



Tanzania Forestry Working Group

Introduction to the Forestry Governance Learning Group

Meeting Minutes

12th November 2009

TFCG Office, Dar es Salaam

Present

1. James Mayers, International Institute for Environment and Development
2. Steve Ball, Mpingo Conservation Project
3. Cassian Sianga, Tanzania Natural Resource Forum
4. Alfred Kigula, Forestry and Beekeeping Division
5. Carol Sorensen, Tanzania Natural Resource Forum
6. Jonas Olsen, MJUMITA (Community Forest Management Network)
7. Andrew Williams, Kilimanyika
8. Jumapili Chenga, TRAFFIC
9. Nike Doggart, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
10. Rahima Njaidi, MJUMITA (Community Forest Management Network)
11. Charles Meshack, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group
12. Salutary Slaa, FARM Africa
13. Rehema Mtingwa, Mama Misitu Campaign (TNRF)
14. Nicholas Kinyau, Mama Misitu Campaign (TNRF)
15. Alfei Daniel, IUCN
16. Peter Sumbi, WWF Tanzania Programme Office
17. Annick Miya Verstraelen, EnerGreen Africa Foundation
18. Caroline Chumo, Tanzania Natural Resource Forum

1. Overview of the Forestry Governance Learning Group (James Mayers, IIED)

<http://www.iied.org/natural-resources/key-issues/forestry/forest-governance-learning-group>

- The Forestry Governance Learning Group (FGLG) has been facilitated by IIED since about 2003.
- Recently the FGLG was evaluated independently by Tom Blomley, to provide lessons for entering a new phase through 2013.

- FGLG is comprised of **teams in nine countries**: Ghana, Cameroun, Uganda, Mozambique, Malawi, South Africa, Vietnam, Indonesia, India (also Niger but phasing out)
- **Main question: What improves decision-making in forestry?** FGLG approaches this question by considering community participation and the workings of innovations such as REDD, while also considering key challenges.
- **Common elements among the FGLG groups**: Existing groupings, policy-makers, opinion formers (e.g. in government, civil society and private sector), unions, press – basically anyone who is set up to listen well to the most marginalized and disempowered in the forestry sector, to make links between the different groups, to seize opportunities to change decisions in formal policy, legislation, institutional structures and information/resource flows
- **Some examples of FGLG work**:
 - **Ghana**: FGLG was central to shaping the formal agreement between Ghanaian and European governments to certify timber exports to Europe
 - **Malawi**: analysis of the charcoal trade that opened national debate on management of charcoal business
 - **South Africa**: FGLG facilitated the opening of the small enterprise timber trade by revising policy and law
 - **Vietnam**: FGLG partners devised new ways for community forestry, by opening ways for forest adjacent communities to acquire their rights to forests.
 - Malawi, Ghana, etc are interested in learning from Tanzanian experiences
- Two main points:
 - Practical politics towards sustainable livelihoods
 - Cross country benefit
- Going forward
 - Already making contacts with Sokoine University of Agriculture and WWF Tanzania Programme Office
 - Going into phase two with support from the European Community and DfID, and looking for additional support. If groups in TZ want to come on board there are opportunities for more linking.

2. Group Discussion:

“Should a ‘FGLG’ be established in Tanzania OR should an existing initiative be supported OR should something of a mix be supported?”

Question: How are FGLG groupings made up?

- A convener, usually representing an institution, typically NGOs, often legal oriented, or a small scale business, or a government body, which has the money and mandate (if necessary) connects with interested, relevant parties.
- Members are typically from a range of NGOs, government bodies and a few businesses
- The process of selection is open. It can be nomination, election, or more informal.

- Transparency is key to judging legitimacy of the Group.
- Findings and feedback are often taken to government, including policy briefs, workshops, taking government to court such as in a case in Uganda that stopped a forest from being sold to a palm oil company.

Question: What is the time frame?

Four years to do all research, produce all products and to work with the media

Question: Are groupings registered?

None are registered, some are almost invisible

Question: What themes does the FGLG work around?

- Improving the security of forest rights and the ability to use those rights
- Legitimizing forest products and value chains
- Improving forest based climate strategies and governance, i.e. REDD and adaptation
- Promoting transnational preparedness by taking advantage of linking the national groups (Example: FGLG has been able to get the international group together each year over the past five years, as well as several one-to-one country exchanges)

Question: What are the impacts of FGLG team work internationally?

- FGLG the partners to get to a lot of meetings, especially the country team partners to attend international meetings.
- FGLG works with FLEG-T, the European Union approach to legal timber action plan within the European Community.
- FGLG is being looked at by climate initiatives internationally because of its well-placed teams and research.
- FGLG is trying to show how two-way flow of information will work in terms of linking international groups to those “on the ground”.

General comments:

- Could FGLG be a tool for the Tanzania Forestry Working Group (TFWG) to **link more with university and government**? The link to researchers is good for providing more evidence for lobbying the government.
- **Where would the group be placed in Tanzania? Should it be at the TFWG?**
- **Should the FGLG be based outside the TFWG, in case there is any friction with other TFWG projects?**
- If the government is part of the FGLG at TFWG and engaged in the FGLG research, then the TFWG will be in an even better position to lobby for governance improvements.
- Tanzania is lucky to have good relations between CSO and government on forest governance.
- Let us not ‘reinvent the wheel’. The TFWG is already successful and a stronger link with academia will be a benefit.

- **We don't have the private sector or the academics here now, so TFWG should get consensus with people in these groups first before confirming the possibility of FGLG being housed at TFWG.**
- **The challenge is to keep the TFWG "fluid".**
- The next step is for James Mayers is to visit professors at SUA, who are already involved in the TFWG through the carbon and community forestry subgroup.
- Another challenge of broadening membership will be to keep clear lines of communication, for example, there is the email list for the TFWG. It would be nice to know all is on the email list.
- **What are the next steps for communication for this initiative?** James Mayers will send out a report after the whole tour. Also minutes of this meeting will be available.

For edits to these minutes, please contact Caroline Chumo at c.chumo@tnrf.org