

PROJECT DOCUMENT

Regarding

Forestry, Governance and National Development: Independent Forest Management

Embassy File No: 104.Tanzania.160.276

Date:

1. Parties to the project/activity:

Tanzania Natural Resource Forum (hereafter referred to as TNRF) P.O. Box 15605
Arusha

Contact person: Andrew Williams, Coordinator
Phone: +255 754 095517
Email: a.williams@tnrf.org

and

The Royal Danish Embassy (hereafter referred to as the Embassy)
P.O.Box 9171
Dar es Salaam

Contact Person: Lars Mikkil Johannessen, Counsellor - Development
Email: larjoh@Um.Dk
Phone: +255 (22) 211 3887 / 88 / 89 / 90 / 91 / Direct Extension: 208

2. Purpose code:

31210 Forest policy and administrative management

3. Description of the project/activity:

This project will achieve the design of a locally appropriate programme of Independent Forest Management in Tanzania and its subsequent implementation. The project will be divided into three phases:

(i) *Inception and Design*: re-establishing government and other stakeholder support for launching IFM in Tanzania, through a participatory design process aimed at ensuring that the ensuing IFM implementation phase leads to an effective and acceptable set of outcomes for good governance, effective forest management and national development;

(ii) *IFM implementation*: forest monitoring and the establishment of institutional linkages to ensure that forest monitoring results are appropriately communicated, agreed and acted upon by government and other stakeholders (e.g. CSOs and the private sector).

(iii) *IFM Evaluation*: reviewing the IFM process and lessons learned, and appropriately recommending further programmatic work (such as Collaborative Forest Monitoring) designed to build on the IFM process in order to ensure that appropriate forest monitoring continues and is appropriately integrated into national forest management.

4. Objectives and outputs of the project/activity:

Objective

Establish a functioning, broad-based and legitimate IFM process in Tanzania that contributes to good governance, effective forest management and national development with the full buy-in of government, civil society, local communities and the private sector.

The key achievable outcomes¹ of IFM in support of this objective are:

- An increase in transparency regarding information and decisions in forestry;
- Improved detection and prosecution of illegal activity, and enforcement of the law;
- Better governance through analytical work, informed debate, and wider participation;
- Greater understanding of the law, and legal compliance.

There are three phases necessary for realizing the objective and outcomes which are grouped below into three phases – inception and design, implementation, and evaluation.

PHASE 1: Inception and design phase for IFM (8-12 months)

It is essential that IFM is carried out in a way that builds trust and confidence with all stakeholders, including ministerial staff, private sector operators, donors and civil society. This involves managing relationships in a politically sophisticated way, using considerable diplomacy, while at the same time proactively seeking, verifying and reporting the facts. The credibility of IFM rests on its ability to investigate politically sensitive situations and its commitment to adhere strictly to an agreed Terms of Reference (ToR) when dealing with them. It is critical that the ToR include the following protocols:

- Unrestricted access to information
- Freedom to travel
- Limited qualified immunity (i.e. the messenger – monitor - should not be blamed)
- The right to publish - exercising this right with professionalism and restraint, in particular by following the protocols of the reporting panel.

Another key issue that will need to be considered in the design phase is the nature of the IFM project, and whether, and if so how, collaborative forest monitoring should be factored into the project.

Following on from previous government agreement on the need for IFM, an inception and design phase will be required to:

¹ Outcomes are differentiated here from outputs. Outcomes are defined here as changes brought about, at least in part, as a result of project implementation, outputs are technical and other related materials produced as part of achieving the outcomes.

1. **Reconfirm and build the buy-in and support** of key stakeholders, such as the Forestry and Beekeeping Division, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, other government ministries and key civil society organizations;
2. **Develop an appropriate approach and design for IFM in Tanzania through a Terms of Reference** that is participatory and widely accepted by key stakeholders

Formation of an IFM Secretariat

An IFM Secretariat will be established consisting of a local consultant, a small administrative staff, and a visiting external IFM specialist. The Secretariat will be administratively and financially managed by TNRF. The IFM Secretariat will coordinate the IFM inception process, and in addition to the events and outputs outlined below, facilitate parallel background work necessary for the development of the final IFM ToR – such as technical annexes etc.

It is currently proposed that the Secretariat will liaise with a Technical Advisory Group appointed by the National Forest and Beekeeping SWAP Steering Committee, and report to the Steering Committee on a regular basis. It is proposed that the NFBK (SWAP) Steering Committee is the appropriate host institution under which IFM should be managed, as it represents a broad cross-section of forest stakeholders – including TNRF in its role as representing civil-society.

The key events and outputs of the inception and design phase are presented below.

OUTPUT 1: IFM framework proposal document - developed by the IFM Secretariat

- Overview of the proposed IFM initiative in Tanzania and its importance for Forest Law Enforcement and Governance, trade, poverty alleviation and Tanzania’s international standing
- Outline of the design phase in more detail
- Initial assessment of the key institutional issues and necessary arrangements
- Other emerging issues identified by the IFM Secretariat

(i) Renewed commitment and basic agreements achieved with senior FBD and MNRT staff:

Meetings with senior FBD and MNRT staff to renew commitment and secure the basic agreements required for starting an IFM process in Tanzania. This step will delineate the objectives, scope, geographic coverage and duration of IFM, and will layout the role of FBD and its surveillance units.

Output: framework agreement on objectives and scope of IFM, institutional roles and responsibilities, communications and liaison;

Participants: Senior FBD / MNRT staff - 25 persons, one day;

Supported by: IFM Consultants, TRAFFIC;

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator;

OUTPUT 2: Outline IFM working proposal - developed by IFM Secretariat

The TOR will include the following:

- Why IFM is required

- What IFM aims to achieve
- The roles and responsibilities of each party in emerging detail
- How IFM will operate both in practical terms and in terms of the mandate or obligations of each party towards the other.
- Emerging indications of how the work will be sustainable afterwards.
- Initial budget and draft job descriptions
- Indicative outputs required and their duration
- A draft performance appraisal.

(ii) **Achieving the buy-in of other senior and middle level FBD staff**

A meeting with Senior and Middle level FBD staff of an outline IFM working proposal to seek their buy-in, inputs and ideas.

Output: Support and buy-in secured of FBD staff, with feedback for the developing IFM proposal, from an FBD staff perspectives - 25 persons, one day

Participants: FBD Technical Committee Meeting

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator and TRAFFIC

(iii) **Consulting NGOs and Civil Society**

A meeting with NGOs and civil society (eg Tanzania Forestry Working Group), to present and seek inputs for an increasingly detailed outline IFM working proposal.

Output: Role of NGOs, role of TFCG Forestry Network (MJUMITA),

Participants: NGO representatives - 20 persons, one day

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator and TRAFFIC

(iv) **Ensuring the Development Partner Group (Forestry) is informed and engaged**

A meeting to present a full working proposal and IFM design in order to obtain the DPG's continued buy-in and their contributions, with a view to building interest in financing the implementation of IFM after the design stage is complete.

Output: DPG inputs into working proposal including funding commitments

Participants: Development Partners Group - 20 persons, half day

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator

OUTPUT 3: Draft IFM ToR - developed by IFM Secretariat

The TOR will include the following:

- Why IFM is required
- What IFM aims to achieve
- The roles and responsibilities of each party in emerging detail
- How IFM will operate both in practical terms and in terms of the mandate or obligations of each party towards the other.
- An indicative strategy of how monitoring and forest audits will continue afterwards.
- A full budget and job descriptions
- Detailed outputs required and their duration
- A performance appraisal.

(v) **Presentation of Draft IFM ToR and outstanding issues resolved at round-table stakeholder meeting**

Following the inputs of government, development partners and civil society, a final round-table meeting to present a draft IFM ToR and to resolve outstanding issues. These might include: How will the process be steered? Who might consultants report to? How will information be made public?

Output: Final inputs into the IFM ToR, resolution of outstanding issues, finalization of steering group;

Participants: FBD, MNRT, NGO representatives, VPO, Presidents Office, TRA, Ministry of Finance, PMO RALG, DPG(F) - 40 persons, two days;

Supported by: IFM Consultants;

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator.

(vi) **Briefing to the Parliamentary Committee on Natural Resources and Environment**

A briefing to the Parliamentary Committee on Natural Resources and Environment (and possibly Finance and Economic Affairs) on the significance and benefits of IFM for Tanzania, and how the committee(s) might wish to use the emerging data.

Output: Parliamentary committee(s) informed and aware of the IFM process

Participants: Parliamentary Committee on Natural Resources and Environment, Finance and Economic Affairs - 40 persons, one day;

Supported by: IFM Consultants

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator

OUTPUT 4: Final IFM ToR - developed by IFM Secretariat

The TOR will include the following:

- Why IFM is required
- What it aims to achieve
- The roles and responsibilities of each party in comprehensive detail
- How IFM will operate both in practical terms and in terms of the mandate or obligations of each party towards the other.
- An indicative strategy of how monitoring and forest audits will continue afterwards.
- A full budget and job descriptions
- Detailed outputs required and their duration
- A performance appraisal.

(vii) **Funding partner meeting**

Formal submission/presentation of the IFM ToR to the Development Partners Group for funding.

Output: Funding commitments

Participants: Development Partners Group, other interested parties

Supported by: IFM Consultants (as necessary)

Facilitated by: Senior Facilitator

(viii) **Tendering of IFM process**

Once funding is secured, the IFM process will likely be put out to tender in the international press for the selection of a forest-based monitor.

(ix) **Institutional arrangements and considerations**

Institutional arrangements outlined below for the Inception and Design Phase are *indicative* and will be appropriately resolved and clarified at the commencement of the project.

Ownership

The IFM initiative will be jointly and primarily owned by the National Forest and Beekeeping SWAP Steering Committee.

Management

An *IFM Secretariat* will be established consisting of a local consultant, a small administrative staff, and a visiting external IFM specialist. The Secretariat will be administratively and financially managed by TNRF. The IFM Secretariat will coordinate the IFM inception process, and in addition to the events and outputs outlined below, facilitate parallel background work necessary for the development of the final IFM ToR – such as technical annexes etc.

It is currently proposed that the Secretariat will liaise with a **Technical Advisory Group** (TAG) appointed by the National Forest and Beekeeping SWAP Steering Committee, and report to the Steering Committee on a regular basis. It is proposed that the NFBK (SWAP) Steering Committee – the **host institution** – is the appropriate host institution under which IFM should be managed, as it represents a broad cross-section of forest stakeholders – including TNRF in its role as representing civil-society.

Implementation partners

The Tanzania Forest Working Group will play a key role in achieving broad buy-in and consensus during the Inception and Design Phase, in large part through the communications and advocacy programme of **Mama Misitu**.

Financial management and accountability

TNRF will be responsible for managing and accounting for the funds allocated for the IFM initiative in the Design and Inception Phase as guided by the IFM **host institution**, and in accordance with TNRF's administrative policies and financial regulations.

Links with Mama Misitu

There is considerable complementarity with **Mama Misitu**, particularly in terms of awareness raising and communications, helping pave the way for IFM. The communications capacity of **Mama Misitu** may be additionally used at a later stage to help communicate the findings and outputs of the IFM process according to the protocols established during the Inception and Design Phase. As stated in the **Mama Misitu** proposal, the Mama Misitu campaign will have a national reach, with an initial focus in south-eastern Tanzania expanding into other parts of the country in a phased process.

It is anticipated that prior to the implementation phase of the IFM initiative, TRAFFIC will restart its monitoring activities as part of a baseline survey and on-going monitoring and evaluation of the progress and effectiveness of *Mama Misitu*.

PHASE 2: IFM Implemented (36 months)

IFM will then be initiated according to the IFM ToR as follows:

(i) Indicative institutional arrangements

Pending the outcome of the Inception and Design Phase, the institutional arrangements developed within the proposed host institution need to enable:

- A management and reporting system to plan and authorise the monitor's activities and channel its findings. This provides justification for management decisions on where and what to monitor.
- Broad participation to ensure responsibility and accountability. Reporting to a single institution lacks transparency. Reporting to a multi-stakeholder panel, which validates and adopts findings, provides a buffer between the monitor and vested interests.
- A system of clear ownership of reports, giving the reports some status in law. Qualified immunity from libel and other action would not be unreasonable.
- Commitment to ongoing participation. The will to retain confidence in IFM and uphold its independence from government must be maintained by all parties.
- Participation of key public services that are likely to be implicated in downstream activities: police, military, judiciary, finance ministry, ministry for development or economic planning, customs and trade regulators.
- Involvement of civil society organisations, preferably those with high public credibility and broad ownership, with due regard to principles of good governance in their internal organisation. A proactive and prominent role for the donor community This relieves pressure on the monitor to conduct its own diplomacy by acting promptly at key moments to keep the IFM on track.
- Well-defined provision for dispute resolution in the event of differences between the parties. Grievance and arbitration procedures should be clearly specified in the contract.

If this is not possible, an alternative institutional arrangement will have to be developed.

It is possible that the National Forest and Beekeeping SWAP Steering Committee may be the most appropriate host institution for the IFM Implementation Phase, pending the outcome of the Inception and Design Phase.

The role of the **Technical Advisory Group** will change to form the '**Reporting Panel**' in the implementation phase of the project. The **Reporting Panel** will form the mediating/intermediary institution required to liaise between the Independent Monitor and government during the IFM implementation phase. This will help facilitate good communications and relations between the independent monitor, government, the private sector and civil society in order to maximise the chances of government taking constructive and appropriate action over the findings of IFM.

(ii) Indicative activities

The following indicative activities are based on experiences from IFM programmes elsewhere in Africa and Asia (refer to Global Witness, 2005). The activities described hereafter are only indicative of what may transpire from the design and implementation of the IFM ToR.

The forest-based monitor may be expected to undertake missions on the full range of permits, contracts and licenses, which will be listed in the ToR. The monitor and the Forest and Beekeeping Division will likely need to meet regularly to produce a plan of joint missions that covers all parts of the forest equitably.

There may be four types of field mission (Global Witness, 2005):

- **Joint Missions:** The enforcement agents and monitor embark jointly on a pre-planned mission. Separate reports, from the enforcement agency (possibly including an official statement of offence against infractors) and the monitor (including observations on the conduct of the enforcement agents) are produced.
- **Joint Requested Missions:** A joint mission undertaken as above, but at the request of a third party (typically an NGO or community). Such missions will be conducted quickly (e.g. within seven days) to minimise any loss of evidence.
- **Independent Missions:** Missions undertaken by the monitor alone where:
 - Enforcement agents are unable or unwilling to participate in a joint mission.
 - It is appropriate to respond to a requested mission independently.Overall, independent missions will serve as a baseline from which to assess the work of the enforcement agency, and ensure field investigations take place even in sensitive areas. The official status of a report from an independent mission may be weaker than that of a joint mission, but it will remain credible as long as the monitor remains credible.
- **Verification Missions:** Where the monitor has not joined a previous official mission, and a subsequent mission alone is necessary to verify the findings of the official mission.

Other activities may include:

- **Monitoring administrative permit allocations** – tracking how forest concessions are to be allocated in the future through a steering committee;
- **Tracking legal cases** - case-tracking systems may be designed, either in collaboration with the Forest and Beekeeping Division, or independently and in parallel, where necessary to maintain the integrity of the data.
- **Monitoring certification of legality** – systems being instituted to provide certification of legality. In regard, IFM will collect evidence on illegality, basing its methodologies on those pioneered by TRAFFIC. The monitor will be able to supply an independent view, through ongoing field-based spot-checks, how robust and well maintained the whole licensing process is, and therefore provide public credibility to these initiatives.
- **Testing the integrity and value of National Forestry and Beekeeping Database (NAFOBEDA)** - to improve systems of control, use and accountability of the data.
- **Analysing trade data** - analyses of international trade may identify possible cases of laundering or mislabelling of traded timber and timber products.
- **Monitoring environmental and social issues** – some degree of social and environmental factors may be incorporated into forthcoming concession

agreements. Independent monitoring of these agreements could strengthen the voice of communities who feel companies have not met their obligations. It would also address a systemic problem that occurs in other countries, namely that much of this provision happens only in the first few years.

- **Monitoring revenue transparency and benefit distribution** - logging might be legal but fees and taxes can be avoided or misappropriated at different levels. Open provision of information on the collection of revenues and disbursement of benefits will lead to people knowing how much has been received in their name. This will precipitate a growing demand for better services, thereby strengthening local democracy and making misappropriation of forest revenues more difficult.
- **Capacity building assistance to law enforcement officers** – the IFM process will likely highlight what is an existing need for improving forest-related crime investigations. The IFM process could usefully provide direct inputs into the development of materials, an accredited training course including field work and procedural improvements. The law enforcement officers benefiting from this activity would be mostly forestry officers, but also some police, customs and ports authorities staff, and prosecutors. There would be additional awareness-raising for the judiciary and links would be developed to the Prevention and Combating of Corruption Bureau and other government institutions.

(iii) **Geographic Coverage**

It is anticipated that although IFM will be a national process, it may invest more resources in some areas of the country most in need of governance and forest management improvement over others.

Although it is likely that an independent monitor will carry out the majority of the IFM, nevertheless civil-society and private sector stakeholders are likely to play a key support role. In this regard, the TFWG is part of a national forum (TNRF) and its members have an on-the-ground presence (many working in PFM) in over 85% of the mainland's regions (18 of 21) and Zanzibar:

- **Africare** – Tabora Region
- **Care** – Morogoro Region and Zanzibar
- **FARM Africa** - Manyara and Kilimanjaro Regions
- **IUCN** – Rufiji District, Coast Region
- **MJUMITA** – Coast, Dar es Salaam, Dodoma, Iringa, Kilimanjaro, Lindi, Manyara, - Morogoro, Mtwara, Singida, Tanga, Regions and Zanzibar
- **MCP** – Kilwa District, Lindi Region
- **TAF** – represented in all regions
- **TFCG** – Coast, Iringa, Lindi, Mtwara, Morogoro, Ruvuma, and Tanga Regions,
- **WCS** – Arusha, Dodoma, Iringa, Mara, Mbeya, Rukwa, Singida Regions and Zanzibar
- **WCST** – Coast Region and Dar es Salaam
- **WWF** – Arusha, Coast, Lindi, Morogoro, Mtwara, Mwanza, Tabora, Tanga Regions and - Dar es Salaam

PHASE 3: Evaluation, gradual monitor withdrawal and next steps

Towards the end of the Implementation Phase, the proposed host institution will instruct the Technical Advisory Group and the IFM Secretariat to work with the independent monitor to review the indicators of success for the continuation of forest monitoring. The indicators will encapsulate a description of a functioning, transparent and accountable system in which monitoring by civil society is a normal component, and IFM projects, particularly those implemented by an international monitor, are no longer required. Improvements in governance will strengthen the rule of law, but a system of checks and balances will always be needed. Several options are available depending on the IFM experience and the performance of partners during the IFM implementation phase. The options include:

- (i) A combined government-civil society monitoring ‘Collaborative Forest Monitoring’ (CFM) alliance to ensure that a law enforcement operation carried out by government is at its most effective
- (ii) The Tanzania Forest Working Group working in partnership with the Community Forest-based Network – MJUMITA to form a strong civil society watchdog system which holds the government to account.

It is possible that the independent monitor will be requested to carry out intermittent studies during a transition phase to monitor the progress of law enforcement. Once enforcement operations have reached a high standard, short, infrequent and unannounced checks would be sufficient to maintain it. The monitor can use its right (but not obligation) to join any enforcement activity to gradually reduce the number of joint missions, but also make surprise spot-checks on the enforcement agents in the field. This process would be reversible: an increase in the monitoring effort would resume if governance deteriorated. What is more likely is that the focus of IFM attention could shift to respond to new challenges as monitors record and adapt to increasingly sophisticated illegal activity: Monitoring needs also to be complemented by other forms of assessment, and other activities which help not only to ensure discipline in the sector, but also to locate its future course in the wider patterns of development of the society. Such a strategy provides the best chance of ensuring that initiatives have real national ownership, and that legality translates into public legitimacy. Again, the implication is that monitoring should be situated in a broader framework of governance reform.

The IFM process is evaluated and recommendations made for next steps.

Indicative activities: field visits, evaluation report, follow-on project proposal, final workshop, stakeholders report, and dissemination of findings

5. Indicators for measuring the achievement of objectives and outputs:

There will be two sets of indicators of success – one for the IFM Inception and Design Phase, and the second for the IFM Implementation Phase.

a) Indicators of Success for Phase 1: IFM Inception and Design

Key indicators of success for the inception and design phase are:

1. The development of the IFM ToR is widely supported by key ministries, parliament, civil society and the private sector;
2. Clear understanding and agreement is achieved on the key components of the IFM ToR
3. An appropriate host institutional is identified for the IFM implementation phase
4. The National Forest and Beekeeping SWAP Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Group and IFM Secretariat develop strong and effective working relationships leading to shared ownership of the IFM process.
5. An IFM ToR is successfully developed to include the following components:
 - the achievable objectives
 - the activities to be undertaken and their timeframes in order to achieve the objectives
 - the specification of IFM outputs (internal reports, technical analyses, public fora, parliament, media, feedback, etc.);
 - the geographical and technical focus of monitoring (prioritisation may be required against resourcing levels);
 - roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders
 - agreed protocols
 - institutional relationships, reporting and communications procedures;
 - financing - resource requirements and identification of funding sources
 - modalities (e.g. monitoring and analytical methods to cover relevant state/pressure/response aspects according to identified focus of IFM, protocols/procedures covering access to information, publication and evaluation, etc.);

b) Indicators of Success for Phase 2: IFM Implementation

The implementation of IFM will influence transparency, accountability and governance in forest management, each to varying degrees over time. The table below provides a summary list of indicators that may be used to assess IFM's impact in each of these areas, both in terms of the performance of the monitor alone, and the wider influence of IFM.

A table of the summary list of indicators that may be used to assess the impact of IFM

| Output-related indicators: what can IFM achieve? | Outcome-related indicators: what changes should occur beyond this? | |
|---|--|---|
| Information and transparency: The published findings from IFM, both individual field mission reports and periodic summary reports, give government, industry, international donors and civil society tools to assess the state of the forest sector. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations contained in each report • Observations of any systemic weaknesses recorded in reports • Observations of trends from series of reports recorded • Public availability of reports | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of laws and regulations to the public (in lay-persons terms) • Public availability of permit data • Enforcement visits documented • Robust evidence collected on infractions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issuance of official statement of offence reported • Publication of outcome from legal cases brought against infractors |
| Accountability and professionalism: in the regulations, systems and procedures the forest authority adopts. As a public service, it must show that it is effectively providing services to a range of ‘customers’, including forest-dependent communities and businesses (small and large), among others. Perhaps most important in the long term are impacts beyond the immediate control and discipline of the various actors. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training in monitoring, enforcement, evidence gathering and reporting etc • Fairness of reporting towards e.g. industry vs. communities • Relationship and networks with all stakeholder groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of infractions detected • Issuance of official statements of offence taking place when appropriate • Clear programme of enforcement work • Occurrence of field missions as planned • Competence and professionalism in the field and in reporting • Conformity of sanctions to the law | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conviction rates for offenders • Prompt and full collection of fines, to the right place • Public opinion of the forest authority • Estimates of bribes being paid • Ability of industry to move towards certification (of legality and then of sustainability) |
| Governance and leverage: in the political environment, including broader and stronger momentum for reform, the role of civil society and global processes. | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of different sources of leverage • Denouncements made in confidence to the monitor • Functionality of the reporting panel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occurrence, foci and venues of debate on forest issues • Involvement of e.g. judiciary, finance, economic and social development ministries • Regional (multi-state) action against illegality • Public awareness of the law | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society engagement with forest authority • Morale of reform-minded officials • Policy-makers understanding of the issues • Interaction with other national planning work (e.g. NSGRP) • Changes to donor forest and governance policies |

Improved information and transparency

An early impact of IFM is often a substantial increase in the quantity, quality and credibility of information on forest management and control systems, illegal activity and sanctions.

Improved capacity of local civil society actors

IFM will also help develop the skills, knowledge and effectiveness of local actors in regards to issues such as forest law, monitoring methodologies, identification of illegal activities, and best practices.

Improved accountability and professionalism

If the IFM process proceeds well, it will improve the accountability professionalism and technical skills of the Forest and Beekeeping Division and may also impact on the reciprocal behaviour, engagement and cooperation of citizens and forest-resident communities.

Improved forest utilisation practices

Through the provision of information, IFM will support the development of improved forest utilisation practices – by both the private sector (as this develops further) and local communities managing forests that are being harvested. In select cases, it may be the case the IFM helps the move for forest harvesters towards certification.

Improved law enforcement and decreased forest crime

Through the provision of inputs into a law enforcement improvement and training programme that would help increase the effectiveness and efficiency of law enforcement procedures implemented by forest officers and other government agents. Indicators would include conviction rates, sentences, investigation rates, advanced training approaches and materials.

A move towards shared responsibility

Through the TAG and subsequently the Reporting Panel, collective discussion, debate, agreement and reporting will occur, with collective responsibility for outputs. Investigations arising from or associated with the IFM process will lead to wider partnerships being developed and/or strengthened between different parts of government, civil society and communities.

A further element to shared responsibility is the potential development of regional and international FLEG forums / agreements as a:

- Forum for debate, consciousness-raising, information- sharing and exchange of best practice.
- Mechanism for capacity-building and technology transfer.
- Data collection and exchange system, both on legal and illegal activities.
- International tracking and/or licensing system to guarantee legality, with independent third party monitoring.
- Framework for enforcement cooperation, including cross-border operations.
- Non-compliance mechanism incorporating trade sanctions.

Detailed project description of activities, outputs and indicators is contained in TNRF project proposal which is attached as ***Annex 1***.

6. Total budget:

This project has a total budget of US\$ 2,355,000. The main budget lines are as follows:

| Phase and Activity Description | Amount USD |
|---|------------------|
| 1. INCEPTION AND DESIGN PHASE | |
| 1.1 Events and Outputs | 52,250 |
| 1.2 Technical assistance | 147,750 |
| 1.3 Other Costs | 20,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL – PHASE 1 | 230,000 |
| 2. IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (PROVISIONAL ESTIMATE)¹ | |
| 2.1 Monitoring Costs | 1,980,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL – PHASE 2 | 1,980,000 |
| 3. EVALUATION PHASE (PROVISIONAL ESTIMATE) | |
| 3.1 Evaluation and monitor withdrawal costs | 145,000 |
| SUB-TOTAL – PHASE 3 | 145,000 |
| OVERALL TOTAL | 2,355,000 |

¹ *Monitoring Costs: Recommended monthly cost of USD 45,000 (Global Witness 2005) together with a forest law enforcement capacity building component at USD 10,000 per month. Headline items for monthly monitoring costs will include:*

- *human resource costs,*
- *transport costs*
- *equipment costs,*
- *material costs*
- *administration & office costs*
- *liaison and reporting costs*
- *extra-ordinary inspection costs – e.g. over-flights*
- *other field costs*