring the stakeholder dialogue down to the District level, and marry its approach to that of the main stakeholder, the Forestry Commission. In doing so, it could merge a more social / livelihood approach with the market/ law enforcement approach advocated by FC. This is resulting in concurrent efforts (TIDD, TBI, VPA (M-SIC), FAO) undertaken to address commonly felt needs.
 - b. The FC was open minded and **cooperative**, assisting with:
 - i. the choice of the projects pilot sites;
 - ii. secondment of staff to assist with national facilitation and the mainstreaming of the community facilitation processes within its District offices;
 - iii. Making mobile sawmills available for two pilot sites.

Main issues and weaknesses

9. The **mainstream wood industry** (i.e. the Ghana Timbers Association, GTA and the Ghana Timber Millers Organisation, GTMO) are key stakeholders to the project. However, their ini-

tial perception that the project is promoting the legalisation of CSM – that they consider as being destructive to the timber stocks in their TUC holdings - created inertia with regards to their participation in the project. Nonetheless,

- a. participation of the GTA's President in the PAC meetings allowed for a better understanding of the project's purpose and improved their participation in project activities;
 - b. One GTMO member (Logs and Lumber Ltd. (LLL), Kumasi) has recently shown willingness to cooperate with the supply of raw material from its TUCs to one of the project's pilot artisanal millers. The firm expects to use such cooperation to minimize illegal logging in the remote parts of its TUC.
10. While the project has clearly contributed to a wide consensus on who should supply legal lumber to the domestic market (policy option 2), many **questions** regarding the modalities of such supply chain still remain unanswered. The participation of the sawmills under option 2 poses a **potential risk** to an assured and adequate supply of raw material to the artisanal millers from the TUC holding sawmills. Therefore, modalities for cooperation between the latter group and the artisanal millers (e.g. the LLL example above) need to be further explored and developed. Possible modes of supply of raw material for artisanal milling by TUC holders include: (i) the TUC holders (cessionaires) log themselves to supply the artisanal millers with logs outside the TUC areas; and (ii) TUC holders allow the artisanal millers to undertake logging themselves inside the concessions. Option (ii) appears not to be the preferred option due to the lack of trust between the two parties based on past experiences. In this rather politicized context, there is still an important role to be played by TBI/the project as a relatively neutral player for a number of years to come.
11. There is some indication that '*viable livelihoods in poor forest-dependent communities*' (**OO1**) can be developed, based on legal forest exploitation, but the experience is still in a very initial stage. Financial viability of options is yet to be proven, as markets are shifting. Financial and technical support for piloting of some models of artisanal milling is very necessary but is quite limited. Additional funding brought in through a FLEGT-ACP (FAO) project has allowed for developing one of several aspects (community based wood tracking) of legal artisanal milling, but much more financial and technical support for piloting is required. As phase I has ended before viable CSM-based livelihood models could be properly developed and promoted, funding would need to come mostly from phase II. However, community development funds budgeted under phase II are quite limited, especially when compared to the necessary research activities at the pilot sites. The current set-up of phase II seems to be essentially an extension of phase I, but does not seem to be fully geared towards implementation and consolidation of the alternatives under development.
12. The *occurrence of illegal logging* (**OO2**) has clearly subsided in the pilot areas, where awareness has been raised to an impressive level. However, large part of the country has not been reached by the CSMP 'gospel'. In this regard, the mission considers a proposal by DOLTA to carry out a nation-wide awareness raising tour an applaudable initiative, which would deserve donor funding - as far as necessary. It would not only allow for dissemination of FLEGT-VPA information, but also strengthen DOLTA's role in fostering the necessary change.

13. The project is making an important contribution to '*conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests*' (OO3) by focusing on solutions to one of the main bottlenecks to this objective (illegal CSM). However, it should not lose sight of 'the overall picture' in which timber harvests still largely exceed sustainable yield levels. In this regard, besides solving *access* to resource issues, sufficient attention must also be given to *increased production* of the very resource base. It is encouraging that chainsaw millers' associations tend to also get involved in plantation activities, following FC's allocation compartments in degraded forest reserves, but it seems that more technical and financial support is required to have such activities take off in a significant manner. This too calls for further strengthening of the pilot activities.
14. Project reporting is relatively unclear; Even though activities are well monitored, and large amounts of information is collected and documented, it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of where the project is today, in terms of expected results, and in comparison with the past situations. Moreover, determination of baseline indicators was initiated towards the end of Phase I and is still ongoing at 2 months from end-of-project. Reporting is mostly done in function of planned activities, but provides little information on the state of play concerning the development of alternatives to CSM in the various sites.

Main recommendations

15. Detailed documentation of MSD process is highly recommended for it to serve as model for other countries and sectors. To some extent, the process has already been documented in the form of an attractive joint TBI/FORIG/FC publication (Securing legal domestic lumber supply through multi-stakeholder dialogue in Ghana) which collects stories of project staff involved in the processes. More detailed documentation of the MSD process seems to be the objective of an upcoming mission by an MSD expert in February 2013.
16. Strengthen implementation of strategies related to the policy (option 2) of having both sawmills and artisanal millers supply the domestic market. In particular, the '**alternatives to illegal CSM**' are yet to be properly developed.
 - a. Modalities and scope of association of 'artisanal millers'; the broad scope of some of the woodworkers' associations (ref. above section) could be seized as an opportunity to also broaden the project scope towards a sustainable forest management perspective.
 - b. Modalities of supply of legal saw logs to artisanal millers (by timber contractors or by milling inside the concessions) are yet to be developed;
 - c. Scope of activities of domestic lumber traders, in particular their role in importing lumber, is yet to be further explored and developed.
17. In view of lessons learning and replication/scaling up of the pilot experiences, the **piloting of artisanal milling** must be accorded the necessary practical support so as to ensure profitability and sustained interest of the concerned associations and communities. The mission identified the following issues of concern: acquisition of legal raw material; proper siting and layout of the artisanal mill yard; efficient operation and maintenance of the mobile sawmills

and the associated band saws; proper staking and storage of the lumber produced; and efficient marketing of the lumber.

- a. Undertake work studies to assess the factors that affect the productivity of the various acquired mobile sawmills under the different pilot site conditions as well as other types of mobile/small mills that may be in operation elsewhere in the country so as to develop robust models that can be adopted for replication.

18. In the light of the above observations and the changing contexts, undertake as soon as possible a **mid-term review of phase II** focusing on the relevance of objectives and expected results, and appropriateness of current budget layouts.

Other issues

19. There is a **strong competition** for the lumber produced locally from neighbouring countries which are said to pay better prices for the lumber than sold locally. The conditions for the support being provided by the project for artisanal milling include sales only to the local market. However, past experiences under similar circumstances indicate that such powerful market forces make it difficult to regulate the latter. Innovative measures therefore seem to be required to ensure the conformity of the artisanal millers who receive support from the project with such requirement. While the mission is of the opinion that the project's focus should primarily be on producing legally and sustainably, and that final destination of the lumber produced may be less of a direct concern, it respects the broad consensus on the definition of artisanal milling as supplying to domestic markets only.
20. The Furniture and Wood Worker Association (FAWAG) has been relying on the cheap illegal chainsaw lumber. The regularisation of CSM into artisanal milling and the VPA implementation will lead to availability of lumber on the local market but probably at a higher price than that of the illegal CS milled lumber. The FAWAG members do not currently have the capacity to produce high quality furniture or joinery that would fetch good prices, and allow them to pay 'realistic prices' (read: higher prices) for the legal lumber. Without an **upgrade of skills and production capacity** of the FAWAG members by the project or their linkage to other support services, they may not be able to take full advantage of the lumber that is expected to become available on the local market in the future. In this regard, increased participation in initiatives and courses aimed at strengthening processing techniques and the marketing of products is considered essential, in combination with systematic law enforcement.
21. According to various resource persons, an important source of legal raw material for artisanal milling is the significant proportion of the yield allocated by the FC to the TUC holders that is generally left standing by the TUC holders as a result of the mainstream wood industry's concentration on species preferences by the export markets. Such "left over" species are made up of mainly the Lesser Used Species (LUS) and the Lesser Known Species (LKS) that are not naturally durable. Studies by FORIG have revealed that over 80 of such species have already been introduced to the local market by illegal chainsaw millers. FORIG may be commissioned to provide easily accessible information to end-users on the appropriate **lumber preservative methods** and chemical treatments in the short-term, while the refinement of such recommendations is undertaken in the longer term.

22. Similarly, skills upgrading with regards to the appropriate methods of **drying and preservative treatment** at the artisanal milling pilot sites is very crucial so as not to give the LUS and LKS species a bad reputation once their use is promoted.
23. The duration of the leases of most of the TUCs have long expired and yet to be renewed. The GTA considers this to be a major impediment to their ability to supply legal raw material for artisanal milling if the situation is not rectified on time. The FC should look into this situation.

GUYANA

Main achievements/ strengts

1. While CSM was legal, FC has come to acknowledge and address problems in sub-sector. The project has instilled a 'new outlook' in FC staff – which is a big accomplishment in itself; a mentality and behavioral change from enforcement towards dialogue.
2. The project came in support of a national drive for enhanced governance and legal compliance (stepped up control and law enforcement), driven to a large extent by Guyana's engagement in the LCDS. It is regarded (by the Office of Climate Change) as an important opportunity to translate Guyana's low carbon development policies into practice on the ground, improving sector performance and stakeholder dialogue as key objectives of the LCDS.
3. High quality of the structured regional-level MS dialogue, both in terms of process and of products. The MSD has seen active participation of all relevant stakeholders, and resulted in identification of solutions; a bottom-up process feeding the national policy process. The dialogue process has contributed to conflict resolution at local level; It could serve as basis and model for further VPA development process... though it is yet to be confirmed if it will be used as such opportunity.
4. Capacity building, especially of SLA and women in the pilot sites. Sustainable Forest Management, Safety, Governance, accounting, technical trainings; the project went beyond information and consultation responding to real needs. In several of the pilot sites, it is the first time that an external actor comes to discuss community development.

Main issues

5. Limited engagement/buy in by the Forest Commission; there appears to be a lack of sense of urgency and felt need by the GFC for project objectives. Nonetheless, in the course of project implementation, it has come to acknowledge the problems existing in the CSM sub-sector and the need for a response strategy. With FTCI as project implementing partner, GFC rightly feels co-responsible for project outputs. However, it is not always easy for GFC to subscribe to the analysis provided by the MSD, in which behaviour of GFC as one of the key stakeholders in the process is sometimes criticized. From this point of view, it would have been easier for the project to be housed outside of the GFC institutions.
6. On the other hand, GFC/FTCI being part of the project and co-responsible for outputs, increases the sense of ownership, as is illustrated by the extensive comments made on draft reports, necessary for long-term sustainability of project results. There is a need for project management to balance the pros and cons of having GFC as project partner, and carefully manage GFC's position in the project, with full awareness of sensitivities. In this regard, the VPA negotiation process that Guyana has started engaging in is expected to increase interest in the outputs and outcomes produced by the project.
7. Result area 5 'Communities involved in sustainable and legal CSM': As yet, the mission is not convinced project has had an important impact in this regard; Legality of operations has increased but field visits in Ituni and Orealla suggest that sustainability of forestry and

commercial operations is still rather limited. A few issues seem to constrain impact at local level: (1) Limited market orientation, both for the chainsaw millers' operations (what is the demand of millers and buyers) and for the alternative livelihood options (a need for better research and analysis of market opportunities). Limited value adding as yet in the wood production chains; Limited financial and material support by the project for developing the new techniques and opportunities: in several cases skills have been developed but practical application of new skills remains limited due to lack of means; Lack of business plans.

8. 'Lax' project management and little corrective action taken: the mission is surprised that the discussion of a 'report on issues' has been allowed to go on for > 1 year without conclusion. While there may have been a need to 'let things settle' for a while, there is also a need for maintaining the momentum. In the mission's view, there are few really contentious issues, and these do not seem impossible to address, provided proper management of the process, proper communication and engagement with the FC. Several factors seem to have caused a stalled process: (1) it seems to have been insufficiently clear – at the outset - what output the MSD process was expected to produce; hence a lack of joint commitment to produce such output; (2) over-ambition: an overestimation of the project's span of influence on Guyana's forest policies; (3) limited allocation of human resources: both project coordinator and MSD Facilitator positions left open for a long time.

Main recommendations

1. To PM: Undertake action to restore effective collaboration with the Forestry Commission on the Multi Stakeholder Dialogue. At the same time, invest more in strategic partnerships with Development Partners such as FAO and USAID. The mission suggests organization of a high-level public event in which results of the (regional) MSD to date are presented as a highly valuable outcome of a joint process, without focusing much on contentious policy issues. Among others, main donors (EU, WB, and USAID) and development partners (FAO) should be invited. In a second stage, to identify real contentious issues (such as arbitration body) and identify ways to move the dialogue forward.
2. Further investigate the viability and constraints of the various management modalities of chainsaw milling / portable milling, including the single operators, the associations and the (indigenous) community run schemes. Results should help guide future support activities. In particular, weak leadership and unequal benefit distribution still seem to be obstacles to effective group management of the associations (for example joint management of a portable sawmill).
3. At community/SLA level; an increased focus on development of the wood value chain, based on proper market research (exploration of the demand of sawmills and other processing industries) and development of business plans seems as much needed as technical skills. Besides the technical training, the project needs to invest more to facilitate practical application of newly acquired skills, and establish a number of successful pilot experiences. At the same time, in the mission's view, development of 'alternative livelihood' should be limited to the 'minimum necessary' (for local support) as the project is hardly in a position to properly facilitate such development; it can however help establish linkages. Moreover, alternative livelihood activities

are mostly undertaken with women, and do not – at this point in time – reduce pressure on the forest resources.

4. To the Forestry Commission: recognize the value and validity of the outcomes of the regional MSD processes and grasp these as opportunities in the context of the VPA consultation process. To build on the ongoing MSD processes for further development of communication and engagement with stakeholder groups, review of the Legality Definition and development of chain of custody mechanisms, in particular for community managed schemes.

ANNEX 2: NAMES OF THE EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

Mr Egbert TOPPER – Topperspective BVBA, Belgium

The evaluation was led by Egger Topper, an experienced Monitoring and Evaluation expert who brings over twenty years of knowledge and experience of forestry and governance. Egger has recently evaluated several projects related to FLEGT, implemented by FAO, EFI, TFT and IFIA/ATIBT, covering English, French and Spanish speaking countries. He therefore has a good overview of actors and developments in forest governance and trade. Egger also has a good understanding of the complexities and challenges faced with conducting of multi-country evaluations having undertaken numerous such exercises for the various donor organisations. This is supported by robust skills in preparing and delivering credible high quality reports for leading international development organisations, in particular the EU.

Mr Francis Kojo ODOOM – Arbor Nova Limited, Ghana

Odoom's experiences include evaluation of forestry projects covering Ghana, Mozambique, Zambia and Uganda. As Director of Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PPME), Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources (MLNR), Ghana (2002-2003), his duties included the facilitation of the design of monitoring and evaluation systems for the Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) as well as for the Land Administration Project (LAP). He has also been intermittently involved in the evaluation of several international projects from 1992 to 2007 for the DGIS, CARE International, Tropenbos International, UNDP, FAO, National Forest Programme Facility and GTZ. His other experiences include planning and managing forestry projects spanning over 12 years. The responsibilities included: project proposal and report writing; and backstopping missions. The fields of specialty involved range from forestry through forest industry to marketing of forest products, Reducing Emissions through deforestation and forest degradation (REDD) as well as social forestry (e.g. forest communities livelihoods) and environmental issues.

Ms Audreyanna THOMAS – Global Perspective Inc, Guyana

Audreyanna is a Development Practitioner who specializes in Communication and is an Accredited Partnership Practitioner. She has over 19 years of experience in various aspects of Communications more recently community development, organisational/institutional strengthening. She has worked for several international and local organizations, such as, UNDP, UNICEF, PAHO/WHO, IDB, USAID, EU, CEHI and Government Ministries and Agencies in Guyana, in areas of communication, national coordination, project coordination, facilitation, editorial, research, among others. Her professional training reflects an interesting multi-disciplinary range which spans across the Social, Natural, Environmental and Health Sciences. She is currently the Managing Director of Global Perspective Inc. (GPI), a Not-for-Profit Consultancy Firm that has as its motto "Bridging the Development Gap". This firm was established by her in 2007, to assist in bringing more impact, sustainability, structure and definition to development processes for an improved quality of life for citizens, especially the poor.

Method and Approach

Our method includes a review of CSMP documentation, discussions with EU and country stakeholders, visits to selected countries and the development of reports that address the evaluation requirements. We propose that a detailed evaluation plan will be developed early on in the project in consultation with TBI. A key aspect of our approach is ensuring that the evaluation is conducted in an objective, impartial, open and participatory manner, based on empirically verified evidence that is valid and reliable.

The evaluation will focus on the performance and impact of the project and on identifying lessons learnt. It will be based on the five evaluation criteria set out by the European Commission; these criteria will be applied selectively to the actors located at different levels and to the outputs and outcomes the project has produced. Beyond outputs and outcomes, particular attention will be given to the processes of participation of and communication with stakeholders.

We propose that for each of the five main (EU) evaluation criteria, one clear Evaluation Question (EQ) will be formulated to be answered by the end of the evaluation. Based on the ToR, for each of these EQs we have developed a tentative checklist, identifying some of the main issues with regard to each of the questions. Essentially, the table represents a reorganisation of the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. We propose to also include the question of complementarity to other EU/donor initiatives, an issue that is considered to be particularly relevant for evaluation of EU funded actions.

This Evaluation Matrix is proposed as a point of departure. The questions and issues would be refined during the preparation phase and agreed upon with Tropenbos.

The approach will essentially be 'deductive' based on mixed methods for data collection. Data collection tools such as semi-structured individual and group interviews, workshops and focus group discussions will be based on pre-formulated templates to support a structured and systematic collection and analysis of information. The review methodologies to be used for data collection and analysis will ensure reliable analysis by triangulating data, as far as possible and drawing on multiple sources to take care that findings are generalized and not the result of bias or views of a single agency or type of actor involved in the process. Focus will be on analysing all information collected in order to obtain evidence based conclusions by combining primary data (collected by the consultants) with secondary information (review of the project bibliography). The tools will include an evidence findings table - structured according to the *evaluation matrix (Annex 4)*.

Data from interviews will be processed separately for each of the main stakeholder groups. This approach is expected to lead to an overall perception, by stakeholder group, of the main issues concerning or affecting the project. The proposed groups are (1) Tropenbos International, its partners and project team, (2) National, regional and local forest and other authorities, (3) Forest resource owners and rights-holders (Chainsaw lumbering communities in Ghana and Concessionaires in Guyana), (4) International Organisations and decision-makers (such as EC, ETFAG), (5) Other stakeholders such as civil society groups, the formal timber industry and independent observers.

Activities and Work Plan

Phase 1: Preparation (5 days)

We propose a briefing and discussion session with TBI (in the Wageningen office) to present our approach and clarify any issues with the TOR or evaluation plan. This is aimed at gaining a shared understanding and agreement on the scope and timelines of the evaluation. The preparation phase will include identification, collection and review of basic available literature, data and other material, including the various official documents concerned by this evaluation. This phase will include agreeing the final TOR and developing the final evaluation plan.

The team will agree on the sites to be visited during the country visits to Ghana and Guyana, and the logistical organisation of the travel. Sites could be selected on the basis of a number of criteria, including for example (a) level of chainsaw milling activity and related trade, (b) overall level of forest governance, (c) degree of success of the project; (d) geographical spread. As regards Ghana, Kumasi would seem to be a good basis from where to visit several sites (Joasu and others) and timber markets. In Guyana, two or three of the four pilot sites may be visited.

The Preparation phase is concluded by submission of a detailed work plan and preparations for the country visits. The final evaluation plan will document the overall scope of work, a detailed approach, a complete evaluation matrix and revised work plan. Contacts with the national consultants will be established and appointments for meetings and interviews with the identified resource persons made. A period of at least two weeks is foreseen, between work planning and actual country visits, so as to increase chances of people's availability.

Phase 2: Key stakeholder interviews and field visits (15 days)

The second phase is dedicated to data collection and analysis. Initially, interviews will be conducted with relevant Europe-based stakeholders, in particular the relevant Services of the European Commission and international organisations such as FERN. Apart from collecting donor and stakeholder views, the purpose of these interviews is to establish the range of issues that are important for the 'field visits', and confirm the list of relevant resource persons.

For each of the focal country visits, a seven days' trip is foreseen to allow for five full work days in-country. The first country proposed to be visited is Ghana, as the CSMP Task Manager is based in Accra. A briefing by the EC-Delegation is aimed at discussing the issues to be considered during the evaluation, to be followed by meetings with national-level stakeholders, in particular the Forestry Commission. Days 2-4 will be dedicated to field visits to meet a selection of stakeholders and resource persons, and visit timber markets. On the last day in-country, initial findings will be discussed with the national project teams and partners.

A similar schedule is proposed for Guyana. Following each country visit, two days of data processing and analysis is foreseen.

Phase 3: Reporting and Debriefing (5 days)

A total of four days is foreseen for synthesis and report writing. One day (including travel) is planned for presentation of findings to TBI and concluding discussions with project management. Based on feedback received, the draft report will be revised and finalised (1 day) for submission by 15th of March 2013.

The evaluation is proposed to start on 15th January 2013 and be finalised by 22nd March 2013. The work calendar with milestones is presented hereafter.

Work Calendar

JANUARY 2013			
		ACTIVITIES	wds
TUE	1		
WED	2		
THU	3		
FRI	4		
SAT	5		
SUN	6		
MON	7		
TUE	8		
WED	9		
THU	10		
FRI	11		
SAT	12		
SUN	13	PHASE 1: PREPARATION PHASE	
MON	14		
TUE	15	Kick-off, meetings with Tropenbos staff	0.5
WED	16		
THU	17		
FRI	18		
SAT	19		
SUN	20	PHASE 1: PREPARATION PHASE	
MON	21		
	22		
	23	Documentation review	1
	24	Documentation review	1
	25	Finalise and submit methodology and work plan	0.5
	26		
SUN	27		
MON	28	Prepare field work, appointments and interviews	2
TUE	29		
WED	30		
THU	31		
		Days in January	5

FEBRUARY 2013			
		ACTIVITIES	wds
FRI	1	Meet EC Task Manager	0.5
SAT	2	<i>PHASE 2: FIELD PHASE</i>	
SUN	3		
MON	4		
TUE	5		
WED	6	<i>International Travel (to London)</i>	
THU	7	Attend Chatham House meeting (London) for interviews with	1
FRI	8	various stakeholders (EC, FERN and other)	1
SAT	9		
SUN	10	<i>International Travel (to Ghana)</i>	
MON	11	Meet national expert and country team members; Meetings with EU Delegation and national-level stakeholders	1
TUE	12	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
WED	13	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
THU	14	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
FRI	15	Present and discuss key findings with project team;	1
SAT	16	<i>International Travel (from Ghana)</i>	
SUN	17		
MON	18		
TUE	19	Data processing and analysis	1
WED	20	Data processing and analysis	0.5
THU	21		
FRI	22		
SAT	23		
SUN	24	<i>International Travel (to Guyana)</i>	
MON	25	Meet national expert and country team members; Meetings with EU Delegation and national-level stakeholders	1
TUE	26	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
WED	27	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
THU	28	Interviews with project stakeholders and partners	1
		Days in February	13

MARCH 2013			
		ACTIVITIES	wds
FRI	1	Presentation of project stakeholders and partners	1
SAT	2	<i>International Travel (return from Guyana)</i>	
SUN	3	<i>International Travel (return from Guyana)</i>	
MON	4	Data processing and analysis	1
TUE	5	Report drafting	1
WED	6	Report drafting	1
THU	7	Report drafting	1
FRI	8	<i>Submit and present Draft Report to Tropenbos</i>	1
SAT	9		
SUN	10		
MON	11		
TUE	12		
WED	13		
THU	14		
FRI	15		
SAT	16		
SUN	17		
MON	18		
TUE	19		
WED	20		
THU	21	Due date for receiving comments and feedback	
FRI	22	<i>Finalise and submit Final Evaluation Report</i>	1
SAT	23		
SUN	24		
MON	25		
TUE	26		
WED	27		
THU	28		
FRI	29		
SAT	30		
SUN	31		
		Days in March	7
		TOTAL DAYS	25

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation Questions and main issues (indicative)	Tropenbos International, partners, project team	National, regional and local forest and other authorities	Forest resource owners and rights-holders (communities, concessionaires)	International Organisations and decision-makers	Other stakeholders (CS groups, independent observers)
<p>EQ1. Are activities supported by the CSM appropriate with respect to the project's objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the CSMP address key constraints to 'incorporation of domestic market issues into FLEGT VPAs'? b. Are 'country needs' and key stakeholder aspirations properly addressed? Is the current geographical focus not leaving important realities untouched? c. Are objectives still relevant in view of a changing environment (VPA's and other Trade Agreements, EU Timber Regulation, REDD developments) d. Are activities (in particular the Multi Stakeholder Dialogues and Capacity Building activities) appropriate to achieve objectives? e. Review of the Logical Framework: Have Critical Success Factors and Key Performance Indicators been identified? Are the main assumptions holding true? 					
<p>EQ2. Are resources converted in efficiently into activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are Financial and Human Resources (expertise) needed made available and on time? b. Is the planning, monitoring and reporting process effective, satisfying implementers and partners? c. Are cost-result ratio and administrative costs reasonable? d. Do partner and stakeholder communication and consultation mechanisms (PCC, MSD-SC) work properly? e. Is Project Management capable of taking corrective action as and when required? 					

<p>EQ3. To what extent has CSM achieved its objectives and expected results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Has the Baseline Situation been properly mapped, as basis for result and impact monitoring?</i> b. <i>Have the six expected results (in particular the MSD process, community development and research) and the action's specific objective been achieved?</i> c. <i>Are results being used by intended users? In particular, do stakeholders participate in a meaningful manner?</i> d. <i>What are the major achievements and/or failures?</i> 					
<p>EQ4. What is (the prospect for) impact of the Project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>Is there any indication of 'Promotion of Viable livelihoods in poor forest dependent communities' in the participating countries? (overall objective 1)</i> b. <i>Is there any indication of an 'Adequate Supply of legal timber on the domestic market' (OO 2)?</i> c. <i>Have FLEGT/VPA and socio-economic development objectives of timber-dependent actors become more consistent? (OO3)? In particular, is the MSD process recognised by VPA decision-makers?</i> d. <i>Is there any positive/negative impact on EU cross-cutting themes (gender, good governance or conflict prevention)? In particular, does the project help ensure that 'conflict and illegality related to chainsaw lumbering by local communities is effectively reduced'?</i> e. <i>Are there other indicators of (un-)foreseen project impact (such as the rate of adoption of best practice to address illegal CSM, for example)?</i> 					

<p>EQ5. What are the prospects for sustainability of the Project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Do partners and stakeholders show/take ownership? How does this show? b. Is there sufficient financial/economic incentive for chainsaw lumbers to practice legal production and trade? c. Are supporting (community) organisations and SMFES capable of continuing the flow of benefits? d. Is the socio-political environment conducive to acceptance or strengthening of CSM objectives? e. Is replication or scaling-up happening? If so, what are critical conditions for such replication? 					
<p>EQ6. Is the Project coherent with and complementary to other EU initiatives and donor interventions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is coordination/collaboration with other donors/actors happening, to avoid overlap and create synergy? b. How does the new Timber Regulation affect CSM's work? c. How does CSM work relate/contribute to other EU policies, in particular in the field of environmental governance (REDD, climate change) or trade (Free Trade Agreements, green procurement)? 					
<p>EQ7. What lessons can be identified and practical recommendations proposed for follow-up action by Tropenbos and on the part of the EU?</p>					

ANNEX 5: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (ORIGINAL)

		Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives		Poverty reduced and viable livelihoods promoted in forest-dependent communities	Number and % of people below poverty line is lower	Government surveys	
		The occurrence of illegal logging reduced	Surveys of illegal logging show reduction	Forestry Commissions reports; reports by international NGOs	
		Conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests in developing countries promoted	Assessments using standards of SFM show continuous improvement	Government surveys	
Specific objective		Level of Conflict and Illegality related to Chainsaw Lumbering reduced	<p>Number of conflicts between stakeholders reduced</p> <p>Number of illegal transports of lumber seized is less</p> <p>Number of incursions by illegal chainsaw lumbering operators in legal concessions is lower</p> <p>Estimate of total production of illegal lumber is lower</p>	<p>Newspaper reports</p> <p>Forestry Commissions reports re chainsaw lumbering</p> <p>Interviews & reports from legal land owners and concessionaires</p> <p>Report of activity 1.2</p>	General economic opportunities in chainsaw lumbering regions remain stable
Expected results	1	Causes and consequences of chainsaw lumbering and its links with illegality understood	Main issues about chainsaw lumbering in each country known by the end of Year 1	Project reports, website	Adequate records exist about chainsaw lumbering
					Stakeholders are willing to share information, also about illegal activities

	2	International best practice determined to address chainsaw lumbering	EU, FAO , NGO and national forest authority policy documents reflect adequate insight in issues, by year 4	Policy documents	Stakeholders, incl. illegal ones, are willing to participate International and national organisations prepare new policy documents and adopt the best practices
	3	Multi-stakeholder learning forums established to discuss chainsaw lumbering issues	Existence of permanent dialogue mechanism in each country by year 2	Newspaper reports, minutes, publications with consensus viewpoints by the platform, stakeholder interviews	Stakeholders are willing to participate
	4	National consensus achieved in Ghana and Guyana about issues regarding chainsaw lumbering using an institutionalised mechanism for permanent dialogue between stakeholders	<p>All relevant stakeholders are represented at a high level</p> <p>4 facilitators trained in each country by end of year 1</p> <p>Number of issues on which consensus has been achieved</p> <p>Four studies have been commissioned or carried out by the platform</p> <p>A consensus action plan is available by end of Year 3</p>	<p>Records of meetings; stakeholder analysis report</p> <p>Records of meetings; publications; policy briefs</p> <p>Records of meetings; publications; policy briefs</p> <p>Action plan published by the platform</p>	<p>Adequate and representative participation can be achieved</p> <p>Availability of potential facilitators</p> <p>All important stakeholders participate in the dialogue</p> <p>Stakeholders are willing to negotiate and make concessions</p> <p>Stakeholders are willing to accept consensus achieved at platform</p> <p>Outcome of the participatory research is conclusive</p> <p>Outcomes of research do not widen the differences between stakeholders rather than diminish them</p> <p>Outcomes and proposed actions are cost-effective</p>

5	Communities dependent on chainsaw lumbering producing timber in a regulated and sustainable way	<p>Eleven community associations created or strengthened by year 5</p> <p>Eleven communities have management and business plans for their forest areas and newly developed activities</p> <p>By end of year 5 the % persons directly engaged in chainsaw lumbering within community has reduced by one third</p> <p>By end of year 5 the % persons engaged in other livelihood activities incl downstream activities has doubled</p> <p>Estimate of total production of illegal lumber is lower in year 5 than in year 1</p>	<p>Articles of association</p> <p>Forestry Commissions records</p> <p>Surveys (activity 5.7)</p> <p>Surveys (activity 5.7)</p> <p>Forestry Commissions reports</p>	<p>Government willing to consider policy options</p> <p>Chainsaw lumbering is accepted as a legal and justifiable livelihood</p> <p>Markets and investments exist to enable development of alternative livelihoods</p> <p>Programme of log tracking will be put in place (Ghana)</p> <p>Timber resource owners invest in monitoring activities</p> <p>Adequate timber resources (continue to) exist for community level chainsaw lumbering activities</p>
6	Action managed effectively	<p>All staff is recruited</p> <p>All outputs are achieved</p>	<p>Process documents</p> <p>Progress reports</p>	

Activities	[Causes and consequences of chainsaw lumbering and its links with illegality understood]		Sources of information about action progress:		Pre-conditions required before the action starts:
					Project progress reports Financial reports
1.1	Assess social, economic and land use factors that promote chainsaw lumbering				
1.2	Assess extent of chainsaw lumbering compared to total timber production in Ghana and Guyana				
1.3	Examine the policy and legal framework in relation to access to timber and illegal chainsaw lumbering	Means: Human Resources (Coordinators, Facilitators, Researchers, Community forestry experts etc.)	1180 Man months		
1.4	Determine transaction costs for options for controlling and/or transforming chainsaw lumbering operations	Int'l allowances	415 days	1072600	
		Local allowances	2900 days	74350	
1.5	Determine costs, benefits and their distribution to various stakeholders as a result of chainsaw lumbering	International Travel	108 trips	140000	
		Local travel	60 months	169800	
1.6	Determine effects on rural economy and social stability	Training (facilitators)	4	56200	
1.7	Assess the nature and scale of conflicts associated with chainsaw logging and coping strategies	Investments (Vehicles, Computer and audio-visual equipment, Office equipment)	60 months	50000	
1.8	Compile all information into case studies for Guyana and Ghana and disseminate	Office & Action Costs (Rent and running costs)	60 months	145900	
		Publications & dissemination	142	360800	
		Services (Audits, Evaluations etc.)	60 months	109800	
[International best practice determined to address chainsaw lumbering]				43750	
2.1	Conduct regional meetings in West Africa and Guiana Shield/Caribbean Region to identify	Studies	4	60000	
		Meetings & Workshops	41	37050	

	principal issues and options regarding chain-saw lumbering	Community development	4 years	231000
		Misc. and management costs		181263
2.2	Compile and distribute synthesis (issues& options) paper	Total		2732513
2.3	e-Conference to discuss and enhance synthesis paper			
2.4	Series of meetings to present findings at relevant forums (EU, regional forums, ETFAG)			
2.5	Design and maintain a website about chainsaw lumbering including project information			
2.6	Produce and distribute ETFRN newsletter about chainsaw lumbering			
<i>[Multi-stakeholder learning forums established to discuss chainsaw lumbering issues]</i>				
3.1	Conduct stakeholder analysis			
3.2	Conduct focus group meetings			
3.3	Create a "task force", responsible for the management of the multi-stakeholder process			
3.4	Conduct a Preparatory Workshop			
3.5	Create capacity to facilitate multi-stakeholder learning platforms			
3.6	Build capacity of various stakeholder groups to participate in multi-stakeholder learning platforms			
<i>[National consensus achieved in Ghana and Guyana about issues regarding chainsaw lumbering using an institutionalised mechanism for permanent dialogue between stakeholders]</i>				
4.1	Conduct regular meetings of the platform following the pre-determined agenda			
4.2	Collect and analyse information as agreed during discussions at the multi-stakeholder learning platform			

4.3	Create a communication mechanism to document and disseminate findings			
4.4	Conduct workshop to present consensus outcomes			
4.5	Integrate platform into existing collaborative forest management administrative structures			
<i>[Communities dependent on chainsaw lumbering producing timber in a regulated and sustainable way]</i>				
5.1	Organise community forestry associations or other forms of stakeholder platform			
5.2	Support process to regularized access to forest land, incl. legality of chainsaw lumbering			
5.3	Enable a process of participatory management planning in order to establish conditions for legal and sustainable operations			
5.4	Transform current operations as far as required by outcome of local management process			
5.5	Support the adoption of alternative livelihoods that do not depend on timber			
5.6	Actively disseminate good examples of new livelihood options.			
5.7	Conduct livelihood surveys to assess dependence on chainsaw lumbering			
<i>[Action managed effectively]</i>				
6.1	Identify country project management teams			
6.2	Constitute the project steering committee			
6.3	Establish an office/secretariat			
6.4	Organise inception meeting and annual management meetings			
6.5	Organise closing International workshop			
6.6	Conduct project evaluations			

ANNEX 6: LIST OF PERSONS/ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED

NAME	ORGANISATION	FUNCTION	EMAIL / PHONE
European Union and EU Member States			
Peter MAXSON	EC DG EuropAid	CSMP Task Manager	Peter.MAXSON@ec.europa.eu
John Bruneval	EuropeAid / Unit C.2 - Climate change, environment, natural resources, water unit	Policy Officer	John.Bruneval@ec.europa.eu
Emilie Göransson		Policy Officer	Emilie.GORANSSON@ec.europa.eu
Julia Falconer	DFID / EFI	FLEGT advisor	
Bart Missinne	Delegation of the EU to Ghana	1 st Secretary, Head of Infrastructure and Sust Dvpt Section	Bart.missinne@eeas.europa.eu
Mr. Joachim Jakobson	Delegation of the EU to Guyana	Trade Officer	
Dr. Ton van der Zon	Netherlands Embassy	First Secretary Environment and Water Advisor	Ton-vander.zon@minbuza.nl
TBI & partners / Project team			
Marieke Wit MSc	Tropenbos International (TBI)	Project Coordinator	marieke.wit@tropenbos.org
Prof. Dr. R.G.A. (René) Boot		Director	
Dr. R.J. (Roderick) Zagt		Programme Coordinator	
Drs. H.C. (Hans) Vellema		Programme Coordinator	
James Parker	TBI-Ghana	National Project Coordinator	0208 160 996
Mercy O. Ansah	FC	National Facilitator	0208 212 799
Emmanuel Fosu	TBI-Ghana	Project Assistant	0244 182 344
Evans Sampene Mensah	TBI-Ghana	Project Assistant	0242 376 702
Abagre J. Awineboma	TBI-Ghana	National Service Personnel	0265 313 960
John K.G. Amonoo	TBI-Ghana	Community Forestry Advisor	0244 765 390
Jane J. Aggrey	TBI-Ghana	Asst. Communication Officer	0240 788 724
Naomi Appiah	FORIG		0208 536 112
Paul B. Bosu	FORIG		0277 750 479
Emmanuel Marfo	FORIG		0244 627 274

NAME	ORGANISATION	FUNCTION	EMAIL / PHONE
Godfrey Marshall	Forestry Training Centre Inc. Guyana	Director	gemar@guyana.net.gy
Rohini Kerrett	Chainsaw Milling Project, Guyana	Project Coordinator	chainsawproject@gmail.com
Leroy Welcome	Chainsaw Milling Project, Guyana	Community Development Advisor	projectcfagy@gmail.com
Diana Gowkarran	Chainsaw Milling Project, Guyana	Project Assistant	projectadmingy@gmai.com
Raymond Herman	Chainsaw Milling Project, Guyana	Community Development Officer - Orealla/Siparuta	
Linden Duncan	Chainsaw Milling Project, Guyana	Community Development Officer - Ituni	
Dane Gobin	Iwokrama	Chief Executive Officer	dgobin@iwokrama.org
Raquel Thomas-Ceasar	Iwokrama	Director - Resource Management & Training	rthomas@iwokrama.org
Vanessa Benn	Iwokrama	Consultant	
Government (Ghana)			
Chris Beeko	Ghana FC	Head Timber Validation Department	
Alhassan Attah	Ghana FC	Executive Director of the Timber Industry Development Division (TIDD)	
Alex BOADU	Ghana FC	Operations Director	
Kofi Affum-Baffoe	FC, RMSC	Manager, Production Unit	
James Ware	FC, RMSC	Asst. Regional Manager, Ashanti Region	
Oppon Sasu	Forestry Commission, Accra	Head, Donor Relations/Projects	0244 367 851
Dr. Richard Gyimah	Forestry Commission, Accra	Manager, Verification and Field Audit, Timber Validation Department (TVD)	0246 420 261
Boakye Amponsah	Forestry Services Division	Asst. District Manager, Juaso Forest District	+233 24 4159299
Government (Guyana)			
Tasreef Khan	Guyana Forest Commission	Deputy Commissioner of Forests - Forest Monitoring Division/Head Planning & Development Division	tasreef_khan@hotmail.com
Raj Singh	Forest Product Development & Marketing Council	Director	592-223-5135

NAME	ORGANISATION	FUNCTION	EMAIL / PHONE
Laura Singh	Forest Products Development and Marketing Council of Guyana Inc.	Industry and Product Development Officer	development@fpdmcguy.org
Theresa Madray	Forest Products Development and Marketing Council of Guyana Inc.	Marketing and Production Officer	marketing@fpdmcguy.org
Derek Babb	Guyana Geology and Mines Commission	Manager - Mines Division	dk_babb@yahoo.com
Shyam Nokta	Office of the President	Adviser to the President and Head Officer of Climate Change	snokta@op.gov.gy
Development Partners (Ghana)			
Prof. Oteng-Agyei	KNUST	Member of PAC (Project Advisory Committee)	
Anthony P. Asare	DOLTA	PAC	
Korsah Brown	NGOs	PAC	
Anthony Partey Asare	National MSD Steering Committee (MSD-SC)	Communications Director, DOLTA	0244 613 919
Richard Agyenim Boateng		CSM Representative, Goaso, Brong Ahafo	0209 120 385
Kwamina Haizel		TIDD, Takoradi, Western Region	0244 716 742
Atta Yeboah		NFF, Sunyani, Brong Ahafo	0244 637 347
Augustine Gyedu		FSD, Goaso, Brong Ahafo	0208 170 822
Victor Nyardi		Domestic Lumber Traders Association (DOLTA)	National President
Anthony Partey Asare	Communications Director		
Rejoice Afi Agyagbo	Member – Volta Region		
Afreh Boakye	National Secretary		
Kingsford KariKari	Member – Ashanti Region		
Peter Kuteke	Member - Eastern Region		
David Frimpong Siaw	Reg. Secretary – Eastern Region		
Edward Asante Kuranteng	Patron – Eastern Region		
William Douglas Bruce	Chairman – Ashiaman Timber Market		
O.K. Boateng-Poku	Ghana Timber Association (GTA)	National President, GTA	0244 024 006

NAME	ORGANISATION	FUNCTION	EMAIL / PHONE
Kweku Owusu Brobbey		Ag. Executive Secretary, GTA	0244 725 728
Francis N. Akowuah	Furniture and Wood Workers Association of Ghana (FAWAG), Kumasi	Executive member, FAWAG	0241 244 422
Christopher Dadzawa		National Secretary, FAWAG	0208 448 393
Armoh Koranteng	Min. of Food and Agriculture	Asst. Director	+233 24 6116345
Arko Tettey	Community Development, Asante Akyem South DA	Asst. Director	+233 24 6120096
Samuel Antwi	Information Services Division, Asante Akyem South DA	District Journalist	+233 26 4288384
Emmanuel Torsu	AAWA - formally Chainsaw Operator	Vice Chairman	+233 24 2122817
Osei Apenteng	AAWA (Farmer)	Treasurer	+233 54 6734977
Abdul Mumuni	GTMO	CEO, Telento Mills	+233 20 8119435
Amoako Dankwa	AAWA (formally Carrier)	Secretary	+233 54 3513840
Isaac Owusu Boakye	EU CSM Project	Community Forestry Worker	+233 24 4940593
John Amoono	EU CSM Project	Community Forestry Advisor	+ 233 20 8401561
Sampson Ampem	AAWA	Farmer	0245 469 048
Justice Abeiku	AAWA	CFC	0202 442 410
Richard Osei-wusu	AAWA	Farmer	0249 281 736
Ebenezer Larbi	AAWA	CFC	0205 383 737
Mohammed Kotoka	AAWA	CS Operator	0547 622 070
James Yamoah	AAWA	CFC	0247 474 174
Sampson Antwi	AAWA	Farmer	
David Asaye	AAWA	Farmer	0248 018032
Benedicta Abebrese	AAWA	CFC	0246 842 418
Osei Apenteng	AAWA	Lumber Buyer	0546 734 977
Victoria Nortey	AAWA	Lumber Buyer	0547 620 493
Emmanuel Torsu	AAWA	CS Operator	0242 122 857
Isaac Asare Tawiah	AAWA	Farmer	0245 918 603

NAME	ORGANISATION	FUNCTION	EMAIL / PHONE
Alex Acheampong	AAWA	Farmer	0205 383 636
A.C.O. Boateng	AAWA	CFC	0268 383 977
Nana Ohemeng Achempong	AAWA	Chief, Obogu	
Nana Owusu Achiaw	AAWA	Chief, Obogu	
Amoako Danquah	AAWA	CFC	
Samuel Mensah Mawutor	Civic Response / is coordinator for Forest Watch forum	Natural Resource Governance Campaigner	smawutor@gmail.com
Development Partners (Guyana)			
Dr. Lystra Fletcher-Paul	Food and Agriculture Organisation	Representative	lystra.fletcherpaul@fao.org
Dr. David Singh	Conservation International	Director	
Khalawan	Task Force/Forest Products Association of Guyana	President	fpsect@yahoo.net.gy
Charles Thom & others	Task Force/Forest Products Association of Guyana		
Sheik Niamatali	Variety Woods and Greenheart Ltd	Managing Director	variety.eborabo@networksgy.com
Rommel Niamatali	Variety Woods and Greenheart Ltd	Executive Director	variety.eborabo@networksgy.com
Deinore Baynes & others	Demerara Timbers Ltd.	Financial Manager	
Mr. Clement Boyle,	Community Development Council/Member of Ituni Small Loggers Association	Chairperson	
Wendy Piggot	Women's Group	Chairperson	
Clement Henry	Orealla/Siparuta	Deputy Toshhaus	
Kingsley Hudson	Siparuta Village Council	Councillor	
Wilfred Felix	Siparuta Village Council	Councillor	
	Women's Group		

ANNEX 7: MAIN DOCUMENTATION CONSULTED

TITLE
Project Contract and Annexes (Logframe, Description of the Action, Budget)
MoU's with Guyana and Ghana Project partners
Contract Riders (1 and 2)
Project Progress reports (2007 to 2011) including all annexes
Mid-term Evaluation Report Guyana (2009)
ROM reports (Ghana July 2011, Guyana June 2012, Ghana May 2012) and TBI response (July 2012)
Project Monitoring Framework
Project outputs, including Evaluation Report MSD 2; Evaluation report MSD 4 draft; Minutes national MSD 7; Stakeholder Analysis Report; TIDD JOINT ACTION PLAN; TIDD-TBI Domestic market policy discussion and implementation strategy paper - final draft; Recommendations Controlling CSM in Ghana July 2009 - Final version, among others.