

The Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFFE), Phase II

**Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam
“Sharing Knowledge on Markets, Landscapes,
and Environmental Policies”**

**Bo Tengnäs
Awang Noor Abd. Ghani
Hendrayanto**

**Department for Natural
Resources and the Environment**

The Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFFE), Phase II

Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam
**“Sharing Knowledge on Markets, Landscapes,
and Environmental Policies”**

Bo Tengnäs
Awang Noor Abd. Ghani
Hendrayanto

Sida Evaluation 2008:04

**Department for Natural
Resources and the Environment**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, Sida Studies in Evaluation, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

Authors: Bo Tengnäs, Awang Noor Abd. Ghani, Hendrayanto.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 2008:04

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 2005-000155

Date of Final Report: 2007 October

Printed by Edita Communication, 2008

Art. no. Sida40946en

ISBN 978-91-586-8155-2

ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Executive Summary	5
Acronyms	9
1. Introduction	11
The purpose of the review.....	11
Terms of Reference	11
The team.....	11
Limitations	11
2. The Evaluated Intervention and its Contextual Framework	12
The emergence and evolution of people-centred forestry.....	12
Agroforestry	12
Issues in natural resources management in Southeast Asia.....	13
The World Agroforestry Centre, ICRAF.....	13
SEANAFAE.....	13
Inputs from Sida, ICRAF and the national institutions 1997–2004	14
Earlier evaluations.....	14
SEANAFAE Phase II: The supported activities	15
3. Findings	16
Objective 1: The solidification of an effective regional and national networking	16
Objective 2: The development of a core group of instructors (marketing).....	22
Objective 3: The creation of a core group of educators (landscape agroforestry).....	25
Objective 4: The development of additional funding	26
Objective 5: The expansion of SEANAFAE	26
Objective 6: The development and sharing of international public goods	28
4. Conclusions	29
Overall assessment	29
Is SEANAFAE on track with respect to achieving its objectives by the end of Phase 2?.....	33
Need for focus	34
Need for a budget revision	34
5. Lessons Learned	35
6. Recommendations	36
Revised and sharpened focus; technical issues.....	36
Fundraising and linkages for sustainability	37
Administrative and Financial Systems	37
The Indonesian network.....	37
Appendix 1. Terms of Reference	39
Appendix 2. List of people met or contacted	43
Appendix 3. List of documentation	47
Appendix 4. Details on ThaiNAFE	49
Appendix 5. Details on VNAFE	55

Appendix 6. Details on LaoNAFE	63
Appendix 7. Details on PAFERN	69
Appendix 8. Details on IndoNAFE	77
Appendix 9. RECOFTC notes on proposed collaboration, October 2006	85
Annex – potential collaborative partners	89
Appendix 10. SEANAFE’s notes on proposed collaboration, August 2006	91

Abstract

Sida supports the development of education in agroforestry in SEAsia. The main objectives are to solidify an effective regional and national (in five SE Asian countries) networking infrastructure and to enhance university lecturers' capability to teach certain aspects of agroforestry.

The aims of the mid-term review are to find out if SEANAFE is on track, draw lessons for the remaining project period and to recommend new directions, where necessary.

The three-person mission visited universities in four countries in SEAsia. The team benefited from having two members from the region and the third member with broad experience of the region and of the particular program.

The project was relatively well on track in certain respects, less so in others. Four out of the five national networks have performed relatively well, while the fifth was lagging behind in evolution and performance. The sustainability of the regional network in a future without donor support is a concern. Most important, therefore, is to achieve sustainability of results and impact at institutional and national level.

The most important recommendation for the remaining period is to revise the budget and streamline planned activities so that a high-quality output of targeted activities can be achieved.

Executive Summary

Introduction

According to the Terms of Reference (TOR), this mid-term project evaluation generally aims to:

- Find out if SEANAFE is on track with respect to achieving its objectives in the end of Phase 2;
- Draw lessons to improve operation within the remaining project period; and
- Recommend new directions, where necessary, with special attention to sustainability of results and future of the network.

The Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education, SEANAFE, Phase II

Participants in an Agroforestry Education Fellows Workshop organised in Bogor in 1998 agreed towards the formation of the Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFE). SEANAFE was officially launched in April 1999.

The ultimate envisaged impact of SEANAFE may best be described by citing its mission statement: *“Through improvement of agroforestry education and training, contribute towards socio-economic improvement of farming communities and sustainable natural resources management in the region”.*

Sida has provided financial support to the activities of SEANAFE and the national networks as well as for ICRAF’s support to these activities ever since its formation. In total about 16,000,000 SEK has been availed to ICRAF for this purpose up to the end of 2004.

During Phase II (1.4.2005–31.3.2009), the Sida support to the network has a somewhat different character as compared to the earlier years. Much of the support intends to prepare the networks for a future without or with a lower level of direct donor funding. The specific objectives for the current phase of Sida support to SEANAFE are:

1. The solidification of an effective regional and national networking infrastructure;
2. The development of a core group of instructors that understand and are capable of teaching the marketing of agroforestry tree products;
3. The creation of a core group of educators that understand and are able to teach the concept of landscape agroforestry;
4. The development of additional funding for regional and national projects;
5. The expansion of SEANAFE to include China, Malaysia and other Southeast Asian nations and the development of a new partnership with RECOFTC; and
6. The development and sharing of international public goods on agroforestry and NRM education and research.

The fulfilment of the objectives 2 and 3 is to be achieved through the implementation of specifically designed projects.

Findings and Conclusions

The review team found that after a somewhat slow start momentum has been gained.

The networks are all functioning reasonably well with the exception of the Indonesian one. The two sub-projects are being implemented and are improving in terms of following the time table. Additional sub-projects of a similar nature were expected to be implemented in collaboration with other donor agencies or other financiers. Little was so far achieved in that respect.

International public goods are being delivered through the activities under objective 6.

There is some progress on broadening of the national networks' financial base, but less so at the SEANAFE level. However, financial sustainability remains a major challenge at all levels.

So far, little has also been achieved with regard to a possible expansion of the network to other countries as well as on the development of a new partnership with RECOFTC.

The review team notes that the range of activity that was planned at the onset of the project proved to be a tall order for the organisation. There is now a need to focus on:

- Quality of the marketing and landscape agroforestry projects. To achieve that, there may be need to strengthen the facilitation unit. This can be achieved either by recruiting a fellow on a similar arrangement as Dr. Damrong in the past, or by hiring consultancy services, or through a combination of these two activities.
- Encouraging national networks fund raising.
- Being pro-active in relation to RECOFTC and donors. Support from ICRAF SEAsia and SEANAFE would be required as the Board on its own will not have the adequate capacity for this.
- Activities that makes the national networks more relevant for a larger groups of members. This could include additional thesis grants, but at a lower level of funding per grant (about 1,000 US \$).
- Completion of the impact study for it to be used as a tool for attracting interest from donors/ financiers. The usefulness of the final output would be maximised if the design is “popular” making it attractive reading for a wider target group. This calls for a short and illustrated version without too much elaboration of the methodology. The full research report need to be completed too, but can be presented in a way more suited for scientists than for a wider audience.

A long list of items suggested to be the focus will only make operational sense if accompanied by a list of areas suggested to be less emphasised:

- Expansion to other countries; a door remains open, but this may not be the right time to work pro-actively on this.
- Institutional changes unless they directly serve a clear fund-raising objective.
- Work on the fund-raising strategy—more direct action is now called for. The strategy itself does not secure the funds. It is the implementation that matters.
- The “3rd and 4th sub-projects” unless they can serve a direct fund-raising purpose and can be developed with support from other sources.

The observations made by the review team indicate that there is now a need to make a comprehensive budget revision for the remaining project period.

Lessons Learned

SEANAFE Phase II has yielded useful learning opportunities for the networks on how to implement projects with relatively long duration and parallel in several countries but most of these are of little universal interest.

Recommendations

Based on its findings the review team makes the following main recommendations:

Revised and sharpened focus; technical issues

- Make a complete budget revision to develop a budget for the remaining period that is relevant.
- The budget revision would have to consider a request to Sida for a no-cost extension. Sida, ICRAF and the Board should, however, look at this critically. The aim should be to have a structure in place that generates significant activity among members.
- The budget revision should also analyse the impact of currency rates exchanges.
- De-emphasise (eliminate budget allocation) for expansion to new countries, the 3rd and 4th sub-projects unless another financier can be attracted, institutional changes unless they serve directly a fund-raising purpose.
- Broaden the gender focus towards a “human diversity approach” taking into account also the need for giving young lecturers better chances to become involved. This may reinforce the interest in gender balance, which is otherwise hard to achieve.
- Consider follow-up activity to the marketing sub-project, engaging expertise other than the team that was engaged.
- Change name on the Landscape Agroforestry sub-project to “Participatory Landscape Agroforestry Analyses” or something similar that sheds more direct light on what the project deals with.
- Introduce a better follow-up and interaction with the country teams.
- Allocate funds for additional thesis grants but at a lower funding level (1,000 US \$ for M. Sc.) and allow the country networks to have a say on whether it should be M.Sc. or B.Sc.
- Complete the Impact Study.
- Continue the cooperation with FAO on APAN News but invest in distribution of more copies.
- Discuss intellectual property rights and publishing arrangements for outputs at an early stage to avoid tension towards the end.

Fundraising and linkages for sustainability

- Revitalise the contacts with RECOFTC based on the earlier discussions.
- Embark on pro-active contacts with donors and other financiers.

Administrative and Financial Systems

- ICRAF is recommended to review the arrangements with contract signatories such that two signatures on behalf of ICRAF will be required also for smaller contracts.
- ICRAF is also recommended to release funds more gradually and with a bigger share by the completion of the work to ensure that ICRAF retains a certain power to ensure that the delivered output is of acceptable standard.

- ICRAF is recommended to supply Sida with financial (and progress) reports timely.
- ICRAF is recommended to look into the amount featuring as advance payments.
- ICRAF is recommended to handle finances directly by ICRAF staff for events where ICRAF staff participates. This increases efficiency and reduces the struggle to get financial reports, and possibly refund of excessive disbursements.
- Ensure that there is full recognition and agreement with regard to the power relations between SEANAFE and the national networks, i.e. there is a supervisory mandate of SEANAFE only as far as the business relation on contracts is concerned. Apart from that, diversification of the national network is acceptable and should be encouraged.
- The Board and ICRAF are recommended to revisit the issue of who is responsible for implementation of activities at the country level.

The Indonesian network

- The Indonesian network requires improved performance to qualify for continued support. The SEANAFE Board is recommended to consider the following two main options: (i) Discontinue support to INAFE and assess possibilities to work with the social forestry centre of Universitas Mulawarman instead, or (ii) Reconstitute INAFE with its NAFEC based on an agreed charter and with an advisory body that consists of deans of member institutions from where an executive committee may be elected. Contact persons should be formalised through the deans and could be the deans or representatives nominated by them. The nominated representatives should have an obligation to report back to the institution. Introduction of membership fees is a challenge but should be implemented.
- Within SEANAFE, Indonesia may be used as test case on how modern technology can be used as a tool for networking. Several universities have developed ICT networking through LAN and Internet. These developments open new avenues. In Indonesia, the Directorate General of Higher Education of the Ministry of National Education has launched the INHERENT programme since a couple of years, aimed at developing the inter universities' networking using ICT to widen accessibility to higher education.
- SEANAFE Board/ICRAF are recommended to treat any request from an Indonesian network targeting the above developments positively, but should only avail support to INAFE if institutional improvements are put in place.

Acronyms

ANAPE	African Network for Agroforestry Education
APAN	Asia Pacific Forestry Network
B. Sc.	Bachelor of Science
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CHED	Commission on Higher Education for Curriculum Development
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Centre)
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
INCA	Integrating Natural Resource Management Capacity in Southeast Asia
INAFE	Indonesia Network for Agroforestry Education
IPB	Institute Pertanian Bogor
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LaoNAFE	Lao Network for Agroforestry Education
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M.Sc.	Master of Science
NAFEC	National Agroforestry Education Committee
NAFRI	National Forestry Research Institute
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Product
NUOL	National University of Laos
PAFERN	Philippines' Agroforestry Education and Research Network
RECOFTC	Regional Community Forestry Training Centre
SEANAPE	Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education
SEARCA	SEAMEO Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture
SEAsia	Southeast Asia
SENSA	Swedish Environmental Secretariat for Asia

Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Sida	Swedish International Development Authority, later renamed Sida
TA	Technical Advisor
ThaiNAFE	Thai Network for Agroforestry Education
TOR	Terms of Reference
UGM	Universitas Gadjah Mada
UN	United Nations
UPLB	University of the Philippines at Los Baños
VNAFE	Vietnam Network for Agroforestry Education
WASWC	World Association of Soil and Water Conservation

1. Introduction

The purpose of the review

According to the Terms of Reference (TOR), this mid-term project evaluation generally aims to:

- Find out if SEANAFE is on track with respect to achieving its objectives in the end of Phase 2;
- Draw lessons to improve operation within the remaining project period; and
- Recommend new directions, where necessary, with special attention to sustainability of results and future of the network.

The evaluation findings and recommendations are to be used as a base for a SEANAFE mid-term review meeting at the end of October 2007. At this meeting there will be opportunity to discuss strategic choices for the future of SEANAFE in order to fulfil the objectives stated in the project document as well as the development of SEANAFE beyond the project period. Sida intends to use the findings for its follow-up of SEANAFE's goal achievement.

Terms of Reference

The TOR is attached, appendix 1.

The team

The team consisted of Bo Tengnäs (Sweden), team leader, Dr. Awang Noor Abd. Ghani (Malaysia), Lecturer and ex Deputy Dean (Academic and International Affairs), Faculty of Forestry, University Putra Malaysia and Dr. Hendra Yanto (Indonesia), Dean of Faculty of Forestry, Bogor Agricultural Institute (IPB Bogor).

Limitations

The team has been well supported by both Sida and ICRAF. Material has been availed and ICRAF has made efforts to provide the information the team requested. The team had, however, to be more proactive in the selection of institutions to be visited than was anticipated based on the TOR. The fact that the SEANAFE Technical Advisor was absent from the office most of the review period limited chances for the team to interact frequently. The newly recruited assistant was most helpful in assisting the team with its fact finding. The team's fact finding in the office of the Facilitation Unit indicated that the feedback from several countries is rather scanty. This is confirmed by the reports on contracts served which indicate frequently that narrative and financial reports are yet to be submitted. The shortage of reports from the countries has, in some instances, forced the team to make more subjective assessments of activities at country level than what would be ideal. Indonesia and the Philippines were chosen as the countries where most extensive contacts were made. Thailand and Vietnam were also visited, while for Laos contacts were made by other means. There were some constraints with regard to timing of the visits in Thailand and Vietnam and a visit to Laos, that was considered, had to be cancelled as the only time available for the team proved unsuitable for the national stake holders.

It should be noted that the activities involves a large number of institutions located in different places in five different countries. Many of these are located in areas that are time consuming to reach. The team tried made a conscious effort to avoid only visiting institutions conveniently located in order to avoid a "convenience bias". Thus in the Philippines, the team interacted with representatives of two institutions

outside of Luzon, and in Indonesia visits included also institutions located in East Java, East Kalimantan and on Sulawesi. The team interacted personally with the SEANAFE Chairman, V. Chairman and with NAFEC Chairpersons from Thailand, Laos (telephone and emails), Vietnam (telephone and emails) and Indonesia. The team interacted with 20 out of the currently 80 SEANAFE members.

The team generally put more emphasis on a qualitative assessment than on a quantitative one. No attempts were made to collect statistical data. A lot of facts and figures are found in the SEANAFE reports to which reference is made.

2. The Evaluated Intervention and its Contextual Framework

The emergence and evolution of people-centred forestry

In the 1960s and 70s development cooperation in the forestry sector predominantly targeted forest plantations, forest industries and forests for watershed protection. There was, however, a growing concern that this “traditional” forestry often had little positive or even negative impact on the livelihoods of local forest-dependant communities. In addition, many of the projects aimed at plantation development were less successful, and governments gradually appeared to lose their effectiveness as forest managers.

During the latter half of the 1970s a new paradigm started to emerge giving the forest-dependent communities a redefined role. The new idea was to explore if these communities could be engaged in forest management in a way that secured a positive contribution to local livelihoods without jeopardising the forests. From the early community forestry initiatives in the late 1970s the notion of “people-centred forestry” has evolved further and new concepts have gained ground. Farm forestry, social forestry and agroforestry may have slightly different meanings and implications, but they all share the basic idea that local communities play an important role in the management of forests and trees.

At the turn of the century, additional issues became prominent in the debates over land use. Increased attention was paid to the service functions of trees and forests. It was realized that in far more situations than what was earlier perceived, the conservation values of forests by far outweigh the value of the products derived from them. For these and other reasons, increased restrictions on logging were imposed in many countries and in particular in countries in Southeast and East Asia.

All these processes gradually brought about a more holistic view on land use and reduced the disciplinary boundaries between them. Agroforestry emerged as a new applied science focussing on the integration of trees in the agricultural setting, both at the farm level and at a broader landscape level.

Agroforestry

Simply put, agroforestry means farming with trees. The formal definition is as follows:

Agroforestry is a dynamic, ecologically based, natural resource management practice that, through the integration of trees on farms and in the agricultural landscape, diversifies and sustains production for increased social, economic and environmental benefits.

The exact understanding of the concept agroforestry has, however, undergone considerable variations. The current definition is much wider in scope than earlier ones. Parallel to the evolution of the agrofor-

estry concept several other similar or related concepts have evolved too, such as community forestry, social forestry, farm forestry and village forestry. The perception of these concepts vary within and between countries and there are various degrees of overlaps between the concepts depending on the local perceptions..

Components of agroforestry education may be integrated in a range of subjects, appear under another 'name' or feature as a specific course named agroforestry.

Issues in natural resources management in Southeast Asia

The recent decades have been characterised by rapid economic growth and change in most parts of Southeast Asia. A major key to this development has been increased agricultural productivity. The rapid agricultural development has, however, mainly occurred in fertile areas suitable for irrigated rice. These areas are mainly in lowlands and in upland areas with rich volcanic soils.

Many other areas are, however, lagging behind. These are especially upland areas with poorer soils where unsustainable slash and burn agriculture dominates land use and lowland areas with poorer soils where large-scale logging threatens the livelihoods of segments of local populations. Local populations in these areas often include ethnic minorities. Improvements of existing agroforestry systems and the introduction of new agroforestry technologies have been assumed to have potential to address some of these issues.

The World Agroforestry Centre, ICRAF

ICRAF was initially formed in 1978 as a small council for research in agroforestry but evolved during the 1990s into a *centre* for research in agroforestry, and joined the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, CGIAR in 1990. The ICRAF SE Asia Regional Programme was established in 1993 with offices in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. Later an office was also set up in Kunming, China.

SEANAFE

History

An African Network for Agroforestry Education, ANAFE, was launched in 1993. Building on the ANAFE experiences and also on a round-table discussion on agroforestry education in Southeast Asia held in 1994, ICRAF initiated a status and needs assessment of agroforestry education in 1997–98. A grant from Sida facilitated the assessment, which was conducted in Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. The 1997–98 needs assessment and subsequent meetings revealed that a number of issues confront the growth and quality of agroforestry education. Among these were:

- In spite of many common needs and experiences among educational institutions in Southeast Asia, there were very limited mechanisms for collaboration, nationally as well as regionally.
- Agroforestry education was hampered by inadequate or outdated curricula, lack of minimum standards and obstacles to agroforestry curriculum development.
- There was need to harmonise agroforestry education within institution, between institutions and among countries of the network.
- Lecturers were found to require further training.
- There was general shortage of relevant and high-quality training materials, and existing ones require up-dating and translation.

Considering the outcome of the needs assessment, the participants in an Agroforestry Education Fellows Workshop organised in Bogor in 1998 agreed towards the formation of the Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFE).

SEANAFE formed in April 1999

SEANAFE was officially launched in April 1999. Its vision, mission and development objectives were agreed upon. These, as well as five priority activity areas and details on organisational structure, resource contribution, information dissemination, links and external relations and evaluation mechanisms were compiled in the SEANAFE Charter adopted by the SEANAFE Board in June 1999.

SEANAFE's mission

The ultimate envisaged impact of SEANAFE may best be described by citing its mission statement: *“Through improvement of agroforestry education and training, contribute towards socio-economic improvement of farming communities and sustainable natural resources management in the region”*. This is obviously a long-term undertaking.

Goals

SEANAFE's network objectives:

- Provide regional and national mechanisms for interdisciplinary collaboration among agroforestry institutions and programmes
- Build individual and institutional capacity for agroforestry education, research and development
- Strengthen the quality, availability and accessibility of agroforestry education
- Facilitate research connectivity and collaboration
- Link agroforestry education to the extension system and practice in the field
- Promote and develop skills in communication and information dissemination
- Assist in mobilizing resources for national and regional collaboration on agroforestry capacity building.

Inputs from Sida, ICRAF and the national institutions 1997–2004

Sida has provided financial support to the activities of SEANAFE and the national networks as well as for ICRAF's support to these activities ever since the time of the needs assessment. In total about 16,000,000 SEK has been availed to ICRAF for this purpose up to the end of 2004.

During the whole implementation period ICRAF has availed its human resources and various forms of infrastructure to implement the project and the national institutions have availed personnel participating in the various events as well as for the formation and management of the national networks.

Earlier evaluations

The mid-term review 2001

After two years of operation the SEANAFE Board and management felt that it would be timely to conduct a mid-term review in April–May 2001. The team carrying out the mid-term review noted that considerable progress had been made, but also noted that the centralised structure of the network seemed to be a constraint for further growth and for cost-effectiveness. Recommendations made included restructuring of the central network coordination functions and decentralisation by support to creation of national networks in the member countries (Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam). Another recommendation made was to embark on thematic focuses that may shift over time in order to maintain vigour and innovativeness in the network.

The evaluation 2004

A comprehensive evaluation of the Sida-support to activities implemented by ICRAF SE Asia, including the support to SEANAFE was conducted in 2004. Sida had by then indicated its intention to terminate the support. The evaluation recommended that a long time horizon be applied bearing in mind that it had taken time and effort to establish the networks and once in place they should be supported for some reasonable time to deliver the outputs they were intended to deliver. A time horizon of another 7–8 years was recommended. Based on the evaluators' findings and recommendations Sida decided to avail continued financial support for another phase.

SEANAFE Phase II: The supported activities

During Phase II (1.4.2005–31.3.2009), the Sida support to the network has a somewhat different character as compared to the earlier years. Much of the support intends to prepare the networks for a future without or with a lower level of direct donor funding. The specific objectives for the current phase of Sida support to SEANAFE are:

7. The solidification of an effective regional and national networking infrastructure;
8. The development of a core group of instructors that understand and are capable of teaching the marketing of agroforestry tree products;
9. The creation of a core group of educators that understand and are able to teach the concept of landscape agroforestry;
10. The development of additional funding for regional and national projects;
11. The expansion of SEANAFE to include China, Malaysia and other Southeast Asian nations and the development of a new partnership with RECOFTC; and
12. The development and sharing of international public goods on agroforestry and NRM education and research.

The fulfilment of the objectives 2 and 3 is to be achieved through the implementation of specifically designed projects, each with duration of 18–24 months and with the following sequence of activities:

1. A regional training workshop to update at least a core group of 20 lecturers from SEANAFE member institutions on the most recent research results, tools and methods on the concerned subject matter;
2. National case studies to be carried out in five countries to enable the testing of methods and tools and to provide content for the development of teaching materials.
3. A second regional workshop will be held to compare research results and experiences and prepare regional teaching materials and curriculum modules (all materials will be modular and made available in a range of formats including on-line and conventional);
4. Regional materials and curricula will be adapted and translated in the local languages;
5. National training courses will be organized for 80 more lecturers from SEANAFE member institutions, 30% of whom shall be females, to launch newly developed learning materials and to train lecturers; and
6. Policy makers will be informed of results.

The *Marketing of Agroforestry Tree Products* Project is expected to be completed in 2007 while the *Landscape Agroforestry* Project in 2008. An additional project on Forest and Environmental Policies was expected to be developed and to be implemented in the initial stages using project seed money. The overall imple-

mentation was expected to be financed from other sources. Yet a fourth project was also to be developed and implemented based on co-funding between Sida and another investor.

According to the project document and in addition to the mentioned projects, the following activities are also to be implemented during the current phase of Sida support:

1. Organize an International Agroforestry Education Conference to be held in conjunction with the network's Fourth General Meeting.
2. Increase collaboration as regards its various activities with regional and international organizations such as with the Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC), the United Nations Food and Agriculture (FAO) and IUCN Regional Offices in Bangkok, Thailand, and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) in Bogor, Indonesia.
3. Invite China, Malaysia, Cambodia, and East Timor to join its network using their own funds and through external support
4. Support Innovative curriculum development efforts through a small grants facility to be made available to co-operators.
5. Five postgraduate research projects on natural resource management are completed.

3. Findings

Objective 1: The solidification of an effective regional and national networking

General

During 2005 SEANAFE activities slowed down as there was a period of uncertainty with regard to funding. Even though the actual period of uncertainty was relatively short, it takes some time to generate new momentum once a decision is in place. Therefore, the start-up of some of the supported activities was delayed as compared to the work plan. Later during the implementation period momentum has been gained.

SEANAFE at regional level

SEANAFE at regional level met some unforeseen challenges during 2006. The TA who has worked with SEANAFE ever since the Swedish support started was offered another job and left ICRAF. ICRAF managed to recruit a successor in a timely manner and there was a two-week over-lap period for both TAs to work side by side for smooth hand over. However, this period was not maximised for such purpose as both TAs were busy attending to the logistical requirements of their new jobs. Further, a decision was made at the same time to shift the location of SEANAFE Facilitation Unit back to Bogor. This resulted in disruption also with regard to support staff and some period for the new TA without access to project documentation which was being sent from Chiang Mai. For some time, the TA worked alone. Once a new assistant was recruited it was decided not to prolong the employment beyond the probation period, and it is only by mid 2007 that the facilitation unit is again fully operational in terms of staff capacity.

In spite of these difficulties activities have been progressing and the team wishes to emphasise that it understands that, given these developments, it would be unrealistic to expect a fully pro-active role of the facilitation unit. Rather, it is impressive to note that it has been possible to support the national networks in their endeavour to implement projects corresponding to objectives 2 and 3 ("Marketing" and "Landscape Agroforestry").

The team is also of the opinion that the project document was highly ambitious with regard to the number of projects (four planned, two on-going) and it may not have been realised fully, that a considerable input is required for follow-up and quality assurance when such projects are implemented. This will be further elaborated below under objective 2.

The SEANAFE Board met five times from 2005 to date and the attendance was good with the exception of the Vice Chairman who was absent during three out of the five meetings. The Chairman expressed the opinion that the Board members need to be more active between the Board meetings, and he was also of the opinion that the Board meetings have been too much focussed on the follow-up of the ongoing activities and spent too little time to discuss strategic issues. Such issues require attention.

A challenge in the near future is the upcoming election of a new Chairman and Vice Chairman. The team was unable to find any signs of preparatory work to ensure that some candidates were identified in advance. Opinion about this fact varied though, some were slightly worried while others did not foresee difficulties in finding the right candidates during the meeting. The TA, being from the region, expressed his wish to entirely distance himself from this process.

Contacts have been maintained with ANAFE through reciprocal visits. The ANAFE coordinator has been attending SEANAFE Board meetings while SEANAFE representatives selected from the country networks participate in relevant ANAFE activities.

The SEANAFE website is well maintained and easily found using for example GOOGLE. It is hosted in the ICRAF website but there is a plan to have it in a separate domain from next year. It is updated quarterly. The printed Newsletter was published during 2006 and 2007 through a collaborative arrangement with FAO Bangkok, resulting in SEANAFE featuring in the APAN news. SEANAFE occupies a maximum of eight pages in the APAN News. Two country networks are assigned to provide articles per issue. SEANAFE has allocated US \$ 1,500 per issue for the publication. The team is of the opinion that this is a very good arrangement making it possible for a wide audience to share the SEANAFE experiences. APAN News is well known in the region and professionally designed and distributed. It is, however, noted that generally only one copy is sent to each member institution. This limits outreach within the member institutions. In a few cases it appeared to be doubtful if at all APAN News had reached some member institution.

The electronic newsletter is published quarterly, disseminated to at least 300 subscribers, and uploaded in the SEANAFE website. The SEANAFE TA prepares the e-News which consists mainly of updates on SEANAFE and country network activities, listing of useful publications, websites, and forthcoming activities of other organizations, etc.

SEANAFE was expected to share its experiences with the International Partnership on Forestry Education at the International Union of Forestry Research Organisation's world congress in Brisbane in 2005. This was accomplished as planned. Four representatives of SEANAFE attended, one each from Thailand, Indonesia and Laos and the TA.

The national networks

The five national networks are evolving slightly differently and some in more promising directions than others. Work plans serving as budget requests for 2007 have been prepared by all networks except Indonesia, and funds have been allocated as a response to the work plans. Agroforestry education faces different challenges in the different countries and it is thus essential that there is full freedom for the networks to adopt the strategies they find most relevant to respond to the national situations. Blueprint thinking aimed at standardising the networks should thus be avoided. A detailed description of the state of affairs of each national network has been attached as appendices 4–8.

PAFERN, the Philippine network, is well established and registered as an NGO/Foundation. It collects membership fees and manages its affairs through the Institute of Agroforestry of the University of the Philippines Los Baños. Agroforestry is well institutionalised in educational institutions with agroforestry offered both as full programmes and also as courses within other programs.

There are, however, major challenges also in the Philippines. The over-riding challenge is the low level of interest among young people for education relating to land use. Forestry is most seriously affected with occasionally a student–lecturer ratio of 1:1. Agriculture may be slightly more popular, but programmes are generally running with a lot fewer students than the institutions’ capacity. Agroforestry programmes and courses share the dilemma. Reasons are multiple, including the fact that the forests are largely gone already, but most importantly, a major driving force for young people acquiring education is the prospect of being employed abroad. In that light nursing, business etc. are hot topics, agriculture holds some promise for work in the Middle East, while forestry and agroforestry do not fare well in that assessment.

Another challenge for PAFERN is the need to prove useful enough to members so that, from the members’ perspective, it is worth the contribution of a membership fee. The present design of the support from Sida through SEANAFE is not such that it automatically involves most members. Rather, the two projects currently ongoing tend to make a few institutions active while others are at best invited to send a participant to a national training course.

The total disbursement to the Philippines for 2005 was US \$ 15,500 and for 2006 US \$ 2,000. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 25,700 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment so far to the Philippines during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 46,100. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3.

The *Thai network (ThaiNAFE)* has advanced from an institutional point of view. Membership fees have been introduced and the network has become associated with the Dean’s Association. These developments are promising with regard to sustainability and it is noted that this has been achieved as a result of internal aspirations rather than as a result of external pressure from e.g. SEANAFE. The administrative node remains at Kasetsart University while the current chairman is from Chiang Mai University. A website contains useful and up-to-date information and is easy to find on the Internet.

There is a felt need to deepen the strategic thinking and to ensure that member institutions really have a shared vision. As a move in that direction, an excursion cum meeting is planned, possibly with a cross-border visit to Laos. The team found that serious thinking is going on in Thailand with regard to the future direction of the network. Challenges mentioned, apart from the need to strengthen the shared vision, include the process when new staff members take over responsibilities for ThaiNAFE affairs as well as become members of the NAFEC. The original founding members or persons will gradually step down and a new group of interested people has to be nurtured. This is more difficult with the present funding arrangement. Training events and other activities did earlier provide entry points but such events are now scarcer due to funding constraints. Some funding has, however, been secured from sources other than Sida.

The total disbursement to Thailand for 2005 was US \$ 16,830 and for 2006 US \$ 5,770. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 18,700 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Thailand so far during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 44,200. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3.

VNAFE, the Vietnamese network, has so far not introduced membership fees or become officially registered as a legal entity but it is vibrant and the records show considerable activity. The website may be regard-

ed as the best among the four existing ones and it is easy to find using search engines on the Internet. It contains comprehensive linkages to member institutions and other useful information. It is a joint venture with the Social Forestry Network, which is an added advantage as it creates synergy but not “divisions”. The Department of Forest Resources and Environment Management, Tay Nguyen University, remains the administrative node. The chairman, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bao Huy is responsible for day-to-day matters including the website. There are currently nine members of the network.

The total disbursement to Vietnam for 2005 was US \$ 2,800 and for 2006 US \$ 12,200. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 20,645 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Vietnam so far during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 38,545. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3.

LaoNAFE is not registered as a legal entity and no membership fees are collected. LaoNAFE has been one of the more active national networks requesting funding from SEANAFE and in implementing a range of activities. Funds were allocated by SEANAFE for the development of a website (March 2007) and the project is reported as completed in the SEANAFE records. Web-based information on LaoNAFE is supposed to be found in the web site of National University of Laos but only in Lao language. The team, without knowledge of Lao was unable to find LaoNAFE on that website and the link from SEANAFE website is thus not particularly meaningful. According to verbal information from the TA the project will be completed by October. The first female chairperson in any national network was elected in Laos.

The total disbursement to Laos for 2005 was US \$ 4,725 and for 2006 US \$ 22,366. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 24,655 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Laos during the current phase of SEANAFE hitherto amounts to US \$ 54,646. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3.

The Indonesian network represents the largest country and is next to the Philippines also the network with the largest number of members. But the performance of the network does not correspond to its size. Rather the team’s visit to some member institutions revealed that very little activity was noted. Introduction of membership fees was discussed and decided upon several years ago, but remains unimplemented. Some member-institution representatives are not aware of who is the current chairman in spite of recently having met him personally. The administrative node appears in certain respects to remain in IPB, the institutional home during the previous chairman but the IPB staff does not regard website development and other matters as their responsibility, at least not unless the chairman urges them to act. The website has not been updated for the last 18 months.

No work plan was prepared for 2007. It was assumed that the unimplemented activities reported from 2006 automatically constituted the work plan for 2007.

A strength is that the current chairman holds several important positions and is also an advisor on food security in the Ministry of Agriculture. This enables him to travel and during visits to various institutions there is opportunity for him to carry out advocacy work for agroforestry and for the network. There are, however, in the institutions visited few signs of that having been effective.

The total disbursement to Indonesia for 2005 was US \$ 19,640 and for 2006 US \$ 7,261. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 18,200 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the national M.Sc. grantee and US \$ 3,500 for the “Regional” grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Indonesia during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 51,501. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3. The projects, which amount to US \$ 33,700, are both handled by Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB).

During the last 18 months the only national activity that SEANAFE funded was a NAFEC meeting (US \$ 1,261).

In addition, Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) was paid 38,910,000 Rupees to host the 14th Board Meeting of SEANAFE (Regional activity) 6–8 August 2007.

A proposal for institutional development

The TA has prepared a proposed SEANAFE Programme for Institutional Development (SEANAFE's PRIDE). The programme has the following four objectives:

- Encourage innovative approaches in SEANAFE's operation and improve the formulation and implementation of its activities into a more coherent and workable fashion for 2008 and beyond.
- Enable SEANAFE to interact and enhance its collaborative actions with a wide range of partners and stakeholders engaged in agroforestry development.
- Promote synergies with the works of other international and regional agroforestry governing bodies and agro-forestry education-related organisations and networks.
- Enhance country networks' recognition and capabilities to deliver useful and practical services and products and generate cost-recovery mechanisms for sustained operation.

Four functional areas are enumerated as follows:

- Network sustainability
- Capacity building
- Agroforestry advocacy
- Agroforestry research and extension.

The programme in its present form represents a bold step towards further development and broadening of SEANAFE. Much of what is listed in the programme is what SEANAFE has already been doing, should be doing as of now or is actually doing now. There is however also many new ideas and features.

It is hard to either endorse or reject the programme unless it is elaborated further into a action plan that clarifies who is to do what and when. It will mainly be up to the national networks to translate the proposed institutional development into action that maximises the relevance of each network in its country. Funding sources will obviously be critical and unless the programme is matched with early and direct discussions with donor organisations it is hard to see the realistic mechanisms for its implementation. It has to be remembered that currently SEANAFE and the national networks combined have just two full time staff. Realisation of the programme calls for another magnitude of operation. There may be a "hen and egg" situation in this. Obviously the funding lacks right now, a fact that tends to make the programme appear unrealistic. Alternatively, the vision is that the programme, when further developed, can serve as a tool to attract donor's interest. Some donors may be cautious though, noting the difficulties in nurturing a rather simple structure as of now, and thus be scared away if the projection is a too bold step in their opinion.

The team disagrees with the programme on one specific issue. Citation: "Activities other than those mentioned in this programme shall be discussed and approved by the SEANAFE Board". The team is of the opinion that there is no power hierarchy between the Regional SEANAFE and the country networks. It is, rather, a business relation between equal partners. SEANAFE has, as long as there is funding, certain offers and the national networks can choose to accept or reject offers. Instead of striving for uniformity, diversification should be encouraged as long as it does not conflict with basic ethical principles and as long as the ambition is to increase the relevance of the national network in the

national perspective. Certain aspects of the programme, therefore, should remain recommendations and the idea that the SEANAFE Board acquires a function of an “approving body” for what national networks do, ought to be rejected.

ICRAF technical backstopping

ICRAF employs the Technical Advisor who has, so far been fully funded by the Sida budget. In the original budget Sida finances for the position was only allocated for 38 out of the project duration of 48 months. The vision was that other donor support would come in to complement the Sida support towards the end of the project period. So far, there are no positive signs with regard to co-funding of the position. ICRAF is unable to allocate its own core funds which are minimal for the SE Asia operations. The internationally recruited TA, who left during the second half of 2006, was replaced by an expert recruited from the region. The cost for the latter is significantly lower (about 50%) than for the former. It is obviously essential that there is a full time position for the whole project period in the Facilitation Unit (the project document anticipated other donors to come in and thus made budget allocation for only 38 out of 48 months).

The current TA has a professional background of community development which gives a potential for strengthening the social aspects in the project implementation. The team finds that an important asset. The newly recruited Project Assistant has a forestry background and an ambition is that she might get involved in technical matters too. It is, however, uncertain whether reality will prove that such involvement to any significant degree will be possible as the administrative work load is continuously there. The team would certainly welcome her professional input.

Apart from the staff directly working with the project, other ICRAF staff members have provided technical backstopping at various occasions, notably in the training events/workshops conducted under the marketing and landscape agroforestry projects. Some ICRAF staff also assisted in reviewing outputs of the national case studies in the marketing project. There will be a significant need for effective technical support from ICRAF in the coming phases of the landscape agroforestry project. The team recognises the challenge that ICRAF SE Asia is practically entirely funded on a project bases and there is thus difficulties in drawing on expertise within the organisation unless there is a system for cost compensation in place. But the team anyhow believes that ICRAF SE Asia competence was one of the factors considered when the themes for the sub-projects were chosen, and it is essential that such competence can be well utilised in the implementation.

Gender aspects

Senior management of educational institutions in SE Asia is still a domain dominated by men. In the Philippines, Indonesia and in Thailand this is in contrast with the composition of the students where there is now a clear dominance of girls in almost all institutions. In Laos and Vietnam girls are still a minority among students but their ratio of the total is increasing. From this perspective, enhanced quality of teaching has in the long run a potential of benefiting females as much as or even more than males. In several institutions, the team got the information that the increasing number of girls being educated has started to impact on the cadre of lecturers. Thus, among the young lecturers the share of ladies is on the increase.

The majority of the most influential people, however, remain men, and the result is that there is still imbalance in the favour of men with regard to participation in the SEANAFE-sponsored activities. The team notes that this issue is frequently discussed with the national network representatives and quotation has been tried (“at least one lady in research teams”) with various degrees of success.

Gender disaggregated statistics is now by and large available for the activities that were more directly handled by SEANAFE and often also for activities handled by the networks.

The relevance of the case studies of the marketing project from a gender perspective is not possible to specifically assess as there was a gender analysis only in the Indonesian report. This shortcoming derives back to the initial stages where it seems that such aspects may not have been emphasised.

A comment was made by one of the national network representatives that it would be more appropriate to emphasise human diversity in a broader sense than just gender. This would encompass most of all, the age factor. It is essential to give young lecturers a chance. The team supports this view. The team noted that, in some cases, the national chairman, or persons closely related to him, has been nominated team members in the teams carrying out the marketing case studies. The team finds such nominations less than ideal.

Objective 2: The development of a core group of instructors (marketing)

The project “Markets for agroforestry tree products” started with the recruitment of country teams and the initial regional training and planning workshop conducted in collaboration with RECOFTC in November 2005. In total 23 participants attended with about equal shares of women and men. Technical support was availed from RECOFTC, an NTFP advisor, an advisor from NAFRI (Laos) and from a consultant of Highland Research and Development Institute (Thailand). Subjects chosen for the case studies (Marketing of cashew nuts in Vietnam and Indonesia, of bamboo products in Laos, of mainly coconut in the Philippines and of para rubber in Thailand) are all relevant from a small-holder perspective. Most of the subjects are thus relevant for addressing poverty in the producer end, but few are relevant in the consumer end as it is produce for export or for the richer segments of the population. The field work commenced after that event and reports were submitted in August 2006.

A second Regional Training workshop was conducted with more or less the same participants (as intended) in August 2006. This workshop was supposed to be the event to prepare teaching materials and curriculum modules. The outputs were, however, limited to drafting the content outline of the teaching materials and listing down of the key theme of the curriculum. It was apparently at this stage some more severe constraints were observed:

- The type of expertise within the teams and the members’ level of commitment and availability had affected the quality
- The country teams had adopted different frameworks in the absence of a prescribed one
- During the August workshop the country teams were requested to identify three key themes each upon which they thought it would be possible to develop “mini case studies”. They did so, but the follow-up, which was done by an external consultant, showed that the approach did not work due to lack, inadequacy and inconsistency of information in the reports. It was then decided to integrate the three case studies into one per country.

The process from August onwards was characterised by the felt need of the SEANAFE management to make continued progress combined with the fact that the contracts with the country teams expired by August. The result was that a consultant by and large took over the process. He edited/condensed/rewrote (“repacked”) the country reports into short reports for each country. This was completed by December and availed to the country teams for translation around February 2007. A version of the translated material into Bahasa Indonesia was availed to the review team. For the Philippines there will be no need for translation. The TA reported that all country teams had translated the case study materials into their respective languages. No copies have, however, yet been submitted to the SEANAFE Facilitation Unit (except for Indonesia) and the review team could therefore not review the final outcome. For Vietnam, The Teachers’ Guide on Marketing of Agroforestry Tree Products is expected to be published in December 2007. The team had also no opportunity to review the final English version that formed the basis for the translation.

A country coordinators meeting was arranged in March 2007 in Bogor with participation from all five countries. This meeting served to reach a common view among country coordinators on how to proceed with the Phase 2 of the project. Guidelines were given accordingly. The country teams remained intact with the exception of Indonesia, where three out of four team members changed between Phase I and II of the project. There, the institutional memory of the project rests with only one person.

As a result of the rather “shaky process” in the latter stages of the project, there is some discontent in several of the country teams with regard to how their material was processed. Issues of intellectual property rights were brought forward, and opinions were expressed to the review team that the national teams felt that much of their work was lost in the process.

Nevertheless, the project moved on. National training courses have been conducted, as planned, to scale up the outreach of the result to some 100 lecturers in the region. These were national training events with some 20 participants in each country. The trainings were conducted in all countries except Thailand, but the Thai training was being planned at the time of the review team’s visit and was reported by the TA to have been conducted during the last week of September 2007.

Observations made by participants in the training and reported to the review team include that the programme was extremely tight with rather much one way communication and little time for discussion and analyses. In Indonesia, member institutions were mostly represented by lecturers who were on study leave on Java. This reduced travel costs, but it was uncertain whether these lecturers would provide any feed back to the institution to which they belong and presumably represent. Each country team was allocated US \$ 10,200 to translate the case studies in local language and to conduct a three-day in-country training for at least 20 participants.

The latter stages of the project, as per its design (book launching, information to policy makers, use of small grants for curriculum development, etc.) are yet to be implemented. Impact on curricula would also be premature to assess. Opinions were, however, expressed to the team, that impact on curricula would require a specific analyses in each institution to identify how marketing of agroforestry projects would relate to general marketing. For lecturers, who are not marketing specialists, to be well equipped in teaching marketing, they would also need to be equipped with some basic materials on the common principles and theory on marketing as their primary basis, and then useful case study materials that serve as illustration and application of the general principles in the agroforestry context. The ideal detailed approach would then differ depending on the situation in each institution.

The team wishes to make the following comments on its understanding and quality assessment of the project:

- The conduct of the original case studies was hampered not only by a prescribed framework, but even more by weak continued dialogue as the field work progressed.
- It may not have been ideal to come up with a too detailed and rigid framework from the start as there could be a risk that flaws at that stage would affect all the studies.
- However, the country reports that the team reviewed, showed evidence of a fairly ambitious work in the countries. It is true that they were uneven, but they did also reveal interesting issues that, if analysed further, could yield material that would be good case study material.
- As of now, the quality and depth of the edited versions are not really such that they correspond to the ambitions indicated in the project document and it is uncertain if the main objective of developing a group of 100 instructors that are well equipped to teach marketing of agroforestry tree products will be met unless additional follow-up activities are implemented.

There are several reasons for the relatively weak quality of the outcome:

- The project design may not have catered for sufficient backstopping.
- The limited backstopping capacity was further aggravated by the board's decision to reallocate a substantial resource for national consultants into team honoraria for the country teams. It is noted, though, that this decision was communicated with Sida and it was made with the anticipation that the country teams would take on a more comprehensive responsibility. In a scenario without this decision, with country teams expected to work without any financial incentives, it is quite possible that the outcome would have been really meagre. Therefore, this should, in the view of the review team, mainly be regarded as an issue originating in the project design. The complexity of guiding teams and securing quality outcome has yielded learning opportunities.
- The composition of the team, were in some cases, not strong enough on all subject matters and especially so on economics and social factors including gender issues.
- The situation was also aggravated by the fact that the SEANAFE facilitation unit underwent staff changes.

The team wishes to express appreciation that the ICRAF TA acted and introduced remedial action by bringing on board editorial capacity and also by arranging an extra meeting for the country coordinators. Without that, the project would have faced risk of collapse. According to the project plan, this project is to be completed by the end of 2007. The question at hand now, is whether to leave the outcome as it is and regard this as a learning opportunity and have a strong quality focus on the project under objective 3 or if additional inputs should be availed to the marketing project to enhance its qualitative outputs. This requires serious consideration. In case further inputs would be favoured, the time horizon for the project completion would need to be extended.

An example from Malaysia shows how a continued follow-up of such research can be organised. The review team wishes, however, also to recognise the difficulty in streamlining five teams comprising some 20 individuals in five countries. In fact, a degree of diversity in output may enrich the process provided that the quality is good enough.

1. There is a need to have a guideline on the preparation of the proposal and should include covering page and abstract, research problem, research objectives, research methods, expected outputs and dissemination, institution and personnel, timetable or work plan, estimated budget (in local currency, with providing the rate of exchange to U.S. dollars at the time the proposal is submitted). Additional information may be attached as an annex. The proposal is submitted through e-mail to the agency for first screening or reviewing.
2. The proposal is evaluated by a technical advisor hired by the agency concerned to comment on the draft proposal. This will allow some clarification on the problems and issues before the proposal can be approved and presented at the workshop. Once the proposal is approved there will be a call for oral presentation.
3. Individual consultation between the researcher and the technical advisor will be made prior the presentation for further clarification and comments. The proposal is then presented to obtain feedback and comments from other experts and participants in the workshop.
4. Post project proposal presentation is conducted to finalize and update the proposal based on comments and suggestions from participants and technical advisor.
5. Final project proposal is approved with the estimated budget and timetable.
6. The project is conducted according to the schedule with interaction between the researcher and technical advisor. A project progress reports is also prepared and presented at a workshop. The same process commences as in the first stage of proposal presentation, i.e. individual consultation, presentation of progress report and individual consultation.

8. At the end a final project report is to be submitted to agency and the same process also applies as in the case of proposal and progress report presentation. The final report by researcher will be edited by a professional editor hired for this purpose to finalize the report in terms of technical and language and in accordance with the format. The approved report is published and circulated. An electronic version of the report is also published on the web site for wider audience. The researcher is encouraged to publish the findings in the international refereed journal and some financial incentive is given if the paper is published.

Objective 3: The creation of a core group of educators (landscape agroforestry)

The second thematic project focuses on “Landscape Agroforestry”. A first regional training cum planning workshop conducted in March 2007 could be regarded as the starting event for the project. The workshop was attended by 18 participants out of which only two were female. The participants in that event constitute the country teams carrying out the field studies, which started in April 2007 and are to be completed by November 2007. The initial workshop was facilitated by resource persons from ICRAF.

The topics are all studies on land use dynamics, one way or another, in selected watersheds or sub-watersheds in the five countries. As the outcome of the studies is not yet available there is not much for the review team to comment on, but based on interactions with members of some country teams some comments will be made on the perception of the task. The review team found that there are quite a few different interpretations of the concept “Landscape agroforestry”. It is clear to all that the idea is to look at agroforestry in the landscape dimension, which is different from the focus on plots or farms which have been common in many educational and research institutions in the past. A view shared by some is that this concept is more “bio-technical” than related subjects social or community forestry. The delineation towards watershed management is not clear, but mostly watershed management is perceived as a concept used for watersheds still dominated by forests, or where forests play an important role for water conservation. It can certainly be argued that the exact definitions are not important as long as something useful is learnt. This view is conveniently acceptable from the researchers’ horizon, but less convenient from a lecturers’ or a students’ perspective. The latter need to avoid excessive duplications in teaching and studying and therefore this issue will definitely deserve attention in the later stages of this project. Training materials and curriculum modules should preferably take into account how the topic landscape agroforestry will fit into the overall programmes offered. This is a parallel dilemma to what was pointed out in the comments on the marketing project. Ideally, an institution-specific activity would help address this issue.

Based on the interactions the team has had with a large number of lecturers on the definition issue and based on observations on what appears to be the focus, the team has considered whether a modified name of the project would help bring clarity: “Agroforestry Landscape Analyses” or possibly “Landscape Agroforestry Analyses”? The team also notes a risk that the focus in this project will end up being too bio-physical, leaving socio-economic aspects without due attention. Announcing a revised project name with inclusion of the word “Participatory” may help giving prominence to this: “Participatory Agroforestry Landscape Analyses”?

This project as a whole is to be completed during 2008. It is expected to be followed up in 2009 by a round table dialogue with selected deans of faculties of forestry and agriculture to mainstream the use of the case study materials and curriculum modules in SEANAFE member institutions. A major challenge is to avoid repeating some of the observed weaknesses of the marketing project. The SEANAFE Board and ICRAF has to carefully analyse what kind of resources, human and financial, that are required to ensure delivery of a high-quality output by the end of 2008. This project must become the show piece that demonstrates the workability of the project implementation approach adopted during SEANAFE Phase II.

A final remark is that this project, if successfully implemented, will play a very important role in broadening the view on agroforestry from the old narrow “alley-cropping perception” to a truly multidimensional and integrated view on trees, crops, livestock and not least people in the landscape (*A note from the member of the review team who has been involved in reviews in 2001 and 2004 is that such a shift can already be noted over this period of time. There is now a generally a deeper and more holistic understanding of what agroforestry all about—without necessarily debating exact definitions!*).

Objective 4: The development of additional funding

National networks

In 2005 both the Thai and the Philippine networks secured non-SEANAFE funding for agroforestry seminar/congress. The Philippine and Indonesian networks decided on membership fees, but the Indonesian network failed up to now to implement that decision. In 2006 the situation was similar. By 2007 also the Thai Network had successfully introduced membership fees. The Thai network secretariat (Dr. Chongrat) prepared a research proposal which was submitted to a Thai research council early 2007, but so far there was no response.

SEANAFE budget allocations were made as a response to requests from Laos (2007) and the Philippines (2006) for resource mobilisation activities. Both networks conducted resource mobilisation workshops resulting in five proposals for Laos and four for the Philippines.

Although modest achievements, the review team notes the progress made.

Regional level

Looking back, contacts have been nurtured with a number of donors and other collaborators with a potential to avail funding or to facilitate further search for funds. A concept note on “Accelerating forest policy implementation by strengthening educational capacity in SE Asia” was drafted and shared with FAO already in 2005, but so far no significant progress has been made. This was one of the anticipated paths forward towards securing funding for the project on forest policy. Some contacts were also taken with the Norwegian Embassy in Bangkok who had a potential to avail funding for activities in the SE Asia region. RECOFTC was more successful with these contacts than SEANAFE.

Some supplementary funding has, however, been secured for the International Agroforestry Conference scheduled for October 2007 (6,000 US \$ from FAO-RAP and 6,000 Euro from the German Research Foundation). These additional funds will be used to sponsor paper and poster presenters.

The review team notes that SEANAFE at the regional level still fully depends on Sida which is a matter of concern for the future sustainability of the regional network.

Objective 5: The expansion of SEANAFE

Contacts with other countries in SE Asia

There have been contacts with several additional countries in the region and invitations have been extended to representatives from China, Cambodia and Malaysia to attend SEANAFE meetings. In 2005, the then SEANAFE Chairman visited Malaysia and discussed prospects for closer linkages between SEANAFE and Malaysian institutions. In 2006 the Board decided to create two task forces among them, one for China and one for Malaysia. A concept paper for the projected China collaboration was revived and discussed during the 13th Board meeting in February 2007.

Invitations were again extended to representatives from these countries to attend the 14th Board meeting in August 2007. This time, positive responses were received from University Putra Malaysia as well as from Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia. Representatives from Malaysia and Cambodia attended the meeting.

The expansion to include institutions from China has not made any significant progress. SEANAFE has drawn the right conclusions that just sending email or letters to Chinese representatives does not work as there is quite a protocol on the Chinese side with regard to international travel. The proposal for a round-table discussion with representatives from selected institutions in south-west China was so far not effectively communicated to the Chinese side.

The review team notes that the nature of the on-going activities is such that new members at this stage may find it somewhat difficult to get integrated in the network activities in a meaningful way. This said, the implication is not necessarily to close the door. Interesting Universities should be welcomed but it may be doubtful if it at this point in time is meaningful to pursue this matter proactively from the SEANAFE side.

Contacts with RECOFTC

In May 2005, a first meeting to pursue this objective was held between the SEANAFE TA and RECOFTC Director and its Capacity Building Programme. This meeting was followed by subsequent meetings and a significant step towards hands on cooperation was taken when RECOFTC co-organised SEANAFE's marketing training and planning workshop in November 2005. The contacts continued during 2006 with RECOFTC attendance to the SEANAFE 12th Board Meeting in August 2006. Prior to that SEANAFE had prepared a paper on collaborative options and after the meeting a draft paper was prepared by RECOFTC attempting to further elaborate how the two organisations could cooperate. Both these papers contain useful ideas and are attached as appendix 9 and 10 for easy reference.

Late 2005 and early 2006 RECOFTC also commissioned a "scoping exercise" regarding education for community based natural resource management in the region. The consultant met the SEANAFE TA, the SEANAFE Chairman and attended a NAFEC meeting in Vietnam. SEANAFE featured frequently and positively in the report. In conjunction with the study, a concept paper was prepared for IDRC with regard to initiation of a network to promote education on community based natural resources.

RECOFTC's strategic plan includes ambitions to work more proactively to support formal education as a complement to its hitherto main focus on training. Its capacity has, however, not yet sufficed to embark on this area forcefully and currently it is mainly in Laos where RECOFTC works actively with the formal education. This relatively low level of activity is in line with recommendations made by a RECOFTC review mission which noted that the current RECOFTC strategy was highly ambitious.

During the first week of September 2007, coinciding with the review mission's visit to Thailand, RECOFTC organised a major conference on "Poverty Reduction and Forests: Tenure, Market and Policy Reforms" with over 300 delegates from 46 countries and with support from 15 different organisations. One of the sub-sessions focused on research and education institutes. The conference was organised in a highly professional way and received significant attention. The review mission notes that in the SEANAFE project document, under objective 6, it was indicated that the upcoming SEANAFE conference on natural resource management education was envisaged to be a joint activity with other organisations, RECOFTC included.

It seems that the collaboration that was established during 2005–06 has weakened during 2007 and as a result some options for "economy of scale" have been lost. This refers mainly to the two international conferences being organised in Thailand this year.

Contacts with other organisations

The contacts with SEARCA were strengthened during 2006 and contacts with the International Partnership on Forestry Education (IPFE) and with FAO were maintained during 2006. The joint venture with FAO on co-production of the Newsletter APAN News is a welcome development. Contacts with IUCN or CIFOR do not feature prominently in the progress reports.

Objective 6: The development and sharing of international public goods

The Regional Conference

The regional conference (“International Agroforestry Education Conference on Integrating Conservation in the Upland Agriculture in Southeast Asia”) is planned for late October in Chiang Mai. Chiang Mai University has created six working committees, each with specific tasks. Additional funding has been secured from the German Research Foundation and from FAO. A partnership with the World Association of Soil and Water Conservation (WASWC) is being explored for the dissemination of conference materials.

Programme details are still being worked upon and some of the speakers are yet to confirm their availability. A total of about 90 participants is projected but so far very few have paid the registration fee. The national networks have been asked to sponsor or to ensure participation of at least five paying participants from each country except for Thailand which has a target to ensure participation of at least 40 delegates. ThaiNAFE found that a rather challenging task.

Over 50 papers have been received. They have been reviewed and 16 papers and 8 poster presentations have been accepted for sponsorship. Three sessions are planned:

- Striking a balance between food security and environmental conservation in SEA upland agriculture
- Making more sense of past and present agroforestry and natural resource management programmes and policies for upland development in Southeast Asia
- Redefining the niche of tertiary learning institutions in agroforestry and natural resources education for upland agriculture development in SE Asia.

The review team notes that it is only one of the three sessions that is directly dealing with education, however, the organizers regard the first two as essential for setting the stage for the discussion under session 3.

Some of the member institutions visited were still expecting an invitation to the conference (However, invitations will not be issued as the conference is designed to be an open call for paper and poster presentations. Interest to participate should be signified to the organisers on personal basis).

Postgraduate research projects on NRM education

Allocations were made to one thesis grant per country (US \$ 2,900 each) and one grant to be awarded in regional competition (US \$ 3,500), i.e. a total of six grantees. Five of these were so far awarded and the respective research projects have either been completed or are on-going. It is only the Philippine network that had not awarded any grant (The TA reported at the end of the review mission that the grant was awarded by mid-September 2007). There, preference would be given to either Ph. D. or B.Sc. level (similar opinions have earlier been expressed in other countries). Two of the grantees are ladies and three are men. Two research topics relate to marketing, two to landscape agroforestry while one deals with CO₂ sequestration.

The TA has noted that there is a high level of interest for such grants and it would have been nice if such activity would continue on a yearly basis. This opinion was reconfirmed by several faculty members that the review team interacted with. The TA has further noted that the budgets prepared by the grantees exceeded the allocated amounts but were adjusted. The TA has also noted that guidelines to implement this activity ought to be more defined.

The review team asked many faculty members if the amount per grantee was satisfactory and the immediate response was that it was adequate. However, further discussions in several countries indicated that the grants are actually quite generous, and a lower amount (about US \$ 1,000–1,500 or even

lower) would suffice and would give a larger number of students either sufficient funding or at least co-funding.

The impact study

This element was not included in the original project document but was added during 2005. In fact, the addition included also an expected development of a *forestry education study* jointly by ANAFE and SEANAFE during 2006 for submission to a new donor. Progress on the latter development has not been reported, but the impact study was carried out during 2006 and a draft report exists. The review team had opportunity to study the draft and notes that it provides significant evidence on a process of change towards more integrated approaches in education which are at least partly attributed to SEANAFE activities. The report will, when finalised, be a useful tool for SEANAFE to demonstrate its success and it is essential that it becomes available for that purpose soon to help SEANAFE with the much needed fund-raising activities.

4. Conclusions

Overall assessment

Relevance of SEANAFE's project phase 2 objectives to the current educational and development needs of the Southeast Asian region

The SEANAFE's project phase 2 objectives are very relevant to the current educational and development needs of the Southeast Asian Region. In addition to the sub-projects, the other activities like training, workshops, thesis grants, curriculum development, producing teaching materials are good and deserve to be continued. Through all these activities, teachers and researchers as well as graduates in the region attain greater knowledge and skills with regard to agroforestry. The future challenge is how to sustain and impart the knowledge and skills gained through this network in agroforestry education.

This kind of activities is still needed in view of the fact that the governments in the SEA region have put more effort in agriculture, forestry, environment and natural resource-based industries. Efforts have also been enhanced to combat deforestation and to guarantee the sustainable management and production of agriculture and forest land. In addition, the changing scenario at the global level towards greater emphasis on environment provides new opportunities in providing knowledgeable and skilled teachers, researchers and graduates in this field. The majority of the universities in the region have realized the importance of agroforestry, and the development of curriculum has been adopted for implementation in many institutions. The demand for trained agroforesters in the SEA region has the potential to be quite high.

Effectiveness and efficiency in carrying out its planned activities within the given budget allocation

Efficiency was lowered initially due to the known fact that from the time funding becomes available there is always an "incubation period" until the national networks and other actors gain momentum. Thus, in spite of the relatively costly regional-level entity being in place, less than planned was implemented during 2005. From the end of 2005 momentum improved, but then the staff changes and the transfer of the Facilitation Unit temporarily reduced the capacity of the Facilitation Unit. In spite of that, reasonable efficiency and speed was maintained and even accelerated during 2007. This was, however, achieved on the expense of effectiveness as the quality is now a concern in the marketing project. This is evidenced by discontent with the outcome in some of the countries.

The challenge ahead is to increase the quality of outcome while retaining momentum in terms of meeting set physical targets.

Effectiveness and impacts of project/activity outputs of SEANAFE and its country networks to their stakeholders

The overriding issues here relate to two factors. The first factor is the introduction of a thematic approach with focus on the sub-projects, which involves relatively few institutions more actively. There is now little that involves the larger number of members as compared to earlier when bore training events, workshops etc. were conducted. Typically, now 5–6 members are most actively involved in each country, i.e. some 30 out of 80 members. This is not to say that the other 50 members are not involved at all. More members have been participating in the national trainings of the marketing project, but activity for the majority of members are now less frequent than in the past. This could be seen as a deliberate step to reduce donor importance during SEANAFE Phase 2.

The other factor is unevenness in performance among the national networks with the Indonesian network standing out as the poorest performer.

Quality and extent of interactions and involvements of officials and individual members of SEANAFE's country networks and member institutions in its activities

This varies a lot between the countries with four out of five countries appearing as fairly good, but the comments in the previous section apply here too.

An issue is the necessity to often bypass the country networks administratively as in most countries the network itself is not a registered legal entity, PAFERN excluded. Projects, constituting currently the bulk of activity, as well as thesis grants, thus by necessity become a matter between the FA and the concerned member institution or person. This may have its advantages in terms of transparency and to avoid having too many stations between the donor in one end and the implemented action in the other end. However, this arrangement reduces the real influence of the NAFEC. There is obviously a joint responsibility between ICRAF and the respective NAFEC to monitor the activity and not least quality of outcome, but the ultimate responsibility does, indeed, rest with ICRAF being the contract partner. It appears that this view of the review team contradicts the contractual arrangements between ICRAF and the implementing member institution. It was reported to the review team that the contracts indicate the national coordinators as being responsible in carrying out the project activities.

These matters were discussed during the 13th Board meeting but, in the view of the review team, it may be useful to discuss this matter in the SEANAFE Board.

Performance of ICRAF, the Facilitation Unit, SEANAFE Board, country network coordinators and Sida

These issues have, by and large, been covered in the previous chapter.

ICRAF managed to recruit a successor to the TA in a timely manner allowing for a reasonable time for handing over. The fact that the Facilitation Unit within a few years moved from Bogor to Chiang Mai and then back again is unfortunate as it resulted in disruptions also with regard to support staff, but there are reasons why so happened. An alternative scenario of not moving may not have resulted in continuity of staff anyway. ICRAF's ability to provide technical backstopping is a challenge as ICRAF SE Asia is practically fully project funded. It could be expected, though, that the 22% overheads charged, corresponding to US \$ 312,000 for the whole project period, would include an allocation for technical backstopping. Some technical backstopping has also been provided but more will be required especially in the context of the Landscape Agroforestry Project. Some administrative issues are covered under the next heading.

The phases and challenges that the *Facilitation Unit* has undergone have been elaborated earlier. The difficulties have been quite obvious but the attempts made by the TA to retain momentum are

recognised and appreciated. The project plan stipulated accomplishments at certain times and it was indeed difficult to maintain both speed and quality in the given circumstances.

The *SEANAFE Board* has met regularly and with fair attendance. The Chairman wished increased activity among board members between the meetings and also expressed concern as to what will happen when a new generation of Board members will take over. So far, there was a degree of continuity with some board members having followed the developments ever since SEANAFE was formed.

The review team has already commented on the *country network coordinators*. Individual differences stand out, and as noted above, for some of the activities, where ICRAF has direct contracts with other Universities, the *de facto* role of the country coordinators is more advisory than supervisory. The main responsibility for follow up remains with ICRAF being the contract partner.

Sida has, given its limited staff time for follow up of different activities, performed well. No negative comments were noted. The disbursements to ICRAF have, however, not followed the schedule agreed in the contract but this is attributed to late financial reporting and an incomplete audit certificate from ICRAF. This is further commented on below.

Effectiveness and efficiency of systems and procedures (administrative, financial and communication)

Administrative and financial at SEANAFE level

Disbursements from ICRAF to the national partners are based on requests from partners followed by contracts between the parties. The signatories are usually the dean of the faculty responsible for the event (could be the country network host institution, but often not so) on the one side and, on the other side, the ICRAF coordinator for SE Asia for contracts over US \$ 5,000 or the TA for contracts US \$ 5,000 and below. From a perspective of Swedish standards, one would expect a system where at least two staff members have to sign every contract on behalf of ICRAF. There is a template for the contracts. ICRAF normally releases 90% of the total contract budget within a week after contract signing. For complex tasks, like the field studies under the sub-projects, a slower disbursement schedule may be preferred giving ICRAF more power towards the end to ensure that the quality of output is as expected.

The review team also noted that in some instances financial responsibility was contracted out for events where ICRAF staff participated (e.g. 14th Board Meeting). It appears to the team that, in such instances, a better option is that the ICRAF staff handles the matters directly. This is likely to be cheaper and the risk for poor financial management, late reporting etc. would be reduced. It appears to the team that the 14th Board meeting was a fairly costly event. SEANAFE Facilitation Unit does expect some funds to be reimbursed from the implementing body.

It is the understanding of the review team that the so disbursed funds are treated as advance payments in the ICRAF accounts until such time that a financial return is received from the implementing body. The ICRAF finance unit has reported an outstanding advance of US \$ 202,759 as per 30.6 2007. Presumably, this is such advances to collaborators. However, it seems, according to the compilation on contracts that were received and reviewed by the review team, that many of the contracts awarded are yet to be administratively finalised with financial returns and corresponding action in the ICRAF accounts making these items appear as costs rather than advances. It seems to the review team that these issues need to be looked into. If advances are allowed to grow to big and if they are kept pending for too long, one result is that the financial reports from a practical point of view will not give the clear indication on expenditure in relation to the different budget headings (the amounts are theoretically advances, but it is hard to envisage that they should be repaid, thus, in reality the funds have been committed and used). Another factor and danger is that it will end up being very demanding to ever get the proper returns.

Administrative and financial at ICRAF/Sida level

The review team noted that the agreed disbursement schedule could not be followed. So far, only the initial disbursement of 2,500,000 SEK was effected.

It is the understanding of the review team that the following factors contributed to this phenomenon:

- There was under spending in the initial stages of the project. The first amount was not fully utilised until during the second half of 2006.
- The financial report from ICRAF to Sida as per 31.12.2006 was severely delayed by ICRAF and reaching Sida only in August 2007. It is supposed to be presented to Sida latest 90 days after the end of the financial year.
- An audit certificate was incomplete.
- In the absence of a complete audit certificate no disbursement could be made. Otherwise, a second disbursement would have been expected earlier during 2007. It is only by September–October 2007 that a second disbursement is being processed.

Delayed reports coupled with considerable amounts paid as advances hamper Sida's ability to use the financial information as a tool for follow up. Further, it puts unnecessary strain on ICRAF's cash flow as disbursements will be delayed.

Communication

By and large, the internal communication seems to function well within SEANAFE and between SEANAFE and the national networks. Communication within the national networks varies significantly between the countries. However, more copies of the APAN News ought to be distributed to the member institution. The bulk of the cost for production is the compilation of the contents, the layout and the start of the printing press. Once that is achieved, additional copies are not very costly.

Sustainability, opportunities and challenges for future funding of SEANAFE and the national networks and how they are being exploited or attended to by the networks

As have been pointed out by earlier review and evaluation missions, sustainability can be discussed at different levels:

- Sustainable impact at institutional level
- Sustainability in networking at country level
- Sustainability in networking at the regional/international level.

The impact study explores the impact at institutional level. It is clear that there is a process of change in education related to agroforestry and more widely to natural resources management. SEANAFE has played and plays a role in that process, and it is sustainable. It would be hard to imagine the institutions reverting back to the narrow bio-physical approaches that were a total monopoly on the scene in the past. It is obvious though, that SEANAFE is one among several players and forces. The most significant achievements may have been reached in countries where there were synergies with strong bilaterally supported projects striving in the same direction, e.g. in Vietnam.

At the national level, there are promising developments especially in the Philippines and in Thailand but also in Laos and Vietnam; less so in Indonesia. However, in all countries there is need to be more pro-active, and the resources available in the SEANAFE budget for fundraising activities, US \$ 18,000 for the whole period has only been utilized by two countries (total requested about US \$ 6,000 including support to website, brochure etc. for Laos and US \$ 2,000 for the Philippines). It is noted that the Thai network did prepare a proposal for funding from national sources but did not request support to

the process). A realistic outlook is that, when donor support ceases, some networks are likely to continue existing relying on domestic sources but with a rather low level of activity.

SEANAFE at regional/international level is in the most precarious situation of the three levels discussed. Without the donor input, the Facilitation Unit will rather instantly disappear and without external resources it is hard to see how the national networks will generate enough resources to sustain the international level. One option is to look at this scenario as an acceptable one, i.e. SEANAFE at the regional level is a useful tool as long as some organisation is willing to support it and when the time without donor support comes the sustainable results are found at the national and institutional level while the tool has played its role and may cease to exist. However, the review mission is of the opinion that SEANAFE could play a role yet for quite a long time. Therefore, SEANAFE needs to be very proactive now in seeking additional donor funds to sustain the operation. Some contacts that were made earlier have not yielded results, possibly for weak follow up. The coming 12 months will be critical. The Facilitation Unit will have to set aside staff time and travel resources to assist the Board in actively seeking contact with donors. Some proposal has to exist and possibly the programme for institutional development after refinement could serve this purpose. A concept note on the "Policy project" also exists and could be used.

It would be essential to seek synergies with RECOFTC. Resource abundance is not such that duplication of effort can be afforded. The review mission would suggest that all alternatives should be open for discussion with RECOFTC, including a possibility that RECOFTC could use its contacts with the donor community to find a financial base for SEANAFE from 2009 onwards. There could be other organisations too that could be approached.

Intellectual property rights

The review mission noted that a discussion on intellectual property rights emerged within the subproject on marketing. It should be clarified that Sida's aspirations are not to own copyright to the materials produced (Sida has no use for that and no system to follow it up) but is only requesting a disclaimer with regard to any responsibility for the contents and acknowledgement of Sida as the donor.

The relation between ICRAF and the country actors is a more intricate one. There could be academic interest in owning the outputs at both these levels, provided that it is of good quality. ICRAF, as an international research body, has elaborate procedures aimed at ensuring that outputs published meet the required standards. Production of working papers is less complicated than of more official publications. The national level, down to the individual level, will have their interest in publishing the output.

The potential competition between ICRAF and the national level will best be handled if there is a clear understanding from the start of each activity on what output is expected and who is to be the owner/publisher of such output. A reasonable approach may be to base ownership rights on where most of the work was accomplished. Purely national studies would, in that case, be the property of the national level, while ICRAF/SEANAFE must have the right to use such materials for further development of materials relevant for the international level.

Is SEANAFE on track with respect to achieving its objectives by the end of Phase 2?

The review team found that after a somewhat slow start momentum has been gained.

The networks are all functioning reasonably well with the exception of the Indonesian one. The two sub-projects are being implemented and are improving in terms of following the time table. Additional sub-projects of a similar nature were expected to be implemented in collaboration with other donor agencies or other financiers. Little was so far achieved in that respect.

International public goods are being delivered through the activities under objective 6.

There is some progress on broadening of the national networks' financial base, but less so at the SEANAFE level. However, financial sustainability remains a major challenge at all levels.

So far, little has also been achieved with regard to a possible expansion of the network to other countries as well as on the development of a new partnership with RECOFTC. At this time, the relevance on working hard on the geographical expansion could be questioned, while collaboration with RECOFTC would have a potential to strengthen the sustainability of SEANAFE, the national networks and RECOFTC, and thus remains a priority.

Need for focus

The review team notes that the range of activity that was planned at the onset of the project proved to be a tall order for the organisation. There is now a need to focus on:

- Quality of the marketing and landscape agroforestry projects. To achieve that, there may be need to strengthen the facilitation unit. This can be achieved either by recruiting a fellow on a similar arrangement as Dr. Damrong in the past, or by hiring consultancy services, or through a combination of these two activities.
- Encouraging national networks fund raising.
- Being pro-active in relation to RECOFTC and donors. Support from ICRAF SEAsia and SEANAFE would be required as the Board on its own will not have the adequate capacity for this.
- Activities that makes the national networks more relevant for a larger groups of members. This could include additional thesis grants, but at a lower level of funding per grant (about 1,000 US \$).
- Completion of the impact study for it to be used as a tool for attracting interest from donors/ financiers. The usefulness of the final output would be maximised if the design is “popular” making it attractive reading for a wider target group. This calls for a short and illustrated version without too much elaboration of the methodology. The full research report need to be completed too, but can be presented in a way more suited for scientists than for a wider audience.

A long list of items suggested to be the focus will only make operational sense if accompanied by a list of areas suggested to be less emphasised:

- Expansion to other countries; a door remains open, but this may not be the right time to work pro-actively on this.
- Institutional changes unless they directly serve a clear fund-raising objective.
- Work on the fund-raising strategy—more direct action is now called for. The strategy itself does not secure the funds. It is the implementation that matters.
- The “3rd and 4th sub-projects” unless they can serve a direct fund-raising purpose and can be developed with support from other sources.

Need for a budget revision

The observations made by the review team indicate that there is now a need to make a comprehensive budget revision for the remaining project period. Several factors have made the budget less realistic. Some of these are:

- The change of TA from internationally to regionally recruited resulting in a significantly lower monthly cost.
- The absence, so far, of supplementary funding making it necessary to budget for the TA to be financed by Sida for the whole project period.
- The need to enhance quality. Reallocation called for to create better support/supervision capacity of projects and to continue the marketing project into 2008 with support to member institutions and kit to trainees.
- The need to focus.
- The opportunity to analyse the impact of the currency fluctuations (there could be a possibility to negotiate with Sida as a result of the weakening of the US \$. The US \$ budget was developed based on rate of exchange 1 US \$=7.15 SEK. Currently the rate is around 6.50. If Sida would agree, this could generate a budget increase in US \$ terms of about 150,000 US \$. Obviously, Sida would agree only if a revised budget demonstrates the need. The analysis in this respect should focus on the FA capacity and on the potential to add activity that may involve more member institutions)

A common expectation in projects running behind schedule is that the donor would agree to a no-cost extension by the end of the project period. The review team would recommend a restrictive approach in that respect. The budget revision will yield the real basis for an assessment of the relevance of a no-cost extension, but generally, the review team would recommend a restrictive position in that regard. The reason is, that the longer duration of the project, the greater share of the total budget will be consumed by the expensive “networking machinery” and especially by the Facilitation Unit. Correspondingly, the share of the resource that is utilised for actual activities will be reduced with extended project duration.

5. Lessons Learned

The review team did not find a lot of experience from this particular period of SEANAFE that generates general learning of a more “universal” character. There is rather a need to wait and see and draw the more universal conclusions towards the end of the current phase. This two-year period was characterised by

- SEANAFE embarking on a new type of activity (sub-projects under objectives 2 and 3) for which there was no prior experience. Especially the implementation of the sub-project on marketing has yielded learning for SEANAFE and the national networks on how to implement such projects. These experiences are valuable for SEANAFE but of more limited “universal” value.
- The substitution of all staff of the Facilitation Unit in conjunction with the shift from Chiang Mai and back to Bogor. This obviously has affected the capacity of the Facilitation Unit during a crucial time. This is, however, also nothing unique. A project with few key positions being very instrumental in implementation is vulnerable at times of staff change.

The impact study provides interesting information on trends in natural-resources education and on the role networking can play, but it will be more appropriate comment further at the time the report is finalised.

6. Recommendations

Based on its findings the review team makes the following recommendations:

Revised and sharpened focus; technical issues

- Make a complete budget revision to develop a budget for the remaining period that is relevant. Main priorities are to (i) strengthen technical capacity by ensuring budget allocation for the TA for the whole period, (ii) create additional resources for inputs in the sub-projects to ensure good-quality outcome, (iii) create budget allocation for additional activities for the national networks with a potential to attract interest and involvement from more members. Such budget revision should be made by or with strong involvement of the Board.
- The budget revision would have to consider a request to Sida for a no-cost extension. Sida, ICRAF and the Board should, however, look at this critically. The aim should be to have a structure in place that generates significant activity among members. Long project duration may counteract this ambition, as a relatively large share of the funds will be consumed by the structure itself.
- The budget revision should also analyse the impact of currency rates exchanges and consult Sida on how best this can be handled with the intention to maximise the outputs of the project.
- De-emphasise (eliminate budget allocation) for expansion to new countries, the 3rd and 4th sub-projects unless another financier can be attracted, institutional changes unless they serve directly a fund-raising purpose.
- Broaden the gender focus towards a “human diversity approach” taking into account also the need for giving young lecturers better chances to become involved. This may reinforce the interest in gender balance, which is otherwise hard to achieve in some countries, as the younger group of lecturers mostly has a better gender balance than the older and most senior group.
- Consider follow-up activity to the marketing sub-project, engaging expertise other than the team that was engaged (it must be assumed that they accomplished as much as they could). This could be for individual consultations with member institutions on curricula, preparation of a training kit for the trainees (the group of about 100 in the region) and for the member institutions, and possibly for a follow-up activity on the field research that was carried out (the exact need differs between countries, e.g. for Thailand there would be a clear potential to take the analysis a step further, while in other countries the need may be more on editing and layout. This is not mandatory: it should only be embarked upon if there is an interest in the respective countries).
- Change name on the Landscape Agroforestry sub-project to “Participatory Landscape Agroforestry Analyses” or something similar that sheds more direct light on what the project deals with. The word participatory serves as a reminder that the socio-economic factors should feature in this project including gender, food security, poverty, etc. This is an aspect that deserves an immediate check with the teams currently engaged.
- Introduce a better follow-up and interaction with the country teams. It is a jeopardy to wait until the end. If, by then, the outcome is not satisfactory it is very late to take remedial action.
- Allocate funds for additional thesis grants but at a lower funding level (1,000 US \$ for M. Sc.) and allow the country networks to have a say on whether it should be M.Sc. or B.Sc. depending on national relevance.

- Complete the Impact Study.
- Continue the cooperation with FAO on APAN News but invest in distribution of more copies. This refers to all printed outputs; ensure that enough copies are printed for good access by staff of member institutions.
- Discuss intellectual property rights and publishing arrangements for outputs at an early stage to avoid tension towards the end.

Fundraising and linkages for sustainability

- Revitalise the contacts with RECOFTC based on the earlier discussions. A truly joint venture on education could pave the way towards sustainability/continued funding/relevance of the networks.
- Embark on pro-active contacts with donors and other financiers, preferably jointly with RECOFTC and with support from ICRAF SE Asia office, aimed at finding an additional funding base. The next 12 months may be decisive. This applies to regional as well as national levels.

Administrative and Financial Systems

- ICRAF is recommended to review the arrangements with contract signatories such that two signatures on behalf of ICRAF will be required also for smaller contracts.
- ICRAF is also recommended to release funds more gradually and with a bigger share by the completion of the work to ensure that ICRAF retains a certain power to ensure that the delivered output is of acceptable standard.
- ICRAF is recommended to supply Sida with financial (and progress) reports timely.
- ICRAF is recommended to look into the amount featuring as advance payments, about US \$ 203,000 and to take appropriate action for it to be reduced. This is linked to the necessity to get narrative and financial reports from partners soon after completion of contracts.
- ICRAF is recommended to handle finances directly by ICRAF staff for events where ICRAF staff participates. This increases efficiency and reduces the struggle to get financial reports, and possibly refund of excessive disbursements (The 14th Board Meeting refers).
- Ensure that there is full recognition and agreement with regard to the power relations between SEANAFE and the national networks, i.e. there is a supervisory mandate of SEANAFE only as far as the business relation on contracts is concerned. In other words, SEANAFE/ICRAF has the obvious task of following up implementation of agreements but apart from that diversification of the national network is acceptable and should be encouraged to maximise their relevance for the members.
- The Board and ICRAF are recommended to revisit the issue of who is responsible for implementation of activities at the country level (The review team is of the opinion that the prime responsibility must follow the financial flow, i.e. it rests with ICRAF and the implementing body and cannot be contracted to the national coordinators.)

The Indonesian network

- The Indonesian network requires improved performance to qualify for continued support. The SEANAFE Board is recommended to consider the following two main options: (i) Discontinue support to INAFE and assess possibilities to work with the social forestry centre of Universitas

Mulawarman instead, or (ii) Reconstitute INAFE with its NAFEC based on an agreed charter and with an advisory body that consists of deans of member institutions from where an executive committee may be elected. Contact persons should be formalised through the deans and could be the deans or representatives nominated by them. The nominated representatives should have an obligation to report back to the institution. Introduction of membership fees is a challenge but should be implemented.

- Within SEANAFE, Indonesia may be used as test case on how modern technology can be used as a tool for networking. Several universities have developed ICT networking through LAN and Internet. These developments open new avenues. In Indonesia, the Directorate General of Higher Education of the Ministry of National Education has launched the INHERENT programme since a couple of years, aimed at developing the inter universities' networking using ICT to widen accessibility to higher education. An Indonesian network is urged to take this opportunity to develop agroforestry education open to academic society but also to parties related to agroforestry research and implementation. Further, an Indonesian network could take a lead on teaching materials and curriculum module development towards "borderless education" or "global education", where courses or lectures conducted by any university is acknowledged by any other university, i.e. a credit transfer system is developed. Research programmes can thus also be integrated with other related institutions.
- SEANAFE Board/ICRAF are recommended to treat any request from an Indonesian network targeting the above developments positively, but should only avail support to INAFE if institutional improvements are put in place as noted above.

Appendix 1. Terms of Reference

1. Background Information

In 2005, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) approved the Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFE)'s project proposal for its Phase 2 implementation. Sida and the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), as host institution of SEANAFE, signed an Agreement for this purpose with funding support amounting to SEK 12,517,000 for the period 1 May 2005 to 30 April 2009.

Phase 2 of SEANAFE Project was conceived to enable educators from more than 70 universities and colleges in Southeast Asia to share knowledge and develop learning tools that address the interface between environmental conservation and poverty alleviation. It recognizes the fact that the complex interface between these two areas must be handled in a holistic and integrated way if it is to help millions of small-scale farmers benefit from commercial markets and, at the same time, help them to manage local landscapes. Thus, the Project is guided by the overarching goal of educating Southeast Asia's next generation of educators, scientists, and political leaders, particularly those currently enrolled in forestry and agriculture universities, on the importance of these issues and build capacity so that they can enact effective policies and programs.

Since SEANAFE's country networks have been established as result of its initial phase of operation from 1999 to 2002 also under Sida funding, SEANAFE took the challenge of organising its Phase 2 set of activities around a series of well-defined regional projects for implementation from May 2005 to April 2009. These include:

- Marketing of Agroforestry Tree Products
- Landscape Agroforestry
- Forestry and Environmental Policies

Thus, the SEANAFE Project Phase 2 is billed as "Sharing Knowledge on Markets, Landscapes and Environmental Policies" with the following specific objectives:

1. The solidification of an effective regional and national networking infrastructure;
2. The development of a core group of instructors that understand and are capable of teaching the marketing of agroforestry tree products;
3. The creation of a core group of educators that understand and are able to teach the concept of landscape agroforestry;
4. The development of additional funding for regional and national projects;
5. The expansion of SEANAFE to include China, Malaysia and other Southeast Asian nations and the development of a new partnership with RECOFTC; and
6. The development and sharing of international public goods on agroforestry and NRM education and research.

The *Marketing of Agroforestry Tree Products and Landscape Agroforestry* projects are fully supported by Sida. They are expected to be implemented over an 18- to 24-month period with the following activities:

1. A regional training workshop to update at least a core group of 20 lecturers from SEANAFE member institutions on the most recent research results, tools and methods on the concerned subject matter;

2. National case studies to be carried out in five countries to enable the testing of methods and tools and to provide content for the development of teaching materials.
3. A second regional workshop will be held to compare research results and experiences and prepare regional teaching materials and curriculum modules (all materials will be modular and made available in a range of formats including on-line and conventional);
4. Regional materials and curricula will be adapted and translated in the local languages;
5. National training courses will be organized for 80 more lecturers from SEANAFE member institutions, 30% of whom shall be females, to launch newly developed learning materials and to train lecturers; and
6. Policy makers will be informed of results.

The *Marketing of Agroforestry Tree Products* Project is expected to be completed in 2007 while the *Landscape Agroforestry* Project in 2008.

On the other hand, the project on Forest and Environmental Policies is expected to be developed and commence implementation by mid 2007 using the Project seed-money, but is slated for financing by other donors. Ideally, it shall adopt the same design of the first two projects.

During the course of its current phase, SEANAFE will also:

1. Organize an International agroforestry education conference to be held in conjunction with the network's Fourth General Meeting.
2. Increase collaboration as regards its various activities with regional and international organizations such as with the Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFIC), the United Nations Food and Agriculture (FAO) and IUCN Regional Offices in Bangkok, Thailand, and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) in Bogor, Indonesia.
3. Invite China, Malaysia, Cambodia, and East Timor to join its network using their own funds and through external support
4. Support Innovative curriculum development efforts through a small grants facility to be made available to co-operators.
5. Five postgraduate research projects on natural resource management are completed.

After two years of operation, a mid-term project evaluation is now called for. Thus, this proposal.

2. Evaluation purpose

In general, this mid-term project evaluation aims to:

1. Find out if SEANAFE is on track with respect to achieving its objectives in the end of Phase 2;
2. Draw lessons to improve operation within the remaining project period; and
3. Recommend new directions, where necessary, with special attention to sustainability of results and future of the network.

The evaluation findings and recommendations will be used as a base for a mid-term review meeting at the end of October 2007. At this meeting SEANAFE will have the opportunity to discuss strategic choices for the future of SEANAFE in order to fulfil the objectives stated in the project document, but also the development of SEANAFE beyond the project period.

The evaluation findings will also be used by Sida to follow-up to what extent SEANAFE is expected to achieve its goals.

3. Stakeholder involvement

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is as stated above to find out if SEANAFE is on track with its implementation in accordance to its project document. In that sense it has a dual purpose, as a check for Sida and ICRAF-SEANAFE to monitor SEANAFE's progress and fulfilment, but also to contribute to SEANAFE's internal dialogue regarding the strategic choices for the future of SEANAFE. Hence, although this is an external evaluation it is important that the views of the SEANAFE members are taken into account in the evaluation process. SEANAFE has participated in developing the terms of reference for the mid-term evaluation.

4. Scope of Evaluation

Specifically, it shall attempt to:

1. Provide a comprehensive description of the overall status of SEANAFE Project as input for analysis;
2. Assess the relevance of the SEANAFE's Project Phase 2 objectives to the current educational and development needs of the Southeast Asian region;
3. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of SEANAFE in relation to carrying out its planned activities within the given budget allocation;
4. Assess the effectiveness and impacts of project/activity outputs of SEANAFE and its country networks to their stakeholders;
5. Assess the quality and extent of interactions and involvements of officials and individual members of SEANAFE's country networks and member institutions in its activities;
6. Assess the performance of the host institution, Facilitation Unit, SEANAFE Board, country network coordinators, including Sida as funding donor, in managing and sustaining operations of the networks
7. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of systems and procedures (e.g. administrative, financial and communication) currently followed in the operation of SEANAFE; and
8. Assess sustainability, opportunities and challenges for future funding of SEANAFE and the national networks, and how these opportunities and challenges are being exploited or attended to by the networks.

The evaluation shall cover the period May 2005 up to the time of the evaluation.

5. Methodology

The evaluation shall be carried out through (1) analysis of available project documents and other relevant documents considered necessary by the team and (2) interviews with representatives of the regional and national networks of SEANAFE and other relevant development partners.

The team may consider other methods and activities as deemed essential in implementing the mid-term evaluation. Such should be spelled out in detail in the tender documents.

The evaluation shall be carried out based on a gender perspective, i.e. analyses made and findings presented shall consider both involvement of women as well as men and the impact and consequences for women and men and their respective roles and responsibilities.

6. Workplan and schedule

The main part of the work is expected to take place in September 2007.

ICRAF-SEANAFE shall suggest a list of SEANAFE member-institutions and other organisations to be visited by the team. The team is free to modify the proposal as it considers fit, and to make any additional contacts as deemed essential.

Due to the volume of work and the many institutions and countries involved, Sida, ICRAF-SEANAFE and the team shall agree on a minimum number of institutions that will be physically visited by the evaluators. It is proposed however that the team, not necessarily all together, should visit both the ICRAF-SEANAFE office in Indonesia and at least two other SEANAFE countries aside from Indonesia. The team shall conduct a debriefing for ICRAF-SEANAFE before leaving the region.

The project document, annual project reports as well as other project information and outputs will be supplied by the project coordinator and the Sida programme officer responsible for the project.

7. Reporting

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. Format and outline of the report shall follow the guidelines in *Sida Evaluation Report – a Standardized Format* (see Annex 1). The draft report shall be submitted to Sida and ICRAF-SEANAFE electronically no later than 1st October 2007. Sida and ICRAF-SEANAFE should submit comments on the draft report no later than the 12th of October 2007. Within 1 week after receiving Sida's comments on the draft report, a final version shall be submitted to Sida and ICRAF-SEANAFE electronically and in 3 hardcopies. The evaluation report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published in the series *Sida Evaluations*.

The evaluation assignment includes the completion of *Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet* (Annex 2), including an *Evaluation Abstract* (final section, G) as defined and required by DAC. The completed Data Worksheet shall be submitted to Sida along with the final version of the report. Failing a completed Data Worksheet, the report cannot be processed.

8. Evaluation team

The Evaluation Team shall comprise of a senior international team leader and one consultant with comprehensive local and regional experience and knowledge. The team members shall not have been involved or linked with the implementation of the evaluated project.

Appendix 2. List of people met or contacted

International

Mr. Per G. Rudebjer, Ex. Capacity Building Specialist of SEANAFE,
now at Biodiversity International (IPGRI) (Electronic comm.)

Sweden

Sida

Ms Åsa Bjällås, Programme Officer

Vietnam

Tay Nguyen University

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bao Huy, VNAFE Chair, Head of Department of Forest Resources & Environment Management (through email communication/interview)

Northern Mountainous Agriculture & Forestry Science Institute (NOMAFSI)

Dr. Le Quoc Doanh, Director General

Mr. Ha Dinh Tuan, Deputy Director General

Forestry University of Vietnam

Mr. Pham Quang Vinh, Chief of Agroforestry Dept/Dep. Dean of Silviculture Faculty

Mr. Kiew Tri Duc, Lecturer, Agroforestry Department

Ms. Hoang Thi Minh Hue, Lecturer, Agroforestry Department

Nong Lam University

Dr. Hoang Huu Cai, Chairman Department of Social Forestry, Faculty of Forestry

Thailand

Kasetsart University, Faculty of Forestry, Bangkok

Asst. Prof. Dr. Monton Jamroenprucksas, Department of Silviculture, Chairman of SEANAFE

Dr. Chongrak Wachrinrat, Ass. Dean for Administration, Faculty of Forestry

Additional staff member

Royal Forest Department

Lady working with Human Resources, recent graduate from KU

Regional Community Forestry Training Centre (RECOFTC) for Asia and the Pacific

Dr. Yam Malla, Executive Director

Ms Noelle O'brian, Coordinator of the Capacity Building Programme (CAPS)

Mr. Peter Stephen, Capacity Building Programme

Mr. Mark Sandiford, Coordinator of the Country Programme (COPS)

Chiang Mai University, Faculty of Agriculture

Ass. Prof. Dr. Boonserm Cheva-Isarakul, Dean, Faculty of Agriculture, Chairman of ThaiNAFE

Embassy of Sweden

Ms Karin Isaksson, SENSA

Indonesia

ICRAF Office Bogor

Dr. Jesus C. Fernandez, SEANAFE Technical Adviser, ICRAF, Bogor

Dr. Meine van Noordwijk, Regional Coordinator, ICRAF, Bogor

Ms Rika Harini Irawati, "Rini", SEANAFE Assistant

Institut Pertanian Bogor (Bogor Agricultural University)

Dr. Ma'mun Sarma, Former INAFE Chair, Head of International Program Office

Dr. Hadi Susilo Arifin, Faculty of Agriculture, Team leader, Landscape Agroforestry

Ir. Qodarian Pramukanto, Faculty of Agriculture, Team member, Landscape Agroforestry

Dr. Leti Sundawati, Faculty of Forestry Team Leader, Marketing Agroforestry Tree Products

Dr. Dodik Nur Norahmat, Faculty of Forestry, Team member, Marketing Agrof. Tree Products

Dr. Fauzi Febrianto, Vice Dean, Faculty of Forestry

Brawijaya University, Malang

Prof. Kurniatun Hairiah, Faculty of Agriculture

Dr. Syekhfani, Faculty of Agriculture

Dr. Didik Suprayogo, Faculty of Agriculture

Prof. Dr. Wani Widiyanto, Faculty of Agriculture

Dr. Tri Wahyu Nugroho, Faculty of Agriculture

Muhammadiyah University, Malang

Dr. M Chanan, Faculty of Agriculture

Dr. Joko Triwanto, Faculty of Agriculture

Dr. Amir Syarifudin, Faculty of Agriculture

Mr. Tatag Muttaqin, Faculty of Agriculture

Tribhuwana Tunggal Dewi, University Malang

Dr. Son Suwarson

Dr. Didik Rusumala

Pembangunan Nasional University, Surabaya

Ir. Agus Sulityono

Gajah Mada University

Dr. Mohamad Sambas Sabarnurdin, Former INAFE Chair, Faculty of Forestry

Prof. Dr. Suhardi, Current INAFE Chair, Faculty of Forestry

Hasanuddin University, Makassar, South Sulawesi

Dr. Syamsuddin Millang, Faculty of Forestry

Dr. Anwar Umar, Faculty of Forestry

Mulawarman University, Samarinda, East Kalimantan

Prof. Riyanto, SEANAPE Contact person, Faculty of Forestry

Dr. Mustofa Agung Sardjono, Director, Center for Social Forestry (CSF)

Dr. Fadjar Pambudhi, Deputy Director, Center for Social Forestry (CSF)

Dr. Setiawati, Education and Training Section, Center for Social Forestry (CSF)

Laos

National University of Laos

Dr. Latsamy Bupha, Chair, LaoNAFE (telephone and email contact)

The Philippines

Meeting at Institute of Agroforestry

Dr. Virgilio Villancio, Director IAF/Chair PAFERN

Ms. Glorylyn V. Acaylar, ICRAF, Administrative officer for the office in the Philippines

Ms. Ann Papag, Senior Technical Assistant

Ms. Leichee D. Landicho, Secretary of IAF

Dr. Roberto G. Visco

Ms. Isabelita M. Pabuayon

Dr. Namerod F. Mateo

Dr. Ronena D. Cabahug

Ms. Stella Villa D Castillo

Dr. Marlo D. Medoza

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University (DMMMSU), North La Union Campus

Prof. Orlando P. Almoite

Prof. Nelly C. Antolin

Ass. Prof. Marcelo. R. M. Cadiente Jr.

Ass. Prof. Eufemia G. Crudo

Prof. Preciosa Dacpano

Instructor Ronald C. Estoque

Prof. Lilito Gavina

Prof. Gsabriel V. Lucero

Prof. Eric F. Salamanca

Prof. Benjamin P. Sapitula

Prof. Carlito S. Solera

Ass. Prof. Cristina B. Turaja

Ass. Prof. Jessie V. Ufano

Benquet State University, La Trinidad

Prof. Alfredo C. Tipayno, Vice President Administration

Prof. Melicio Balangeu, Dept. Chair, Silviculture and Forest Influences

Dean Kenneth Laruan, Dean, College of Forestry

Prof. Vallentin Macasus, Director, Inst. Of Highland Agriculture and Agroforestry

Dr. Feliciano Cobru Jr. College of Forestry

Dr. Danilo P. Padua, Special Assistant to the President

Dr. Tessie Merestela, Vice President, Academic Affairs

Papanga Agricultural College, Magalang

Dr. Emelita C. Kempis, Vice President for Academic and Cultural Affairs

Dr. Honorio M. Soriano Jr. President

Prof. Bonifiscio C. Gumilet, Dir. of Prod. Tn.

Dr. Carmelito B. Tarun, Director of PBRC

Prof. Oscar B. Tarun, Fac. of Forestry and Agroforestry

Dr. Rolando Q. Baccay, Chair, Dept. of Forestry and Agroforestry

Dr. Nora P. Lucero, Dean, Institute of Agricultural Sciences and Technology

Meeting at Aklan State University, Banga

Ed. Dr. Ms. Eugenia C. Capaciete, PAFERN Board Member, Visayas West,
Leon National College of Agriculture, Campus Administrator

Dr. Danilo E. Abayon, Dean, College of Agric., Forestry and Env. Sc., Aklan State University

Dr. Melba L. Raga-as, Faculty, Forest Dept.

Dr. Nemia N. Bohulano, Faculty, Forest Dept.

Dr. Jerson Calaguio, Faculty, Forest Dept.

Dr. Rogelio Felizando, Faculty, Forest Dept.

Appendix 3. List of documentation

- Agreement between Sida and ICRAF on support to SEANAFE, Phase II “Sharing knowledge on markets, landscapes and environmental policies” During 1 May 2005 to 30 April 2009*
- Asia-Pacific Agroforestry Newsletter (APANews). No. 29, March 2007. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.*
- Asia-Pacific Agroforestry Newsletter (APANews). No. 30, July 2007. FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand.*
- Bjällås, B. May 2005. In-depth assessment memo for SEANAFE II “Sharing knowledge on Markets, Landscapes, and Environmental Policies”*
- Isaksson, Karin. 2007. Travel Report covering Annual Review meeting 2007.*
- Minutes of NAFEC Meetings for Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam.*
- Minutes of INAFE, LaoNAFE, VNAFE, ThaiNAFE and VNAFE Board Meetings.*
- Minutes of SEANAFE Board Meetings.*
- Minutes of SEAFANE Annual Review 2006 and 2007.*
- Philippine Agroforestry Development MONITOR. No. 1, August 2006. Philippines Agroforestry Education and Reserach Network, Los Banos, Philippines.*
- Philippine Agroforestry Development MONITOR. No. 2, October 2006. Philippines Agroforestry Education and Reserach Network, Los Banos, Philippines.*
- Philippine Agroforestry Development MONITOR. No. 3, December 2006. Philippines Agroforestry Education and Reserach Network, Los Banos, Philippines.*
- Reports of Market for Agroforestry Tree Products Project, Phase II for each country (drafts and final).*
- Research Proposals of Landscape Agroforestry Project for each country.*
- Rudebjer, P.G., Leila D. Landicho, Damrong Pipatwattanakul, Iskandar Z. Siregar, Dang Dinh Boi. 2007. Impacts of the Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFE) on agroforestry education capacity. Draft*
- Sida. 2005. Sida at Work. A manual on Contribution Management*
- Sida. 2007. Looking Back, Moving Forward. Sida Evaluation Manual. 2nd revised edition.*
- Tengnäs, B. and Upik, R.U. 2001. SEANAFE Mid-term review.*
- Tengnäs, B., Pelinck, E.P. Wasrin, R.U. 2001. RECOFTC 2001—2004. An appraisal of strategies, plans and funding requirements carried out for SDC and Sida*
- Tengnäs, B., Bhattarai, T. and Wasrin, U. R. 2004. Integrating Natural Resource Management Capacity in Southeast Asia. Evaluation of the Swedish support to ICRAF SE Asia 1997–2004.*
- Tengnäs, B. Comments on proposal for SEANAFE Phase II. 2005.*
- The Swedish Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 2005. Strategy for development cooperation with parts of South-East Asia January 2005–December 2009.*

- Veer, Cor.* 2006. Curriculum Development for CB NRM in Asia. Report on a scoping exercise. RECOFTC, Bangkok
- Virgilio T. Villancio, Leila D. Landicho and Rowena D. Cabahug.* 2005. Philippines Agroforestry Education and Research Network (PAFERN): 2001 and Beyond. Philippines Agroforestry Education and Research Network, Los Banos, Philippines.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2004/05. SEANAFE, Phase II: Sharing knowledge on markets, landscapes, and environmental policies (Project Document, incl. appendices and revisions)
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2005. Integrating natural resource management capacity in Southeast Asia. Final Report 2003–2005
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2005. SEANAFE Revised Budget
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2005. SEANAFE Plan and budget 2005
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2005. SEANAFE members January 2005.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2006. SEANAFE Board Members 2006.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2006. SEANAFE Annual work plan and budget 2006.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2006. SEANAFE supplement to Annual work plan and budget 2006.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2006. SEANAFE Annual Report 2005. The Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. SEANAFE Plan and budget 2007.
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. SEANAFE Annual Report 2006. The Southeast Asian Network for Agroforestry Education, incl. appendices
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. SEANAFE Mid-Year Progress Report 2007 (January–June).
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. SEANAFE Financial Statement per December 2006
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. SEANAFE Financial Statement per 30th June 2007
- World Agroforestry Center.* 2007. Performance Overview of SEANAFE and Copuntry Network Projects and Activities May 2005–June 2007

In addition a range of *information material from the member institutions* were availed to and studied by the team.

Web sites were visited including those of the national networks, SEANAFE, RECOFTC and others.

Appendix 4. Details on ThaiNAFE

Recalling the past

Desire to revitalise activities of the past which are no longer on the SEANAFE agenda?

There was mention of SEANAFE's earlier work on curriculum development and especially on the development and translation of training materials. These were useful activities which are currently not featuring as they used to. Thesis grants were also mentioned and it was noted that there is only an allocation of one for Thailand during the whole period 2005–09. International training, although costly, was an effective means to develop a cadre of lecturers that were taking interest in SEANAFE. It is difficult to achieve that now.

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1

National network officially recognised with legal status?

ThaiNAFE is not recognised as an official entity. The Association of Deans has taken on a role as a kind of administrator of certain SEANAFE business. This linkage is useful as it makes Deans more aware of SEANAFE. It is the Deans who nominate ThaiNAFE contact persons (NAFEC representatives) in the various universities and it is therefore essential that they are aware of SEANAFE. Further, with regard to the prospects for general strengthening of agroforestry in curricula, the involvement of the Association of Deans is an important and welcome move. Agroforestry remains a fairly marginal subject in curricula in Thailand and the Association may be in a good position to help mainstream agroforestry content into other general courses.

Work plan for current year?

A work plan for 2007 has been prepared with an indication of the expected budget allocations from SEANAFE and other sources. The work plan contains three activities: (i) ThaiNAFE annual meeting, (ii) exchange of lecturers and excursion to strengthen the linkages between institution, and (iii) an on-farm activity involving lecturers and farmers. It is felt that activities need to be enhanced and the item (ii) includes a planned excursion with the NAFEC in Thailand and hopefully also across to Laos. This exercise is intended to offer an opportunity for NAFEC delegates to get to know each other more and to identify the commonly shared ideas on what ThaiNAFE can best be used for. Student's exchange was tried, but it was found that student's programme was generally too tight to accommodate such new initiatives. Web-based contacts should be tried instead, and in addition it was believed that exchange of lecturers would be easier to organise (item (ii)).

There are also ideas on the development of web-based learning, which could bring several member institutions together in the implementation of a joint activity. The marketing project and the landscape agroforestry project go on under the respective lead institutions which have direct contacts with SEANAFE in this regard.

Financial support from SEANAFE for the national network management

The years 2005 and 2006 were intended to be the last years when there was a budget allocation for the general network management (US \$ 15,000 for the two years combined). The total budget featuring in the 2007 work plan and expected from SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 2,500 for item (i), US \$ 1,500 for item (ii) and US \$ 1,700 for item (iii). According to SEANAFE, the budget allocation for NAFEC meetings of 2,500 US \$ is supposed to cover two meetings but the work plan indicates one scheduled for 8th November 2007. According to SEANAFE additionally US \$ 1,500 is paid to each network for website development and at least US \$ 1,500 can be used for a one-time initial fund for resource mobilization.

These items do not feature in the work plan. In addition to the items of the work plan is the allocation to the projects on Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry with disbursements of US \$ 10,200 and US \$ 8,500 respectively. As per SEANAFE records, a total of US \$ 18,700 was so far disbursed during 2007 (excl. the M.Sc. grant which is paid directly to the grantee and also excluding the three items in the work plan as the activities have not yet been implemented and funds not requested.

The total disbursement for 2005 was US \$ 16,830 and for 2006 US \$ 5,770. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 18,700 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Thailand during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 44,200.

Main activities carried out with SEANAFE funding (excl. the subprojects)

2005

A country workshop combined with ThaiNAFE Committee meeting. This committee meeting was not so well supported by the Deans as they were not fully aware of SEANAFE. With the involvement of the Association of Deans the situation improved in 2006.

2006

National General Meeting was conducted

A national ThaiNAFE conference

Some website development

Networking with communities and schools on teaching agroforestry.

2007

So far no activities reported apart from those linked to the marketing and landscape agroforestry projects.

Administrative node existing/functioning?

The Faculty of Forestry of Kasetsart University remains as the administrative node although Dr. Monton of that faculty left the national chairmanship. Dr. Boonserm of Chiang Mai University is now the Chairman, but it was felt useful that an administrative function remained at Kasetsart and in Bangkok. Dr. Chongrat Wachrinrat, Associate Dean for Administration, is responsible for day-to-day matters including the website.

Able to handle funds, how, on its own or through other body?

There are two mechanisms. One is the Association of Deans that handles membership fees and their utilisation; the other is that member institutions are nominated as lead agencies on certain activities. The latter is the case for the Marketing project with Chiang Mai University as the lead agency, and for the Landscape Agroforestry where Kasetsart University has assumed a leading role. Both activities have been designed in such a way that other member institutions are involved in order to secure coverage of different ecozones.

When were NAFEC meetings held, attendance, minutes? Gender balance?

A ThaiNAFE committee meeting was held late in 2005 in Chiang Mai. A General Meeting, during which Dr. Boonserm was elected chairman, was held in August 2006 and another committee meeting was held late in 2006. The meetings were usually linked to workshops (A new dimension of Agroforestry; northern/southern Thailand). It appears that reports have so far not been submitted on the first and third of these events. Minutes were not available in the SEANAFE office.

Did national chair participate in SEANAFE board meetings, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th?

The ThaiNAFE Chairman participated in all SEANAFE Board meetings.

Website in English/National language? Satisfactory and updated?

There is a website, mainly in Thai language but parts have been translated into English. It includes two short newsletters from 2007 in Thai. The Thai website appears under Kasetsart University, while the English version has a web address of its own. A search on ThaiNAFE on Google yielded rapid results. The website was easy to find. ThaiNAFE is featuring adequately on the Internet and the website contains useful and up to date information as well as adequate links.

Membership

There are currently “about eleven” members. Two or three have probably not paid the membership fees since it was introduced, but on the other hand some new members joined. It is, however, noted that two of the new members are faculties within Kasetsart University (Agriculture and Fisheries). Six members are now actively involved, mainly through the Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry projects. It is a challenge to ensure that all members are benefiting to the extent that they are ready to continue paying membership fees. The website lists 10 institutional and 16 individual members.

Newsletters, other outputs at national level?

A ThaiNAFE newsletter is found on the website.

Implemented additional activities that were not planned in the SEANAFE context?

In 2005, a workshop was conducted without financial support from SEANAFE (A new dimension of Agroforestry/northern Thailand). It was attended by about 60 people and fully funded from national sources (Naresuan University). LaoNAFE Chairman attended.

Is the SEANAFE facilitation unit capable of meeting the challenges resulting from the implementation of the current plans?

In general the response was positive. In particular, useful information provided from SEANAFE on research grants from other sources than SEANAFE was mentioned. On information it was noted that there is a rich flow of emails, but many are just “ccied” without being directly relevant for the one receiving the copy. A more selective flow of information with a higher share of messages directed to the recipient and less “copies” would be appreciated. People are too busy to read things of little direct concern. It was also noted that SEANAFE's internal monitoring and follow up is somewhat weak. Some of the earlier activities still deserve to remain more active.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

Some of the people contacted felt that the subjects chosen for both projects were not such that would automatically generate a high level of interest. A higher degree of freedom for the national networks to decide on the topics would be preferred. It was argued that the present system was top-down, however, this may be attributed to the fact that the current national chairman was not the chairman during the preparations of the current phase of SEANAFE. The preparations were, according to records, a process that closely involved the SEANAFE Board.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Thailand 21–26 November 2005, was attended by six Thai (3 males; 3 females – 2 of which were observers).

Core team selected and market case studies completed? Quality?

The six who attended the international workshop constitutes the country team. Associate Professor Charoon Suksem is a seventh person appointed as the team leader. Field research was carried out during the first half of 2006. The topic was Para Rubber Products of Small-Scale Farmers in Northern Thailand. According to the SEANAFE assessment, the Thai study, as compared to the other studies,

had its strengths on (i) market/value chain analysis, (ii) market information systems, and (iii) institutions influencing agroforestry marketing. The team noted that there was weak socio-economic analysis of the different actors in the marketing chain and, generally, there could have been room for deeper and further analysis. An example is that it was observed that the rubber exported to China through Chiang Rai is purchased from Bangkok or Rayong Provinces, while the original production site could be anywhere in Thailand including in the north. This appears to imply that there is unnecessary transport and thus transaction costs could be reduced giving farmers in the northern part a comparative advantage as compared to their colleagues in the south. The problems relates to processing and the marketing organisation. This fact was more or less mentioned in passing, while it could have been used as an entry point for a far wider and deeper discussion. Together with the studies from the other countries, it was repackaged by an external consultant into case studies by December 2006 and finalised for translation in February 2007. The original report is to be given a number in the ICRAF series of Working Papers and be reproduced in a limited number of copies.

Topic relevant for men as well as women?

There was no gender analysis in the study.

Small-scale focus on commodity?

The research topic is relevant from the small-scale farmers' perspective. Parts of northern Thailand are, as compared to other parts of the country, areas with a relatively high incidence of poverty. Rubber production in this area has a potential to generate jobs and thus reduce labour movement from the region to the cities. It is a new but expanding enterprise in the north. Rubber is both a small-scale farmer's crop and an estate crop in Thailand. In the north, however, it is by and large a small-scale activity. In Thailand as a whole 93% of the area planted with rubber is divided into 1,012,000 small-holders' plantations with an average area of 2.1 hectare. In that comparison the rubber estates' plantations cover just a marginal area.

The whole market chain addressed with a transaction cost approach, i.e. look both at a high farm gate price and a competitive price for the consumers/exporters? Consumer end relevant for the poor?

Generally, SEANAFE TA has noted that the teams did not have a common framework from which to base the conduct of their research. Thus the focus of the contents greatly differed between the countries. The Thai study was assessed by SEANAFE to have a relative strength on the market/value chain analysis. Rubber is mainly an export crop with large multinationals as the ultimate buyers and motorists as ultimate users, so the consumers do not belong to the disadvantaged. All aspects of transaction cost were not well analysed, see remarks above.

Participated in Regional (International) writing workshop? Regional level teaching materials and curriculum modules prepared? Hard copies as well as electronic? Records of distribution?

The second Regional workshop intended to be a writing workshop producing teaching materials and curriculum modules was conducted on 15–18 August 2006 in Chiang Mai with 3 males and 2 females from Thailand attending (same group as in workshop I). The outputs were, however, limited to drafting the content outline of the teaching materials and listing down of the key theme of the curriculum. Thus, a regional consultant was hired to package the case study materials together with the SEANAFE Technical Advisor. The country team leaders were consulted in the process from time to time. The September 2007 SEANAFE newsletter features the abstracts of the research report from Thailand. The research abstract have been uploaded in the SEANAFE website. In addition, a country coordinator's meeting was organised in Bogor on 7–9 March 2007 with one participant from Thailand.

Teaching materials and curriculum modules for national level developed in national language? Quality on a scale 1–5? Small SEANAFE grants awarded for curriculum development?

Not yet produced.

National training conducted or planned? Financial support by SEANAFE? Participants? Gender?

The national level training is planned for mid September.

National research and extension organisations involved in the process?

Not yet, but possibly at a later stage.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

This was mentioned as rather limited. Comments on the summary of the research report were, however, received and mentioned. However, an ICRAF staff (Joel Tukan) served as one of several resource persons in the first international training workshop. The SEANAFE TA has sought assistance from some ICRAF SEA technical staff in packaging of the case study materials. Comments made by Jim Roshetco and Laxman Joshi were considered where necessary.

Benefited from services of regional consultants? National consultants?

The representatives of ThaiNAFE were not aware of any consultancy support. Some external resource persons had, however, contributed without additional expenses to the SEANAFE budget. The budget for national consultants was, in all countries and after communication with Sida, reallocated into a “team honorarium”, through a decision by the SEANAFE board.

Attended international book launching and training workshop?

No book launching as yet. The country studies will not have an ISBN number, be considered as working papers and for limited circulation (less than 100 copies). The compiled case study materials (after consultant’s input) will also not have an ISBN number and shall be reproduced only for teaching-learning purposes for use by member and non-member institutions. Only the case study itself (after consultant’s input) and the “Guide questions” shall be uploaded in the SEANAFE and national websites.

Impact on curricula in member institutions?

Premature to be assessed.

Plans for information to policy makers at national level?

Seems not yet to have happened in Thailand. The outcome in its present form does not provide a sufficient basis for discussions with policy makers.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 3**How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?**

It was felt that the topics for both projects were not such that would automatically generate a high level of interest. See further above under Objective 2.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Chiang Mai 22–26 March 2007, marked the kick-off of the Landscape Agroforestry Project. Three Thai participants attended out of which all three were men. Efforts had been made to include women but proved futile. It was noted that equally or more important than achieving a gender balance is to achieve a sound mix of age groups. Young lecturers need to be given chances.

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The participants in the regional (international) workshop constitute the core team responsible for the research. Work is now in progress with a funding support from SEANAFE of 8,000 US \$ for a period of eight months. It is now approximately half way through. The quality cannot be assessed at this point in time.

Topics relevant for men as well as women?

The topic is Suitable Landscape Agroforestry Mapping and Planning for Economic Sufficiency in Huaieng-Khlongpeed Watershed in eastern Thailand. The relevance from a gender perspective will largely depend on how the study will be conducted.

Small-scale farmer focus?

Relevance and focus depends on how the research will be carried out.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

During the first regional training/workshop all resource persons were from ICRAF. The project will be linked to the ICRAF TUL-SEA during phase 2. For the second regional workshop to be held in January 2008, David Thomas will be hired as technical coordinator to critique the results of the country research and to formulate specific case study materials for teaching purposes.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4**Sought funding from SEANAFE to prepare proposal? Annually? Received?**

SEANAFE has a budget allocation of at least 1,800 US \$ per country for resource mobilisation. Thailand did so far not request the use of such funds. This allocation is only available until the end of 2007.

Proposals for additional funding at national level prepared? Which?

Dr. Chongrat was in charge of the preparation of a research proposal submitted to the National Research Council of Thailand. It was submitted about half a year ago, but so far there was no response. Normally, a response should be expected faster and it is suspected that the proposal was not deemed good enough by the council.

Non-Sida-funding secured?

ThaiNAFE has now an additional limited funding base in the membership fees. In addition, national funds have been secured for particular events. The sources have been funding available from within member institutions. The most prominent non-SEANAFE-funded activity was the conference organised by Naresuan University in 2005.

Membership fees introduced?

An annual membership fee of 5,000 Bhat per institution was introduced. It is felt that 5,000 Bhat, presumably from about 10 members, will yield a minimum financial base for survival.

Other moves towards sustainability?

The planned excursion with NAFEC represents an attempt to revisit the foundation of ThaiNAFE and look into possible future directions. It was also noted that there are many issues on the political agenda that has a potential to make ThaiNAFE viable. One such is the linkages between land use changes and climate change, which is an area that policy makers are aware needs research and teaching inputs.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 6**M.Sc. thesis research project(s) completed or in progress? Quality? How much money availed? Too much or too little?**

The national grantee is Ms Ratinan Srisuwan of Kasetsart University conducting a study titled Local Marketing Channel for Agroforestry Products in Households of the Agroforestry Phupan Network, Sakon Nakhon Province. She is currently working and is expected to complete the thesis work by November 2007. The amount granted is regarded as well enough.

Wishes for modifications on this??

Additional grants would have been welcome.

Appendix 5. Details on VNAFE

Recalling the past

Desire to revitalise activities of the past which are no longer on the SEANAFE agenda?

VNAFE earlier work on participatory curriculum development and especially on the development and translation of training materials for agroforestry education at BSc. and Master levels. These were useful activities which are currently not featuring as they used to. Thesis grants were also mentioned and it was noted that there is only an allocation of one for Vietnam during the whole period 2005–09.

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1 Network Management

National network officially recognised with legal status?

VNAFE is not yet recognised as an official entity by the government. However, the membership and representatives of VNAFE have been confirmed by Rector/Director of University/Institutes. VNAFE intends to host a workshop to introduce VNAFE and to link better to government programmes.

Work plan for current year?

A work plan for 2007 has been prepared with an indication of the expected budget allocation. The work plan contains three activities: (i) A NAFEC Meeting scheduled for October, (ii) A workshop on resource mobilisation and to link better to national agriculture and forestry programmes, and (iii) coordination, exchange of information and web site management. Out of the total budget of US \$ 10,000 for these activities, so far US \$ 2,000 has been requested by VNAFE and allocated by SEANAFE for the third item.

Financial support from SEANAFE for the national network management

The total budget featuring in the 2007 work plan and expected from SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 1,500 for item (i), US \$ 6,500 for item (ii) and US \$ 2,000 for item (iii). In addition to the items in the work plan is the allocation to the projects on Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry with disbursements of US \$ 10,200 and US \$ 8,445 respectively. As per SEANAFE records, a total of US \$ 20,645 was so far disbursed during 2007 (excl. the M.Sc. grant which is paid directly to the grantee and also excluding the two items in the work plan that were so far not implemented.

The total disbursement for 2005 was US\$2,800 and for 2006 US\$12,200. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 20,645 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M. Sc. Grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Vietnam during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to *US\$ 38,545*.

Main activities carried out with SEANAFE funding (excl. the sub-projects)

2005

VNAFE National General Meeting combined with NAFEC meeting on 30–31 August 2005 at Faculty of Forestry, Nong Lam University, Thuduc District, Ho Chin Minh City. Eight participants (all males) attended the meeting. The SEANAFE TA and RECOFT consultant also attended the meeting. The group have exchanged views and experiences about market and landscape agroforestry project as well as planning for the national activities in terms of agroforestry development for 2005–2006.

2006

Workshop on sharing existing agroforestry curricula through a participatory curriculum development (PCD) on agroforestry on 29–30 March 2006 at Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry, Central

Vietnam. The workshop was attended by 26 participants. Major accomplishment was to standardize agroforestry curriculum for BSc level. A framework of agroforestry curriculum was developed which comprised major scopes, subjects and credit units.

VNAFE National General Meeting combined with NAFEC meeting 1 2006 on 30–31 March 2006. Major accomplishments include review of 2005–2006 activities (including monitoring of Marketing Project), coordination of the network activities in 2006, a strategic plan for VNAFE for 2006–2010 developed and agreed, providing information of Phase II of the project to the members, election of new NAFEC chair and members.

Conducted Participatory Workshop in October 2006 at Tay Nguyen University to improve and upgrade training curriculum of two majors at the University level. The two majors were Forestry & Forest Resources and Environmental Management.

Survey and document agroforestry good practices in Vietnam. Major accomplishments include documentation of national information on field-based lessons, enhance capacity building of young staff through field practice with farmers and stakeholders. Three universities were involved (Thai Nguyen, Tay Nguyen and Nong Lam) which represent three main regions of the country. Each university sets a team to study, collect, document practices using a prepared framework and guideline for interview, collection, studying agroforestry practices.

NAFEC meeting 2 2006 which was held on 9–10 October 2006 at Tay Nguyen University. Major accomplishments include review and evaluation of 2006 activities (including monitoring of Marketing Project of Agroforestry Products), present the results of planning for 2006 and 2007 activities of VNAFE, selection of one MSc thesis application for grant of SEANAFE. A field visit to National Park Yok Don, Dak Lak was also included.

Production and disseminate brochure. Major accomplishment include production of brochure in both languages (English and Vietnamese) regarding VNAFE and the brochure has been delivered to all members of the network and other stakeholders

Administration and communication. These include networking with all VNAFE members, communities and schools on teaching agroforestry.

VNAFE web site establishment. Major accomplishments include development and maintenance of web site for sharing, disseminating information of network to all members and other stakeholders as well as other outsiders.

2007

Planned participation in the International Agroforestry Education Conference on Integrating Conservation in Upland Agriculture in Southeast Asia which to be held in Chiang Mai on 24–26 October 2007. Funded paper presentation: Le Quoc Doanh and Ha Dinh Tuan (*“Balancing food security and environmental conservation in the uplands: Vietnamese experience – NOMAFSI”*)

Plans for the October 2007 event. This activity will be carried out in Northern Mountainous Agriculture & Forestry Science Institute (NOMAFSI), Phu Tho. The work will be attended by 10 people (7 males, 3 females). The dates have not been decided yet.

October 2007: One Master student granted by SEANAFE finishing his research on “Forecasting CO₂ Sequestration On Natural Broad-Leaved Evergreen Forests” with excellent score.

Information exchange, coordination of network and web site maintenance. This is a routine activity where website is updated regularly by Dr Bao Huy office.

Administrative node existing/functioning?

The Department of Forest Resources and Environment Management, Tay Nguyen University is the administrative node of VNAFE. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bao Huy is the Chairman of VNAFE and he is responsible for day-to-day matters including the website. There is no permanent staff specifically hired for this purpose. The operation of VNAFE is based on use of facilities available at the department.

Able to handle funds, how, on its own or through other body?

There has been no mechanism yet to handle funds for VNAFE. The mechanism has been discussed in NAFEC meeting. Membership fees have not yet been decided upon.

Funds are allocated to member institutions nominated as lead agencies and other members are invited to get involved.

When were NAFEC meetings held, attendance, minutes? Gender balance?

VNAFE National General Meeting with NAFEC meeting was held on 29–30 August 2005.

NAFEC first meeting 2006 was held on 30–31 March 2006 at Hue.

NAFEC second meeting 2006 was held on 9–10 October 2006 at Tay Nguyen University. The meeting was attended by 15 people including SEANAFE TA and 4 students.

NAFEC meeting 2007 has been planned for October 2007 at NOMAFSI, Phu Tho.

Did national chair participate in SEANAFE board meetings? Which of 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th?

The VNAFE Chairman participated all except the 14th (2007) Board meeting.

Website in English/National language? Satisfactory and updated?

There is a website developed and fully operational and it can be accessed at <http://www.socialforestry.org.vn>. The website is a joint effort between VNAFE and the Social Forestry Training Network. The website has information in English and Vietnamese and it is managed by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bao Huy of the Department of Forest Resources & Environment and Environment Management, Tay Nguyen University. The web site is for sharing, disseminating information of network to all members and other stakeholders as well as other outsiders. Information on agroforestry and relevant matters are obtained by all member institutions. In general, the web site is good and provides information on membership, events, research and extension, education and training, documents, feedback and links.

Membership

There are currently nine members on VNAFE. Six members are now actively involved, mainly through the Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry projects. It is a challenge to ensure that all members are benefiting to the extent that they remain active members of the VNAFE. The involvement of members depends on availability of funds.

Newsletters, other outputs at national level?

An earlier newsletter produced with Sida support was discontinued when the Sida support ceased.

Implemented additional activities that were not planned in the SEANAFE context?

In 2006, VNAFE Web site establishment was not planned but it was successfully developed and maintained.

Is the SEANAFE facilitation unit capable of meeting the challenges resulting from the implementation of the current plans?

In general the response was positive. In particular, useful information provided from SEANAFE on research grants from other sources than SEANAFE was mentioned. Other information was obtained through emails. Other forms of information including CDs, publications, Newsletters (APAN News), training information, workshops, and others are regularly received from SEANAFE. Direct communication among members of VNAFE has been regular.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2 (Markets for Agroforestry Tree Products)

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The topic for the project is very relevant to the educational and development needs of the country. The government has paid much attention with regards to marketing of agriculture products. This will help understanding of market value chain and can benefit farmers in the market chain which can further improve their marketing activities of agroforestry products. It was also mentioned that wood cannot be obtained easily in the future and alternative agroforestry products should be considered. Low adoption of agroforestry practices by farmers is often due to marketing constraints.

Farmers are facing risks and uncertainties in terms of price because market is not well organized. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development has realized the issue and a major initiative was the development of a ministry information centre which disseminates information on agricultural production and prices. However, accessibility to this information by farmers is low because of lack of facilities. The VNAFE network could help address this vacuum.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

1st Regional (International) Training Cum Planning Workshop, organised at RECOFTC in Bangkok, Thailand 21–26 November 2005, was attended by four representatives from Vietnam (4 males; 1 female).

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The lead institution for the Marketing project is Nong Lam University. Other institutions involved include University of Agriculture and Forestry and Tay Nguyen University.

The four who attended the international workshop constitutes the country team. The project leader is Mr. Dang Hai Phuong from the Faculty of Forestry, University of Agriculture and Forestry, Ho Chi Minh City. Other team members include Ms Le Thanh Loan Lecturer, Faculty of Economics, UAF Mr. Vo Hung, Lecturer, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, Tay Nguyen University.

All research activities were completed in July 2006. They were repackaged into case study materials by December 2006 and finalized for the materials by December 2006 and finalized for translation by February 2007.

In August 2007, the team organized a training/workshop to share the results of not only Vietnamese group but also other countries of SEANAFE. An action plan has been developed to apply the research into teaching. It was mentioned that the manual prepared will be used in teaching in 2008.

Topics relevant for men as well as women?

It was felt that there should be no specific topic for men and women. However, it was mentioned that women plays important role as “middlewomen” in marketing cashew nuts as well as in processing cashew nuts. These aspects could be considered in future research.

Small-scale focus on commodity?

The research topic, “Cashew nuts supply chains in Vietnam: A Case Study in Dak Nong and Binh Phuoc Provinces, Vietnam” is relevant from the small-scale farmers’ perspective. In Dak Nong and Binh Phuoc Provinces the people are poor and largely depend on forest-based activities. There are 20% and 40% of ethnic minorities in the Dak Nong and Binh Phuoc provinces, respectively. For farmers, the income is derived from and strongly affected by produce’s farm gate price. Unfortunately, the farm gate price of cashew nut is inadequate. Factors affecting farm gate prices are crucial for a more profitable venture of cashew nuts production by farmers in the provinces. Understanding this issue helps the government to provide significant strategies and policies.

The whole market chain addressed with a transaction cost approach, i.e. look both at a high farm gate price and a competitive price for the consumers/exporters? Consumer end relevant for the poor?

The whole market chain was studied based on a transaction cost approach. The value added in each trading point in the distribution chains of cashew nuts was calculated. The analysis was conducted to determine the cost and benefit of each stakeholder in the value chain from farmer to the processing company. It was found that though a farmers' profit in each kg has been achieved, their monthly income incomes are not high due to the small scale of the production and also due to farmers being involved in yearly production rather than for a specific production period. A good analysis on value chain analysis has been conducted.

It was also mentioned that cashew nuts are internationally traded and the price is determined by the demand and supply internationally. However, the processing factories controlled the price of cashew nuts. Farmers are always in the losing end because they have to borrow money from the middlemen for investment and sometimes they get advance credit. The loan or advance credit arrangement involves payment of 3% monthly interest.

Participated in Regional (International) writing workshop? Regional level teaching materials and curriculum modules prepared? Quality of outcome on a scale 1–5? Hard copies as well as electronic? Records of distribution?

The second Regional workshop on 15–18 August 2006 in Chiang Mai was attended by three representatives from Vietnam (2 males; 1 female). In addition, VNAFE was represented at the country coordinator's meeting organised in Bogor, Indonesia on 8–10 March 2007. This was able to review and finalize the country case study materials for translation in local language of SEANAFE member countries.

Teaching materials and curriculum modules for national level developed in national language? Small SEANAFE grants awarded for curriculum development?

The Teachers' Guide on MAFTP is expected to be published in December 2007.

With regards to the curriculum modules, these have been discussed and developed in the participatory curriculum development (PCD) workshop held on 29–30 March 2006 at Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry, Central Vietnam. The workshop was attended by 26 participants representing universities, research institutes, agricultural extension centres, the Forestry Department of Hue province, and the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development of Quang Binh and Quang Tri provinces. Major accomplishment was to standardize agroforestry curriculum for BSc level. A framework of agroforestry curriculum was developed which comprised major scopes, subjects and credit units.

The application of the AF curriculum, generated during the workshop is being adopted by three universities, namely Forestry University, Hue University and Nong Lam University.

There was also a proposal from Forestry University of Vietnam to examine and assess the agroforestry engineering training framework to cater for the need of agroforestry graduates in the northern Vietnam. This is expected to be carried out from October 2007 to June 2008. Funding is requested from SEANAFE.

National training conducted or planned? Financial support by SEANAFE? Participants? Gender?

The national training in Sharing the results of Market research of agroforestry products was conducted on 27–30 August 2007, in Ban Me Thuot City, Dak Lak Province. There were 25 participants with 20 males and 5 females. The breakdown by member institutions: Universities (5), Agriculture – Forestry Institutes (2), Provincial Extension Centers (3), Vocational Forestry School (1). Financial support around US\$ 10,000 was received from SEANAFE.

General comments on the workshop include the following:

Shared knowledge/information related to marketing of agroforestry products not only in the country but also in the region.

Gave opportunity for participants to learn/share their experiences on the processing and marketing of wood, agroforestry cultivation

Initiated ideas for follow up of the project

National research and extension organisations involved in the process?

Yes, involved in the training.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

No technical support from ICRAF mentioned.

Benefited from services of regional consultants? National consultants?

The representatives of VNAFE were not aware of any consultancy support at the regional or international levels.

Attended international book launching and training workshop?

No book launching as yet.

Impact on curricula in member institutions?

Premature to be assessed.

Plans for information to policy makers at national level?

Seems not yet to have happened yet in Vietnam. However, the information reaches the policy makers through informal communication such as web site and there is a plan to organize a workshop to involve MoET, MARD for this purpose.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 3 (Landscape Agroforestry)

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The title of the project is “Study on Upland Maize-based Landscape Agroforestry in Son La Province, Northern Vietnam.” It was felt that the topic is relevant in the context of agroforestry practices in Vietnam. Farmers usually do not depend on a particular crop but on a range of crops. Maize was chosen in the case study because there is demand for maize on the market. A good transportation network has opened up opportunities for marketing and high yield can now be achieved due to improved varieties.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Chiang Mai 22–26 March 2007 marked the kick-off of the Landscape Agroforestry Project. There were four male participants from Vietnam.

Core team selected and market case studies completed? Quality on a scale 1–5? (5=best)

The lead institution in the Marketing project is Northern Mountainous Agriculture & Forestry Science Institute (NOMAFSI) and the project leader is Dr. Le Quoc Doanh of NOMAFSI. Other institutions involved are Hue Agriculture and Forestry University and Forestry University of Vietnam. The participants in the regional (international) workshop constitute the core team responsible for the research except Mr. Nguyen Tuan Hung.

Work is now in progress with a funding support from SEANAFE of US \$ 7,800.00 for a period of eight months. The survey has been completed and data collected were also analysed. First draft report is being prepared and the final report is to be completed by December 2007. The quality cannot be assessed at this point in time.

Topics relevant for men as well as women?

Topics that are relevant for men and women were not specifically identified and mentioned. However, some topics were noted, for examples, role of women in agroforestry landscape management, non-wood products, production and seedling maintenance of agroforestry tree.

Small-scale farmer focus?

The focus on fruit tree (mango, tamarind), accessing silvopastoral agroforestry system is particularly relevant for the small scale farmers.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4: Development of Additional Funding for Regional and National Projects

Sought funding from SEANAFE to prepare proposal? Annually? Received?

Funding is sought from SEANAFE on an annual basis. The funding is based on the proposed activities as agreed upon at the NAFEC meeting.

Proposals for additional funding at national level prepared? Which?

There has been no specific research proposal for securing additional funding from other agencies. However, the individual institution has its own initiatives in securing funding for research and other related agroforestry activities. Some institutions have been getting funding from international agencies such as ADB, SIRAJ, IFRAD, IRRI and IDRC.

Non-Sida-funding secured?

There has been no non-Sida secured funding for the specific VNAFE project at this moment but the possibilities have been discussed.

Membership fees introduced?

Membership fees have not been introduced yet but will be given due consideration in the future.

Other moves towards sustainability?

To strategize on network operations, the VNAFE conducted a general meeting/workshop of representatives from its member institutions. It served as venue for formulating specific objectives and activities, as well as clarifying the vision of VNAFE for 2006–2010. It was noted that there were many challenges to be faced in the future:

- Ability to find sources of finance
- Concepts on agroforestry in Vietnam are still not clear and agreed upon
- Land use rights and changes in land uses are difficult to control
- How to link agroforestry with upland communities
- Link agroforestry training to market, environmental services
- Interdisciplinary research experiences

However, there are opportunities in the future, as follows:

- Need for agroforestry training at different levels of education in Vietnam
- Increasing interest, cooperation from various organizations in agroforestry
- Able to mobilize resources from organizations, localities
- Environmental benefits from agroforestry are creating interest among stakeholders

- Existing research groups, and trainers in agroforestry
- Trend of multi-sectoral, interdisciplinary training
- Favourable policy environment
- VNAFE strategies align with ICRAF/SEANAFE strategies
- Agroforestry is part of natural resource management and thereby promotes sustainable development.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 6: Development and sharing of international public goods.

M.Sc. thesis research project(s) completed or in progress? Quality? How much money availed? Too much or too little?

The national grantee is Mr. Pham Tuan Anh who is conducting his research for the M.Sc. entitled “Forecasting CO₂ Sequestration on Natural Broad-Leaved Evergreen Forests.” He is studying at Tay Nguyen University and hosted by Forestry University of Vietnam. His thesis was presented to National Master Degree Evaluation Council and he obtained an excellent score for his thesis. The project already completed in October, 2007. The amount granted (US \$ 2,900.00) is regarded as well enough to cover field work and other indirect costs. The topic is important because through agroforestry system the amount of carbon stored can be increased. The project has policy implication towards promoting carbon offset which helps to reduce global warming.

Wishes for modifications on this??

The grant could be reduced to provide more opportunities for MSc theses. This amount could be around US\$1,500.00 per project. Thus, there could be 2 projects within the 2-year period.

Another possibility is to provide grant for B.Sc. student research project, the ratio of 1 M.Sc. and 1 B.Sc. thesis. The grant for a BSc thesis could be US \$ 500. Previously (2004), three B.Sc. students from Forestry University of Vietnam received scholarship from SENAFE, and in 2004 3 B.Sc. students from Tay Nguyen University obtained their sponsorship to implement their undergraduate thesis. This same arrangement could be applied in the future.

Appendix 6. Details on LaoNAFE

Recalling the past

Desire to revitalise activities of the past which are no longer on the SEANAFE agenda?

The work on curriculum development and especially on the development and translation of training materials was appreciated. The agroforestry curriculum was revised in 2006.

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1 Network Management

National network officially recognised with legal status?

LaoNAFE is not yet recognised as an official entity by the government. However, efforts towards this goal have been made by organizing a workshop with representatives of the ministry of education and other institutions. This enables to explain LaoNAFE function and activities to the stakeholders.

Work plan for current year?

A work plan for 2007 has been prepared with an indication of the expected budget allocations from SEANAFE. The work plan contains six items: (i) NAFEC Meeting, (ii) Resource mobilisation and training course on proposal writing, (iii) LaoNAFE Web site development, (iv) Development of LaoNAFE brochure, (v) Administration, (vi) National general meeting.

Financial support from SEANAFE for the national network management

The total budget featuring in the 2007 work plan and expected from SEANAFE amounts to US \$ 2,500 for item (i), US \$ 2,000 for item (ii), US \$ 450 for item (iii), US \$ 250 for item (iv), US \$ 1,300 for item (v), and US \$ 3,500 for item (vi). According to SEANAFE, the budget allocation for NAFEC meetings of 2,500 US \$ is supposed to cover two meetings but the work plan only indicates one. In addition to the items in the work plan is the allocation to the projects on Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry with disbursements of US \$ 10,200 and US \$ 8,295 respectively. As per SEANAFE records, a total of US \$ 24,655 was so far disbursed during 2007 (excl. the M.Sc. grant which is paid directly to the grantee and also excluding the items in the work plan that were so far not implemented).

The disbursements for 2005 were US \$ 4,725 and for 2006 US \$ 22,366. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 24,655 during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the M.Sc. grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Laos during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to *US \$ 54,646*.

Main activities carried out with SEANAFE funding (excl. the subprojects)

2005

5th LaoNAFE Meeting 13–14 September 2005, at FoF, NUOL Vientiane. 13 participants, 11 male and 2 female

National General Meeting, November 29–30, 2005, Faculty of Forestry, NUOL, 23 participants, 20 male and 3 female with the SENAFE TA

2006

Hold NAFEC 6th meeting on 17 May 2006 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 17 participants.

Hold NAFEC 7th meeting on 21 November 2006 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 13 participants including SEANAFE TA.

Submission of articles for the 29th issue of SEANAFE newsletter, September 2006

Conducted Participatory Curriculum Development (PCD) on 15–16 May 2006 at Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. Attended by 17 participants including 3 resource persons (14 males, 3 females)

Conducted Workshop on Slide-Series Development on 20–21 November 2006 at Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. Attended by 13 participants including 5 resource persons and SEANAFE TA (10 males, 3 females)

Setting up of Project on Slide Series of Agroforestry in Three Regions (North, Centre, South) of Laos, November 2006

Selection of the national grantee for SEANAFE's MS Research Fellowship, October 2006

2007

Conducting Training on Proposal Writing and Packaging, Workshop on Resource Mobilization and 8th NAFEC Meeting, 7–10 May 2007, Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. Training & Workshop was attended by 17 staff from various institutions related to agroforestry in Laos.

SEANAFE grant recipient Mr. Khamphouvieng Phouisombath completed his MSc thesis at Mahidol University, Thailand. The title of the thesis "Utilization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) in a community forest area: a case study in Houy Hok Village, Kasy District, Vientiane Province, Lao PDR."

Held NAFEC 8th meeting on 9–10 May 2007 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos.

Administration (office expenditure), Jan–Dec 2007 at Faculty of Forestry, NUOL

Will conduct National General Meeting on 5 Nov. 2007 at Faculty of Forestry, NUOL

Administrative node existing/functioning?

The Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos is the administrative node of LaoNAFE. Dr. Latsamy Boupma is the Chairperson of LaoNAFE and she is responsible for day-to-day administrative matters. The operation of LaoNAFE is based on use of facilities of the faculty.

Able to handle funds, how, on its own or through other body?

There has been no mechanism yet to handle funds for LaoNAFE. Such mechanism has been discussed in NAFEC meeting but no decision on membership fees have been made.

Funds are allocated to member institutions nominated as lead agencies and other members are invited to get involved.

When were NAFEC meetings held, attendance, minutes? Gender balance?

NAFEC 5th meeting on 13–14 September 2005 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 14 participants including SEANAFE Capacity Building Specialist.

NAFEC 6th meeting on 17 May 2006 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 17 participants.

NAFEC 7th meeting on 21 November 2006 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 13 participants including SEANAFE TA.

NAFEC 8th meeting on 9–10 May 2007 Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. 10 participants including SEANAFE TA.

Did national chair participate in SEANAFE board meetings? Which of 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th?

The LaoNAFE Chair participated in all except 10th(2005) board meetings.

Website in English/National language? Satisfactory and updated?

The website is still being developed. The LaoNAFE web site is <http://www.nuol.edu.la>.

The information on website is in Lao and some information is in English. The information is supposed to include the following: Introduction on LaoNAFE, AF curriculum, AF Research and other document. The review team had, however, difficulties finding it, possibly as it is mainly in Lao language.

Membership

There are currently ten members of LaoNAFE. Three new institutions joined the network in 2005: Dongkhamxang School; Suphanouvong University, and Pakse University. The SEANAFE membership list appears not fully up to date.

Newsletters, other outputs at national level?

Newsletters have not been published yet.

Implemented additional activities that were not planned in the SEANAFE context?

In 2006, LaosNAFE implemented the following activities which were not planned:

Submission of articles for the 29th issue of SEANAFE newsletter, September 2006

Selection of the national grantee for SEANAFE's MS Research Fellowship, October 2006.

Is the SEANAFE facilitation unit capable of meeting the challenges resulting from the implementation of the current plans?

SEANAFE has provided and facilitated useful information to LaoNAFE with regards to various activities and implementation of current plans. Information obtained include CDs, publications, Newsletters (APAN News), training information, workshops, slide series development and others activities.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2 (Markets for Agroforestry Tree Products)

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The topic for the marketing project, "Marketing Options for Bamboo Products", is relevant to the educational and development needs of the country because Lao PDR has large natural bamboo resources which have a good potential for improving farmers' livelihood. However, lack of marketing skills among agroforestry and forestry experts limit further development of this resource into high value added product. Other factors that impede the development of the bamboo industry include high cost of transportation and lack of market information. This project can help to provide information on the value chain and profitability of bamboo production, processing and marketing. The outputs of the project can be used as a case study in Laos and other South East Asian Countries.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

1st Regional (International) Training Cum Planning Workshop, organised at RECOFTC in Bangkok, Thailand 21–26 November 2005, was attended by four representatives from Laos (3 males; 1 female).

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The core team include Dr. Latsamy Bupha, Faculty of Forestry, National University Laos, Mr. Phongxiong Wanneg, Netherlands Development Organization, Dr. Bouvieng Souphanthong, Faculty of Economics and Business Management, National University of Laos, and Mr. Boukaet Sayasouk, Burapha Development Consultants. (3 males, 1 female).

All research activities were completed in July 2006. They were repackaged into case study materials by December 2006 and finalized for the materials by December 2006 and finalized for translation by February 2007.

Topics relevant for men as well as women?

There was no gender analysis in the study.

Small-scale focus on commodity?

The topic is suitable for small-scale farmers.

The whole market chain addressed with a transaction cost approach, i.e. look both at a high farm gate price and a competitive price for the consumers/exporters? Consumer end relevant for the poor?

In the market chain analysis, the team analyse the marketing and transaction cost.

Participated in Regional (International) writing workshop? Regional level teaching materials and curriculum modules prepared? Hard copies as well as electronic? Records of distribution?

The second Regional workshop was attended by three representatives from Laos (2 males; 1 female). It was conducted on 15–18 August 2006 in Chiang Mai and was intended to be a writing workshop producing teaching materials and curriculum modules. The outputs were, however, limited to drafting the content outline of the teaching materials and listing down of the key theme of the curriculum.

In addition, a country coordinator's meeting was organised in Bogor, Indonesia on 8–10 March 2007 with one female participant from Laos. The country case study materials was reviewed and finalised for translation in local language of SEANAFE member countries.

Teaching materials and curriculum modules for national level developed in national language? Small SEANAFE grants awarded for curriculum development?

The Teachers' Guide on MAFTP is expected to be published in December 2007. Universities and Agriculture and Forestry Colleges plan to use the case studies in 2008–09. There has been a plan to hold a round table discussion workshop on November 6, 2007. The translation of country case study on marketing for teaching in local languages is being undertaken.

In addition, a workshop on Slide-series development was conducted on 20–21 November 2006 at Faculty of Forestry, National University of Laos. The objectives of the workshop were to (i) develop slide series in order to contribute effectively agroforestry education, to create greater understanding in B. Sc. and Diploma Students of the agroforestry system and practices applied in northern, central and southern part of Laos, and (ii) to discuss the work plan for 2007. An agroforestry database was also developed in 2007.

National training conducted or planned? Financial support by SEANAFE? Participants? Gender?

There was no report on the country training that should be part of the marketing project.

National research and extension organisations involved in the process?

Not yet, but possibly at a later stage.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

It was not mentioned the technical support from ICRAF.

Benefited from services of regional consultants? National consultants?

The representatives of LaoNAFE were not aware of any consultancy support at the regional or international levels.

Attended international book launching and training workshop?

No book launching as yet.

Impact on curricula in member institutions?

Premature to be assessed.

Plans for information to policy makers at national level?

Seems not yet to have happened in Lao PDR.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 3 (Landscape Agroforestry)**How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?**

The title of the project is “Landscape and livelihood changes in a sub-watershed of Nam Kading River, Bolikhamxay Province, Laos.” The rationale for the project is that high investment on intensive agriculture and forestry has led to degradation of the environment in Lao PDR. The effect of this investment is high conversion of land for cash crops (sugarcane, maize, cassava and rubber). Understanding agroforestry and its links to landscape changes helps to formulate strategies on long term management. The topic is thus relevant, considering that the knowledge, skills and appreciation of agroforestry need to be transferred to students and lecturers in agroforestry related institutions.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Chiang Mai 22–26 March 2007 marked the kick-off of the Landscape Agroforestry Project. All four Lao participants were male.

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The participants in the regional (international) workshop constitute the core team responsible for the research. Work is now in progress with a funding support from SEANAFE of US\$8,295.00 for a period of eight months. Final report is to be completed by December 2007. The project duration is 1 May to 30 January 2008. The quality cannot be assessed at this point in time.

**Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4:
Development of Additional Funding for Regional and National Projects****Sought funding from SEANAFE to prepare proposal? Annually? Received?**

LaoNAFE is one of the two networks that so far requested support for an event targeting the fund raising capability. The national training on proposal writing was conducted on May 2007, in Vientiane. 17 participants attended the workshop (12 males and 5 females). Financial support was received from Sida/SEANAFE (US \$ 2,000).

Proposals for additional funding at national level prepared? Which?

There has been no specific research proposal for securing additional funding from other agencies.

Non-Sida-funding secured?

There has been no non-Sida funds secured for LaoNAFE project at this moment.

Membership fees introduced?

The annual membership fee has not been introduced yet. The membership fee is still being discussed, but it seems that it is difficult to succeed since the economic condition in member institutions is weak.

Other moves towards sustainability?

To sustain the operation of LaoNAFE in the future, efforts will be made to look for national donor. However, it seems that the chances of getting funding are slim.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 6: Development and sharing of international public goods.

M.Sc. thesis research project(s) completed or in progress? Quality? How much money availed? Too much or too little?

The national grantee of SEANAFE recipient is Mr. Khamphouvieng Phouisombath. He completed his M.Sc. thesis at Mahidol University, Thailand in January 2007. The title of the thesis was “Utilization of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) in a community forest area: a case study in Houy Hok Village, Kasy District, Vientiane Province, Lao PDR.”

The topic is important because non timber forest products play a key role in the livelihood of the local community as food, medicine, and for income. Understanding the utilization of NTFPs by the local people will provide general policy framework towards sustainable management of NTFPs in Lao PDR. It also provides incentives for local community to conserve forest for long term social benefits which also include protection of the environment.

Wishes for modifications on this??

Support for funding for the M.Sc. project is okay. It can also be reduced, but not to such extent that the quality of the report will decline. Another possibility is to provide funding for the B.Sc. student and the amount is around US\$500.00. At the B.Sc. level, however, the thesis will be in local language.

Appendix 7. Details on PAFERN

Recalling the past

Desire to revitalise activities of the past which are no longer on the SEANAFE agenda?

PAFERN's earlier work on curriculum development and especially on the development and translation of training materials were useful activities which are currently not featuring as they used to. PAFERN has formulated the new Policy Standards and Guidelines for BS Agroforestry which has been approved by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) for implementation in school year 2007–2008. A new breed of agroforestry professionals will be produced in 2011. They will have general competence in carrying out the science, art and business of a dynamic and interactive process of production, management and utilization of trees and other crops and its linkages with the environment. The move now is towards professionalisation of Agroforestry in the Philippines, which calls for the creation of a licensure examination for BS Agroforestry program. The House Bill (House Bill No. 3117) has been proposed to Senate for the Creating the Board of Agroforestry to institutionalize and professionalise agroforestry in the Philippines. The challenge now is to obtain the approval of the proposed House Bill so that professionalisation of agroforestry is recognized by the government.

Another challenge now facing the agroforestry education is the declining trend of enrolment in agriculture-based higher education including agroforestry. This is related to employment opportunities after the graduation and especially prospects for jobs overseas. The more popular programs such as business studies, ICT and nursing are attracting more students than the agricultural programs. Another feature is that currently more female students than the male enter universities.

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1

National network officially recognised with legal status?

PAFERN has acquired a legal status. This recognition has been acquired through various activities especially with regards to formulating the new Policy Standards and Guidelines for BS Agroforestry and the proposed House Bill for the Creation of Board of Agroforestry to the Senate.

Work plan for current year?

A work plan for 2007 has been prepared with an indication of the expected budget allocation from SEANAFE. It contains nine activities summarised in the following table

Activity	Expected results	Budget (US\$)
3rd National Agroforestry Congress	Compilation of recent developments in agroforestry education, research and extension Issues, concerns, plans and programs for advancing agroforestry in the Philippines	3,500
Lobbying for the professionalisation of agroforestry	Review and approval of proposed House Bill at least at the Technical Working Group level	500
4th General Assembly of PAFERN	Election of new set of officers Plans and programs for 2007 and beyond	3,500
Board Meetings	Two Board Meetings conducted	2,500
Uploading and maintenance of agroforestry web site	Web site accessible to all PAFERN members	1,000
Publication of PAD Monitor	Two issues published	1,000
Small group workshop to develop project proposals	Project proposals aimed at sustaining PAFERN initiatives Collaborative projects with funding institutions	500

Activity	Expected results	Budget (US\$)
Writershop to develop lecture syllabus of agroforestry courses	Course outlines and draft syllabus	2000
Production of lecture syllabus	At least five lecture syllabus developed	
		14,500

Financial support from SEANAFE for the national network management

The total estimated budget for 2007 thus amounts to US \$ 14,500 out of which, according to SEANAFE records, so far US \$ 7,500 was agreed in a contract. In addition to this is the allocation to the projects on Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry with disbursements of US \$ 10,200 and US \$ 8,000 respectively. The mentioned amounts totalling US \$ 25,700 represent the disbursement so far during 2007.

The total disbursement for 2005 was US \$ 15,500, for 2006 US \$ 2,000 and for 2007 US \$ 25,700. Adding the committed grant, US \$ 2,900 for an M. Sc. Student (September 2007 as per report from SEANAFE TA), the total disbursement/commitment to the Philippines during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to *US \$ 46,100*.

Main activities carried out with SEANAFE funding (excl. sub-projects)

2005

Conducted 5th PAFERN Board Meeting on August 5, 2005.

Organized a 1st Policy Forum on Agroforestry on September 22, 2005 which was attended by 75 participants.

Organized 3rd General Assembly of PAFERN on October 26–27, 2005. This was implemented in conjunction with the 2nd National Agroforestry Congress attended by 151 participants

Published the PAFERN 2001 and Beyond (a compilation of PAFERN's accomplishment from 2001–2004 and plans for the coming year).

Continued implementation of the Collaborative Agroforestry research and Extension Project in four state colleges and universities

Misamis Oriental State College of Agriculture and Technology: Agroforestry so Barangay

Iloilo State College of Fisheries: research and Extension Farmer – The Dingle Model for Upland development

Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University: La Union Upland Agroforestry Development program

Isabela State University: Formation of IEC Team Through Academic LGU-Farmer Partnership in Isabela

Worked for the Approval of the Policy Standards and Guidelines for BS Agroforestry (in collaboration with the Taskforce on Agroforestry Education)

Continuous lobbying with the policy-makers senate and House Representatives to support the proposed bills for the Creation of Agroforestry Board.

Continuous dissemination of agroforestry information to the member institutions

2006

Conducted 6th Board Meeting on February 20, 2006 at Institute of Agroforestry (IAF), College of Forestry and Natural Resources, UPLB Los Banos, College, Laguna.

NAFEC Meeting (PAFERN Board meetings) on August 25 2006 (7th), November 8 2006 (8th).

Major actions following the meetings include presentation of matters to be discussed during the 12th SEANAFE Board Meeting

Organized 1st Visayas Agroforestry Congress on November 8–9, 2006 in Iloilo with the aim of reviewing the best agroforestry practices in the Island of Visayas. The congress was organised by PAFERN-Visayas region. In this Congress, the draft of Constitution and By-Laws of the National Agroforesters' Association (NAAP) was presented. NAAP is the partner with PAFERN in lobbying for the professionalisation of agroforestry in the Philippines

Organized 2nd National Agroforestry Congress (October 26–27, 2006), co-organized by the Institute of Agroforestry, PAFERN and the Camarines Sur State Agricultural College

Hold 3rd General Assembly (October 27, 2006)

Participation of PAFERN during the 1st meeting of the Technical Working Group formed by the Philippine House of Representatives in line with the proposed House Bill on the Professionalisation of Agroforestry

Formulation and submission of a project concept paper on Capacity-Building of Educational Institutions and Farming Communities for Enhanced Promotion of Agroforestry and Integrated Natural Resources Management in Southeast Asia for funding by the European Commission.

Publication of the 1st issue August 2006 (No. 1) and 2nd issues October 2007 (No. 2) of the Philippine Agroforestry Development (PAD) Monitor.

Finalization of the draft Constitution and By-Laws and creation of the interim Board of Directors of the of the National Agroforesters' Association of the Philippines

Conducted the first PAFERN national resource mobilization workshop on 18–19 December 2006 at University of the Philippines Los Banos, College, attended by 25 participants. In the workshop, five draft project proposals were produced for submission to potential funding agencies. Linkages with potential funding agencies were developed in the presence of representatives such agencies as Foundation for Philippine Environment, the Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation, the Development Bank of the Philippines, the Philippines Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resource Research and Development (PCARRD), and the World Agroforestry Centre.

2007

Participating in the International Agroforestry Education Conference on Integrating Conservation in Upland Agriculture in Southeast Asia which to be held in Chiang Mai on 24–26 October 2007.

Funded papers and posters that will be presented by PAFERN members are:

Funded paper presentations:

Carlito r. Solera (Integrating Tree Crops, annual crops, and natural rubber in an avenue cropping system: A sustainable soil-conserving and poverty-alleviating agroforestry model in the Philippines uplands – DMMMSU)

Leila D. Landicho (“The Power of School Led Multisectoral Partnership in Agroforestry development and Promotion in the Philippine Uplands: lessons and Experience – UPLB)

Orlando Almoite (“Perspectives and Challenges in Agroforestry Education: The Don Mariano memorial State University, La Union, Philippines Experience”-DMMMSU)

Funded poster presentation:

Florence T. Acay (“Paving the Way to Threefolding Partneship and Triple Bottom Line to Agroforestry in the Philippines: The Experiences of the Upland Resource and development Center of the Isabela State University – Isabela State University)

Information exchange, coordination of network and web site maintenance.

Publication of the Philippine Agroforestry Development (PAD) Monitor

Production of lecture syllabus for major agroforestry courses for use in member institution

Resource mobilization in May 2007

Lobbying for the review of the proposed House Bill to professionalise Agroforestry in the Philippines at least at the Technical Working Group level Jan–December 2007

Holding of the 3rd National Agroforestry Congress in November 2007 in conjunction with the 4th General Assembly of PAFERN

Administrative node existing/functioning?

The Institute of Agroforestry, College of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of the Philippines Los Banos remains as the administrative node of PAFERN. Dr. Dr. Wilfredo M. Carandang is the Chairman of PAFERN and he is responsible for day-to-day matters including the website and assisted by administrative officers at IAF. The operation of PAFERN is based on use of facilities of IAF.

Able to handle funds, how, on its own or through other body?

PAFERN has been able to handle the funds effectively through NAFEC and Board meetings. Such an arrangement has been designed to enable member institutions to participate in the project.

When were NAFEC meetings held, attendance, minutes? Gender balance?

5th PAFERN Board Meeting on August 5, 2005 (minutes are available).

6th Board Meeting on February 20, 2006 (minutes are available). 11 officials attended.

7th NAFEC Meeting (PAFERN Board meeting) on August 25, 2006.

8th NAFEC Meeting (PAFERN Board meetings) on November 8, 2006.

Did national chair participate in SEANAPE board meetings? Which of 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th?

The PAFERN Chairman (Dr. Wilfredo Carandang) participated in 11th (2006), 12th (2006) 13th (2007) and 14th (2007) board meetings. The 10th (2005) Board meeting was attended by Dr. Virgilo Villanco.

Website in English/National language? Satisfactory and updated?

There is a website with information on PAFERN, *Country Coordinator, Board Members and Officers, Major accomplishments of the network*, activities for 2007. It can be accessed at www.pafern.org The website is in English it is managed by Institute of Agroforestry, UPLB. The web site includes the following information:

Institution database

Agroforestry resources

Links

IAF

Membership

There are currently 31 members on PAFERN. All members are now actively involved in PAFERN activities including Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry projects, Agroforestry Congress, Training courses, research projects and others. It is a challenge to ensure that all members are benefiting to the extent that they remain paying members of PAFERN.

Newsletters, other outputs at national level?

PAFERN produces quarterly newsletter Philippine Agroforestry Development (PAD) Monitor. It is one of the means to spread the recent development and trends in the field of agroforestry. The publication serves as an important vehicle in reaching out and promoting agroforestry development in various sectors of the Philippine society. So far three issues have been published: August 2006 (No. 1), October 2006 (No. 2), December 2006 (No. 3). Other outputs include a report on Philippines Agroforestry Education and Research Network (PAFERN) 2001 and Beyond, CDs on National Congress, and other training materials related to agroforestry.

Implemented additional activities that were not planned in the SEANAFE context?

In 2006, PAFERN conducted the National Resource Mobilization Workshop on December 18–19, 2006 which served as a venue to develop the resource mobilization framework vis-à-vis the agroforestry development trends, and thrusts of the potential funding institutions.

Is the SEANAFE facilitation unit capable of meeting the challenges resulting from the implementation of the current plans?

The response was positive. In particular, useful information provided from SEANAFE on research grants from other sources than SEANAFE was mentioned. Other information was obtained through emails. Other forms of information including CDs, publications, Newsletters (APAN news), training information, workshops, and others are regularly received from SEANAFE.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The topic for the marketing project, “Market Development for Coconut-Based Agroforestry Farms in Quezon province, Philippines”, was selected because coconut is a major component of the country’s agriculture economy and landscape. The coconut industry is considered as among the major pillars of the Philippine economy. Understanding the marketing and value chain is important for the educational and development needs of the country. Also, the topic helps to increase the knowledge and skills among agroforestry lecturers and graduates of universities not only in the Philippines but also in the South East Asia countries.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

1st Regional (International) Training Cum Planning Workshop, organised at RECOFT in Bangkok, Thailand 21–26 November 2005, was attended by four representatives from the Philippines (1 male; 3 females).

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The core team consists of Dr. (Ms) Isabelita M. Pabuayon, Lecturer, Dept of Agricultural Economics, College of Economics & Management, University of The Philippines Los Banos (UPLB). The team members are Ms. Rowena D. Cabahug, Researcher, Institute of Agroforestry, College of Forestry & Natural Resources, UPLB, Ms. Stella Villa A. Castillo, Lecturer, Dept of Forestry Products & Paper Science, College of Forestry & Natural Resources, UPLB Mr. Marlo D. Mendoza, Researcher, Institute of Agroforestry, College of Forestry & Natural Resources, UPLB.

All research activities were completed in July 2006. They were repacked into case study materials by December 2006 and finalized for translation by December 2006. The Philippine team expressed a degree of discontent with the outcome of the “repacking”, noting that much of their original details got lost in the process. They would prefer also to have the original report being prominent. The case study will not be translated into local language in the Philippines as English is used in higher education.

Small-scale focus on commodity?

The research topic, “Market Development for Coconut-Based Agroforestry Farms in Quezon province, Philippines” is relevant from the small-scale farmers’ perspective. The coconut industry is the largest industry in Quezon province. Most of the business in coconut production is family-oriented business.

Participated in Regional (International) writing workshop? Regional level teaching materials and curriculum modules prepared? Hard copies as well as electronic? Records of distribution?

The second Regional workshop intended to be a writing workshop producing teaching materials and curriculum modules was conducted on 15–18 August 2006 in Chiang Mai with 3 female and 1 male participants from Philippines attending (same group as in workshop I). The outputs were, however,

limited to drafting the content outline of the teaching materials and listing down of the key theme of the curriculum.

In addition, a country coordinator's meeting was organised in Bogor on 7–9 March 2007 with one female participant from the Philippines.

Teaching materials and curriculum modules for national level developed in national language? Quality on a scale 1–5? Small SEANAFE grants awarded for curriculum development?

The new curriculum of Bachelor Science of Agroforestry (BSAF) has been adopted by the universities offering as declared by the Committee on Higher Education (CHED). In this new curriculum, 46 units are new major agroforestry courses. Teaching materials are urgently needed to meet the need for the school academic year 2007–2008.

Teaching materials produced from the marketing agroforestry project are useful source of reference in this subject. The teaching materials produced are in English with materials in CD format being finalized.

National training conducted or planned? Financial support by SEANAFE? Participants? Gender?

The national level training was conducted in May 2007. The training course revolved around the area of concept/framework of marketing, market research/market study and integrating this concept to the agroforestry curricula. The title of the workshop was “Marketing of Coconut in Quezon Province, Philippines.” It was attended by 26 people from the member institutions. Financial support was obtained from SEANAFE.

National research and extension organisations involved in the process?

Not yet, but possibly at a later stage.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

This was mentioned as rather limited. Comments on the summary of the research report was, however, received and mentioned.

Benefited from services of regional consultants? National consultants?

The representatives of PAFERN did not mention any consultancy support but were aware of a regional consultant's input in the marketing project.

Attended international book launching and training workshop?

No book launching as yet.

Impact on curricula in member institutions?

Premature to be assessed.

Plans for information to policy makers at national level?

Seems not yet to have happened in the Philippines.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 3

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The title of the project is “Landscape Agroforestry Dynamics in Two Sub-watersheds within the Makiling Forest Reserve in Los Banos, Laguna, Philippines.” It was felt that the topic is relevant in the context of agroforestry landscape agroforestry framework in the Philippines. The general objective of the project is to characterize and analyze the dynamics of agroforestry landscape development in two sub-watersheds within the Makiling Forest Reserve. Specifically the project aims to: (i) describe the biophysical and socio-economic cultural conditions in the two sub-watersheds, (ii) characterize the structure and functions of agroforestry and other land use systems in two sub-watersheds, (iii) define

and analyze the factors that influence the development of the watershed towards integrated landscape, and (iv) formulate policy recommendations towards more systematic agroforestry based land use in the two sub-watersheds.

The project is relevant in the context of educational and development needs of the country. This is so because forest plays important role in watershed hydrology, wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities to the local community, biodiversity conservation, microclimate regulation, carbon sink and other ecological services. The conversion of forestland to other uses will result negative externalities not only to local community but also globally. Understanding the issues and factors that contribute to the degradation of forestland areas at the landscape level will provide useful information for the policy makers to formulate strategies and policies for long term sustainable management of forest. In addition, the link between social conflicts among various stakeholders and environmental consideration can be fully explored. This case study would provide useful insight information on landscape agroforestry not only in the Philippines but in the South East Asian Region as well.

Regional (International) training workshop attended?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Chiang Mai 22–26 March 2007 marked the kick-off of the Landscape Agroforestry Project. The Philippine participants were Dr. Roberto G. Visco, Dr. Wilfredo M. Carandang, Mr. Ronald C. Estoque and Ms. Pia Fleur Khristine M. Noriel. The team comprises three males and one female participant.

Core team selected and market case studies completed?

The core four who attended the international workshop constitutes the country team. Work is now in progress with a funding support from SEANAFE for a period of ten months (1 April 2007–30 January 2008). A one week field work was conducted in August 2007 and some of the activities are still going on. The second progress report supposed to be completed by September 2007. The quality cannot be assessed at this point in time.

Topics relevant for men as well as women?

Topics that are relevant for men and women were not specifically identified and mentioned. Even the topic of landscape agroforestry itself is confusing among the experts in agroforestry. There is a need to rename of the topic or redefine of the scope of the project.

Small-scale farmer focus?

The focus on various land use of agroforestry practices found in the Makling Forest Reserve system might be relevant for the small scale farmers.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4

Sought funding from SEANAFE to prepare proposal? Annually? Received?

PAFERN applied for US \$ 2,000 for a resource mobilisation workshop in 2006. It was conducted and reports submitted to SEANAFE.

Membership fees introduced?

An annual membership fee of P 5,000 per institution was introduced since the establishment of PAFERN. Each member institution is also required to pay an annual fee of P 2,000. The fees will yield a minimum financial base for survival. It was noted that the fees collected were not enough to cover major activities of PAFERN.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 6

M.Sc. thesis research project(s) completed or in progress? Quality?

How much money availed? Too much or too little?

There has been no application received by the Board to pursue MS Thesis. It was noted that most of the faculty members of member-institutions may have already finished their MS degrees and are now into Ph.D, while others are still in their initial stage of the graduate program. Based on 8th Board Meeting, it was suggested that the establishment of the Undergraduate Thesis Support Program will be more appropriate in the Philippines. For instance, in 2003 and 2004, PAFERN has supported about 10 undergraduate students with partial support of P10,000. Instead of just supporting one thesis/study in the case of MS Thesis Support, the amount of US\$2,900 can be divided among many undergraduate students to implement their research/studies in agroforestry.

Contrary to these opinions the SEANAFE TA reported after the review team had left Philippines that an M.Sc. student had been nominated.

Appendix 8. Details on IndoNAFE

Recalling the past

Desire to revitalise activities of the past which are no longer on the SEANAFE agenda?

INAFE conducted two researches for master thesis on AF marketing and landscape AF, one is supported by regional funding and another one by national funding. Capacity building of lectures in term of widening knowledge will be more efficient through self learning modules using multi-media learning-teaching technology deliver through internet (ICT) or CD.

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1

National network officially recognised with legal status?

INAFE is not recognized as an official organization. The INAFE organization only consists of a chair and members or contact persons in universities. The membership was appointed based on meeting agreement without clear right and obligation (undocumented). It is also not clear whether the membership is individual, institution or both individual and institution. INAFE charter is still in draft form and the agenda to formalize it is unclear. The current chairman is also chairman for other organizations as well as an expert of minister of agriculture for food security. With this position he could possibly get funding for activities related to agroforestry, Nevertheless, this fund is allocated to unplanned activities, therefore the relation to INAFE programs becomes vague.

A legal/formal status of INAFE would be important to empower the organization. Empowering could be generated/driven by self interest to be a member, with payment of a fee as interest indicator. This would generate a need to get benefit from the organization; in this case, leadership of organization needs to create innovative program to be attractive to members.

Work plan for current year?

INAFE does not prepare work plan for 2007, at least for the period of July–December 2007. The Plan of 2006–July’ 2007 and implementations are presented as a “Country Network Accomplishment Report” signed by chairman on 9 July 2007. Therefore the activities of INAFE members after July 2007, mostly based on SEANAFE programs of 2007 or unplanned activities related to agroforestry.

Financial support from SEANAFE for the national network management

The total disbursement to Indonesia for 2005 was US \$ 19,640 and for 2006 US \$ 7,261. Adding the disbursement of US \$ 18,200 made so far during 2007 and a committed support of US \$ 2,900 for the national M.Sc. grantee and US \$ 3,500 for the “Regional” grantee, the total disbursement/commitment to Indonesia during the current phase of SEANAFE amounts to *US \$ 51,501*. The amount includes disbursements for the two projects commented further on below under objectives 2 and 3. The projects, which amount to US \$ 33,700, are both handled by Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB). During the last 18 months the only national activity that SEANAFE funded was a NAFEC meeting (US \$ 1,261).

In addition, Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM) was paid 38,910,000 Rupees to host the 14th Board Meeting of SEANAFE (Regional activity) 6–8 August 2007. The SEANAFE TA reported that all of that was not used and a refund is expected.

For the year 2007 (until September 2007) the financial support for activities implemented by the national network itself is very small or in fact nothing. This is due to lack of national networking program planning for 2007. Currently, it is only the two sub-projects, both handled by IPB are supported by SEANAFE.

Main activities carried out with SEANAPE funding (excl. sub-projects)

2005:

The First NAFEC Meeting in August 25–26, 2005, at Bogor Agriculture University, attended by 7 lecturers (6 male, 1 female) and 2 ICRAF (SEANAPE TA and Joel Tukan).

NAFEC meeting for Planning educational survey, September 29, 2005, University Lambung Mangkurat, 6 lecturers, including 1 female

NAFEC meeting to formulate the material for policy campaign of the agroforestry education, December 8, 2005, Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Esat Kalimantan, 6 lecturers, including 1 female

Website development for information and communication. The website is <http://www.ipb.ac.id/pafi>
Issued one INAFE newsletter

2006.

General meeting, in February 6–9, 2006.

Participating in ANAFE Board meeting, Kenya 13–14 November 2006.

Drafting of INAFE Charter, November 13–14 2006.

Selection of the national grantee for SEANAPE's MS research fellow, October 2006.

2007.

Hosted SEANAPE board meeting in Yogyakarta, August 2007

Administrative node existing/functioning?

INAFE is now chaired by Prof Dr Suhardi from Gajah Mada University (UGM), but the administrative node is unclear, whether it is in Faculty of Forestry Gajah Mada University where the main office of present chairman is or in another place. Formally, the administrative node followed the office of the chairman, in this case it should be in Faculty of Forestry UGM, Yogyakarta. In fact, Prof Dr Hadi Susilo Arifin of IPB is a moderator for INAFE mailing list to maintain the communication among member. The two running main activities are coordinated by Dr Leti Sundawati (Marketing for Agroforestry Tree Products), and Prof Dr Hadi Susilo Arifin (Landscape Agroforestry) both are based in Bogor (Bogor Agricultural University, IPB).

The INAFE web site was developed in 2005 by the IPB team, but it was not updated during the last 18 months. The classic reason for the unclear administrative node is budget limitation, but the effort to get budget allocation from SEANAPE is minimal, while such budget could have been availed if it was requested.

Able to handle funds, how, on its own or through other body?

Generating and managing fund are possible through integrating activities of INAFE with programs of other institutions. In this way, co-funding can be secured for seminars, workshops or studies. The other option is that member institutions are nominated as lead agencies on certain activities. The latter is the case for the Marketing project and the Landscape Agroforestry where IPB is the lead agency. Both activities have been designed in such a way that other member institutions are involved in order to secure coverage of different ecozones.

When were NAFEC meetings held, attendance, minutes? Gender balance?

The first Indonesia NAFEC during SEANAPE Phase II was in August 25–26, 2005, at Bogor Agriculture University, attended by 7 lecturers (6 male, 1 female) and 2 ICRAF staff (SEANAPE TA and Joel Tukan). This meeting decided on a membership fee of Rp 500.000 (equivalent to USD 50) per year per institution, and the first membership fee will be due on November 2005 (at the second INAFE Meeting).

Another event was conducted on September 29, 2005, at Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarbaru, South Kalimantan, to discuss data collection, analysis, reporting and formulating policy recommendations to the future of agriculture and natural resources education (prepare of circulation material to discuss with Minister related with agroforestry education), attended by 6 lecturers, including 1 female.

There was yet another meeting on December 8, 2005, at Mulawarman University Samarinda, East Kalimantan to formulate material for policy and campaign of the agroforestry education, attended by, 6 lecturers, including 1 female.

During 2006 there were two NAFEC meetings. The first was a National General Meeting on 7–8 February 2006. One important output of that meeting was the election of Dr. Suhardi Manto of Gadjah Mada University as a chairman of INAFE to replace Dr Ma'mun Sarma of IPB. The second meeting was on 13–14 November 2006 to select the national team members for the SEANAFE landscape agroforestry project.

Did national chair participate in SEANAFE board meetings? Which of 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th?

The INAFE Chairman participated in all SEANAFE Board meetings.

Website in English/National language? Satisfactory and updated?

There is a website but it was not updated during the last 18 months.

Membership

Currently 20 universities are recorded as members of INAFE. The membership fee decided since November 2005 has not been implemented. Five universities are now actively involved, mainly through the Marketing and Landscape Agroforestry projects. It is a challenge to ensure that all members are benefiting to the extent that they are ready to pay membership fees.

Newsletters, other outputs at national level?

INAFE issued two Newsletters in 2005, but it is since then not continued.

Implemented additional activities that were not planned in the SEANAFE context?

Coordination for country research activity for SEANAFE's Markets for AF Tree Products project, January–July 2006, and Selection of the national grantee for SEANAFE's MS Research Fellowship, October 2006, reported as unplanned but implemented (attachment 2a, annual report 2006). General studies in UNHAS-Makasar, UNTAN-Tanjungpura-West Kalimantan, and in Kupang are activities that were implemented in 2006 but really unplanned (reported in country accomplishment, 2006–July 2007).

Is the SEANAFE facilitation unit capable of meeting the challenges resulting from the implementation of the current plans?

In general the response was positive.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2

How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?

The major issue on marketing of agricultural products in Indonesia is the marketing infrastructure, including price information. Due to the wide-spread small-scale agriculture, cooperation among farmers is also necessary and important.

The impression of the training on marketing of agroforestry products is not really on the topic itself, rather than a new approach of lectures material preparation where the case study help to understand the theory.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

Four Indonesian (two are female) attended the 1st Regional (International) Training Cum Planning workshop, organised in Thailand 21–26 November 2005.

Core team selected and market case studies completed? Quality on a scale 1–5? (5=best)

The Indonesia team is coordinated by Dr Leti Sundawati of Faculty of Forestry IPB and includes lecture from Faculty of Forestry, Faculty of Economic and Management, IPB, and also from Nusa Bangsa University (UNB), Bogor. The case study or research has been completed and the results of 5 cases study from 5 countries have been consolidated and translated to Indonesian as the lecture material.

Small-scale focus on commodity?

The subject of the study was decided in the country representative meeting in Phase I SEANAFE project. It could be based on the important value of the commodity relative to other commodities.

Case study of a commodity chain market in small scale seems less effective to fulfil the marketing strategy of agroforestry products in general. As known, the agricultural land ownership in Indonesia is very fragmented, therefore a more comprehensive strategy of marketing is needed rather than focus on a commodity. Development of information system on price, market opportunity/needs, technology availability for post harvesting is important to give an effective commodity choice for farmer.

Participated in Regional (International) writing workshop?**Regional level teaching materials and curriculum modules prepared?****Quality of outcome on a scale 1–5? Hard copies as well as electronic? Records of distribution?**

Indonesian, INAFE delegation (2 males, 2 females) attended the 2nd Regional (International) Training workshop, organised in Thailand 15–18 August 2006, and one Indonesian female participated in Country Coordinators' meeting on 7–9 March 2007 in Bogor.

Teaching materials and curriculum modules for national level developed in national language?**Small SEANAFE grants awarded for curriculum development?**

Translation of the teaching materials is the activity of the marketing project, so it was funded by the project fund component. Completed.

National training conducted or planned? Financial support by SEANAFE? Participants? Gender?

This lecture material has been used for ToT in August 2007 in which 21 participants from 16 universities attended, 5 participants were female. The recruitment of participants was, however, not all known by contact persons or dean as they were commonly lecturers on study leave. This arrangement reduced cost but it is apparent that not all lecturers gave feed back to their home institution.

National research and extension organisations involved in the process?

Not yet, but possibly at a later stage.

Technical support secured from ICRAF?

This was mentioned as rather limited. However, an ICRAF staff (Joel Tukan) served as one of several resource persons in the first international training workshop. For the phase 2, SEANAFE TA has sought assistance from some ICRAF SEA technical staff in packaging of the case study materials. Comments made by Jim Roscheteo and Laxman Joshi were considered where necessary.

Benefited from services of regional consultants? National consultants?

The representatives of INAFE were not aware of any consultancy support.

Attended international book launching and training workshop?

No book launching as yet. Base on SEANAFE agenda, it will be at the end the year 2007.

Impact on curricula in member institutions?

Several universities whose representatives participated in the ToT Marketing for AF tree products has included the teaching material into their lectures.

Plans for information to policy makers at national level?

Seems not yet to have happened in Indonesia.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 3**How relevant is the topic for the educational and development needs of the country?**

Agroforestry in the landscape scale actually is a multi-objective of a land management. Research on that has already resulted in a pool of knowledge. The problem on land management is actually not really on how to arrange the land use on a certain land, but more on non-technical aspects, such as land tenure, access right on state land, etc. It is, therefore, essential that socio-economic aspects are given prominence in this project.

Regional (International) training workshop attended with 4 participants? Gender?

The Regional (International) Training and Planning workshop, organised in Chiang Mai 22–26 March 2007 marked the kick-off of the Landscape Agroforestry Project.

Core team selected and market case studies completed? Quality on a scale 1–5? (5=best)

The Indonesia team of landscape agroforestry has been established and it is coordinated by Prof Dr Hadi Susilo Arifin of Faculty of Agriculture IPB and involved lecturer from Gadjah Mada University (UGM), (incl. the INAFE Chairman) and Lampung University (UNILA).

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4**Proposals for additional funding at national level prepared? Which?**

INAFE is late to become aware of the idea on proposal preparation. The SEANAFE reminder was received on mid September 2007. The INAFE chairman plans to discuss this in early November 2007 during a planned NAFEC meeting in Bandung.

Non-Sida-funding secured?

The INAFE initiative to run the activity related to INAFE for which there is no specific funding is to integrate activities in related institutions to achieve co-funding. This arrangement is mainly applicable to workshops and general studies.

Membership fees introduced?

An annual membership fee of Rp 500,000 was actually decided in November 2005, but until now, it is not implemented.

Other moves towards sustainability?

INAFE charter is necessary to be agreed by member. The NAFEC then is necessary to look into possible future directions. It was also noted that there are many issues on the political agenda that has a potential to make INAFE viable. One such is the linkages between land use changes and global warming, which is an area that policy makers are aware needs research and teaching inputs. In this case, INAFE is important to initiate collaboration with other parties concerned with global warming.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 6

M.Sc. thesis research project(s) completed or in progress? Quality? How much money availed? Too much or too little?

The regional grantee is a man embarking on his research for the M.Sc. His research has been finished and now in the process of writing in English (translating) and is expected to complete the translation work by November 2007. The amount granted is regarded as well enough.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Activities and outputs in relation to the LFA Objective 1

Conclusion:

INAFE-SEANAFAE activities within period of May 2005–September 2007 are still far from achievement of the objective 1 (an effective regional and national networking infrastructure).

NAFEC was active at the beginning (the first year) of Phase II to run organization and to develop the national networking. This is indicated by activities and outputs, but recently (the last year) the activities to maintain and strengthen national networking infrastructure tended to decline.

Indicators of the less effective organization are:

The organization (INAFE) charter is still in draft form.

Unclear annual program, unsecured funding mechanism, unclear administration node,

NAFEC meetings, national general meetings and formal documents recognizing NAFEC are not well documented.

The website is not updated regularly, newsletters, etc. are not published periodically.

The INAFE members and related persons to INAFE are perhaps the most important resource of INAFE to develop the networking for agroforestry education. Therefore, a national committee should build capacity of the organisation.

Recommendations

To build the organization capacity, INAFE charter is important and urgently needs to be well formulated, agreed and issued as the foundation on which to build the capacity of the organization.

In order to institutionalise the INAFE in the university, an advisory board consisting of Deans needs to be considered as a part of organization.

The nominated contact persons in faculties, which are members of INAFE, should be formalized through Deans' letters. This could imply that membership should be at faculty level rather than on institutional level. If INAFE membership is still decided to be on institutional level, then the members of INAFE will consist of contact persons of faculties. The contact person is needed to expand the internal (faculty and university) networking. The Dean can delegate to other staff member to be the faculty or institutional representative. For example, a Dean could delegate his mandate as board member to vice dean or contact person. Contact person of a faculty could delegate his mandate as member to colleagues in same faculty. The mandated persons have obligation to report all activities to superiors and colleagues.

The main constraint to run organization is the very limited resources they have, especially financial. The membership fee, which has been decided since November 2005, has still not been implemented. This is a challenge to the chairman and the committee. Membership is a must, on one hand to show

the seriousness of a member, but on the other hand also for the committee or organization to show the attractiveness of the organisation to members. This is not easy, but should be realized.

Networking development continued big financial constraints could be initiated by utilizing the existing Information and Communication Technology (ICT) network. Several universities have developed ICT networking through LAN and internet. Such facilities should be utilized to maximum, at least to maintain communication through e-mail, VoIP, active web, and now mobile phone has possibilities to push e-mail, therefore mobile phone could function as mobile PC for retrieving e-mail. Communication can thus be done anywhere.

The Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of National Education launched INHERENT Program 2–3 years ago, This program is aimed to develop the inter-universities' networking using ICT to widen the accessibility of higher education. This program could be for ICT infrastructure development, e-learning management development, and e-learning content development.

INAFE could take the opportunity to develop the agroforestry education which is open to academic society, but also to all parties related to agroforestry research and implementation.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 2 and 3

Conclusion

The objective 2 (a core group of teachers understand and are able to teach marketing of agroforestry tree products) is about to be reached. Five national case studies on marketing of agroforestry tree products have been completed, a regional teaching materials and curriculum module on marketing of agroforestry tree products has been developed, and INAFE has translated teaching materials and curriculum modules and trained 21 lectures (5 of them are women) from 16 universities in methods and tools for studying marketing of agroforestry tree products.

The output “Principles and practices of marketing agroforestry products are incorporated into curricula” is still premature to evaluate, but need to be monitored.

The activities to achieve objective 3 are the same with the activities to achieve objective 2. The difference is only on the substance of research for teaching material and curriculum module. The research activities was just initiated in June 2007 and planned to be completed in 2008. Based on the experiences of work towards objective 2, the achievement of the objective 3 is not expected to encounter any major difficulties. It is still premature to monitor the outputs 4 and 5 under objective 3.

Recommendations

Tools for monitoring of the outputs 4 and 5 as well as objective indicators should be formulated early and incorporated in the program of SEANAFE of 2008–2009, to make sure there is monitoring and to ensure it is budgeted for.

The results of the research should be availed first for peer review from other parties or experts before incorporated in teaching materials or curricula modules. The 5 case studies on marketing agroforestry tree products are compiled without comparative study to get lesson learned from those studies.

Teaching materials and curricula module development in agroforestry will be more comprehensive if not limited to the research of SEANAFE programs, but enriched with other research results or best practices on agroforestry experiences.

SEANAFE-INAFE programs should be more focused on teaching materials and curriculum module development toward what we called “borderless education” or “global education”, where the courses or lectures are conducted by any university are acknowledgeable by any other universities (credit transfer system is developed). Research programs can thus easily be incorporated with other related institutions.

Activities and outputs in relation to Objective 4

Conclusion

The objective 4 is that SEANAFE has secured additional funding for two regional and two national projects. SEANAFE, and especially INAFE has so far not prepared well to achieve this objective.

Recommendation

INAFE should first strengthen the organizational capacity to prepare the activities to achieve this objective 4. For these purposes, recommendations have been written in the recommendation for objective 1. Studies on forestry and environmental policies have actually already been conducted by several institutions. Those studies need to be synthesised and advocated to policy makers.

Appendix 9. RECOFTC notes on proposed collaboration, October 2006

Draft Discussion Note

Developing and Implementing Regional Support Mechanisms for CBNRM Higher Education Institutions in South East Asian Region:

A RECOFTC and SEANAFE Collaboration

Status: DRAFT for discussion

– This discussion note has been developed to consider areas of collaboration between SEANAFE and RECOFTC during the proposed meeting on 15 November between Jess Fernandez (SEANAFE), Dr Monton (KU University and SEANAFE Chair) and Michael Newman and Peter Stephen (RECOFTC)

Dated: October 2006

Authors: Michael Newman and Peter Stephen, RECOFTC

Background

At the 12th SEANAFE Board Meeting, held between the 21–24 August, 2006 at IRRI, Los Baños, Philippines, the SEANAFE Board agreed to explore opportunities to strengthen ties and collaborative partnerships with both SEARCA and RECOFTC (a budget of approximately \$5,000 has been allocated for this activity in 2007). The decision arising from the 12th SEANAFE board meeting was: *The Board DECIDED to organize roundtable discussion to analyse the CB (capacity building) work of the 3 organizations and suggest a way forward.*

(By the end of November 2007 plans for the roundtable meeting are to be finalized to identify a strategic framework and findings reported back to the SEANAFE Board in January 2007).

Under the Capacity Building Program of RECOFTC, one of the key activities for 2007 is the investigation of mechanisms for improving CF (and CBNRM) curriculum in higher education institutions in the region. The collaboration of RECOFTC, SEANAFE and SEARCA in the broad arena of curricula development should build upon the strengths of the three organizations and benefit all those in the region seeking to improve curricula and ultimately learning outcomes for students.

RECOFTC is keen to further explore a collaborative partnership with both SEANAFE and SEARCA and this discussion note is to help start the exploration process.

Summary of RECOFTC'S current work in CBNRM curricula and training development

RECOFTC, as a regional facilitating body that has operated in the South East Asia for the last 20 years, has extensive experience in facilitating regional network initiatives. RECOFTC has been involved in several higher education initiatives including:

- Collaborating with the International Partnership for Forestry Education to develop an undergraduate 'Community/Social Forest Management' course;
- Working with SNV-Laos and the National University of Laos on the development of curriculum for non-timber forest products; and

- A review of CBNRM curriculum development in Asia with a particular focus on the use of competencies in curriculum development.

Recently, RECOFTC has also been involved in the development and delivery of an online based learning initiative, Adaptive Linkages and Learning in CBNRM (ALL in CBNRM). ALL in CBNRM involves eight learning groups from a range in institutions (including Universities, Government Ministries and NGOs) participating in an eighteen month program involving ten learning modules on a range of CBNRM themes. The program is primarily delivered through an online forum, with learning groups participating from across the South East Asian region.

RECOFTC will also host The Second Regional Community Forestry Forum for Asia in March 2007 which will bring together senior government delegates from 13 countries to discuss governance mechanisms to address equity and benefit sharing from Community Forestry/Community Based Forest Management.

In addition, RECOFTC has an extensive library of training manuals and material on a diverse range of CF and CBNRM related topics which could be adapted to assist in the innovative delivery of CBNRM curricula. RECOFTC is currently developing up a landscape level training program titled 'The Landscape Functions and People: Applying Strategic Planning Approaches for Good Natural Resource Governance'. This training program is scheduled for 29 January to 9 February 2007.

RECOFTC's strength and niche in Asia is its extensive knowledge in *community-based NRM* processes, practices and policies. This overlaps to a degree with SEANAFE's mandate in agroforestry education, but RECOFTC sees benefit in working with SEANAFE to further facilitate its work in the higher education sector and it is hoped SEANAFE sees benefit in working with RECOFTC through the current activities outlined above the RECOFTC is currently undertaking.

To set the scene

Community based natural resource management (CBNRM) is being increasingly adopted as an important policy instrument in forestry and other natural resource management sectors in Asia. During the last decade universities and other training and education institutes have responded to this trend and attempted to adjust their curricula and curricula delivery accordingly. The developments in agroforestry curriculum reflect this trend.

Whilst progress has been made by some institutions, the 2006 RECOFTC review of CBNRM curriculum development in South East Asia¹, identified a clear regional need for:

- more systematic and systemic frameworks and approaches to curriculum development, based on articulated qualifications or competencies,
- improved access to relevant materials of high quality for adaptation and use by teachers and students,
- more effective linkages of education with field realities and research,
- more effective ways of sharing experiences, lessons, best practices and innovations to enhance the capacity of lecturers in design and facilitation of more effective learning approaches.

The intention of this proposal (discussion) is not to develop a universal CBNRM curriculum. Such an approach would not be reflective of the significant cultural and social differences within South East Asian countries. Rather, the proposal (discussion) aims to build on and better integrate existing curriculum development initiatives and higher education networks and only develop new collaborative national and/or regional curricula support mechanisms where necessary. (The Annex lists a number of possible key partners).

¹ Veer, C. (2006) *Curriculum Development for CB NRM in Asia – Report of a Scoping Exercise*, RECOFTC, Bangkok.

Possible areas for collaborative work between RECOFTC and SEANAFE

RECOFTC has a very successful and popular training of trainers (ToT) training program titled 'The ART of Building Training Capacities'. RECOFTC could work with SEANAFE to develop and implement a customized training program for NRM lecturers interested in developing more participatory and learner centered ways of delivery material in community forestry and/or CBNRM.

Immediate SEANAFE Linkage: This would complement the current *training of trainers* work conducted by SEANAFE.

RECOFTC could collaborate with SEANAFE in the delivery of the upcoming Landscape Level Planning course scheduled for January–February 2007. While arrangements between RECOFTC and Wageningen International (formerly IAC) are now well underway for the development of the training material, key SEANAFE staff/member could attend the training to further enhance both their knowledge and understanding of the teaching and learning processes regarding the multi-disciplinary dimensions of landscapes.

Immediate SEANAFE Linkage: This could complement the work of key SEANAFE members under the *Landscape Agroforestry thematic project*

RECOFTC could collaborate with SEANAFE on its work on payment for environmental services (PES). RECOFTC is hosting a workshop on this issue with RUPES, SNV and WWF in January 2007 in Lombok Indonesia. Again material arising from this workshop could be useful in the further development of the Agroforestry Landscape thematic project currently underdevelopment by SEANAFE.

Immediate SEANAFE Linkage: This could complement the work of key SEANAFE members under the *Landscape Agroforestry thematic project*

A key SEANAFE member could be invited to the upcoming Second Regional Community Forestry Forum for Asia in March 2007 as an observer. This would again enhance understanding of key forest policy impacting on developments in the region. RECOFTC is also hosting theme 10 of the ALL in CBNRM project which is titled 'Participatory Processes for Policy Change'. Again there is scope for the sharing of material and further collaborative work in this area.

Immediate SEANAFE Linkage: This could complement the work of key SEANAFE members under the *Forest and Environmental Policies thematic project*.

RECOFTC could collaborate with SEANAFE in the development of the fourth thematic project that is currently under discussion by SEANAFE. The development of this fourth thematic project could not only cover intellectual development of material, but also transition of material into curriculum updating and teaching material. Themes that RECOFTC has an immediate competitive advantage in are conflict, governance, livelihoods and an interesting theme for possible exploration may be 'Capacity Building'.

Immediate SEANAFE Linkage: The collaborative work between RECOFTC and SEANAFE on the *fourth thematic project area*.

RECOFTC is interested in further exploring the development of *competencies for CBNRM* and their use in curriculum development. Competencies have been identified as a useful tool to provide a focused and a strategic framework to the development and implementation of curricula support mechanisms. Several reviews of various industry competencies have been already been conducted in the region. For example, the ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation has recently published '*Competence Standards for Protect Area Jobs in South East Asia*'. The ASEAN review provides detailed competencies for 24 key protected areas jobs. In addition the Malaysian-German Forestry Education Project (MGFEP) has

undertaken a similar approach in the development of new forestry curricula with the University of Malaysia, Sabah. By building on such reviews, selected universities (identified through the SEANAFE network) would be engaged to undertake an analysis of current competencies for recent graduates required by employers in the field of community-based natural resource management. These reviews would provide an indication of regional priority areas and a guiding framework for CBNRM curricula development and curricula delivery support.

Further more the work on competencies for CBNRM would allow for the establishment of a collaborative platform for information exchange on the broader topic of community based natural resource management and further maximize existing CBNRM higher education activities in the region. Further advantages of this approach are:

Encourages collaboration between the range of university faculties involved in CBNRM, and between universities and the 'CBNRM job market';

CBNRM curriculum development needs are strategically identified;

Universities are involved throughout;

Encourage collaboration between a range of related networks and institutions.

RECOFTC has started to develop up a 'concept note' on this area to seek financial support for the implementation of such a project. RECOFTC would see a two stage process:

A guiding framework through which competencies for CBNRM are analyzed at the national level (The ASEAN study could provide a model for this work). It would be hoped that national members of the SEANAFE network could conduct this analysis at the national level. A series of workshops would review outcomes at the national level and a regional workshop would identify regional trends or themes and start the process of matching current curricula to identified competencies/standards.

The second stage would maximize current higher education initiatives to develop support mechanisms for CBNRM curriculum development based on the findings and outcomes of Stage 1. This process would utilize existing higher education networks (SEANAFE, MLI, and IPFE), and training institutions (IIRR, AIT, and SEARCA) (See Annex 1 for potential partners) and further develop collaborative partnerships and provide a unique opportunity to establish a strong regional platform where valuable experiences from different projects, networks and initiatives could be shared and maximized.

Universities in Thailand and Malaysia have already adopted a market research approach to curricula development. For example, a review of competencies required for recent forestry graduates was a key feature of curriculum development activities through the MGFEP project. This proposed area of collaboration would build on this good work. The idea has also been discussed with representatives from the Institut Pertanian Bogor (University of Agriculture, Bogor) and the Universitas Hasanuddin. The idea was considered with interest (as was the collaborative work of INAFE, SEANAFE and RECOFTC) and worth pursuing.

List above are a number of 'opening' points for collaborative work between the two organizations. Further discussion about resource brought into the partnership and resources required need further discussion.

Please also note that the above is simply to start the discussion between SEANAFE and RECOFTC and RECOFTC looks forward to hearing alternative suggestions from SEANAFE.

Annex – potential collaborative partners

This proposal offers significant opportunity for collaboration with a wide range of networks, institutions and organisations; and the potential to establish a formal collaborative platform for exchanging experiences and learnings. Higher education activities that would be incorporated in this proposal are outlined below. These activities would significantly benefit from formal collaboration and could collaboration could provide significant cost savings rather than the current potential for replication.

South East Asian Network for Agroforestry Education (SEANAFE)

SEANAFE is a network of 78 higher education institutions in the South East Asian region working toward curricula development and support for Agroforestry. Within each country where SEANAFE is active, national networks of universities have been established complete with national committees and a national chairperson. The national chairs form the SEANAFE Board, which has an important role in supervising, planning and monitoring the network activities and the secretariat.

SEANAFE has been highly successful in raising the profile of Agroforestry within participating universities and facilitated the development of several undergraduate and postgraduate Agroforestry courses within member institutions. SEANAFE is currently working on a thematic basis to develop new Agroforestry curricula. SEANAFE offers this proposal an existing network of key CBNRM higher education institutions and would be well placed to facilitate Phase I (the country analysis of competencies). For the purpose of this proposal, faculties other than forestry would need to be included (for example social sciences, humanities, fisheries, agriculture, geography etc). This would provide SEANAFE with significant benefits including greater awareness of their work within the academic communities of partner universities. In addition, SEANAFE have committed to greater collaboration with both RECOFTC and SEARCA in their project documentation and this proposal would deliver on that commitment.

In addition, SEANAFE has published practical guide for developing Agroforestry Curricula. This is an example of the type of product that could be adapted and institutions would significantly benefit from wider distribution.

International Partnership for Forestry Education (IPFE)

IPFE is a newly established global network of forestry-related higher education institutions. There have been several initial projects, and IPFE plan to host their first international conference in Nairobi, May 2007.

Initial IPFE projects included the development of a Social Forestry Course for the Asia-Pacific region. Core project partners included the Australia National University; Southern Cross University, Australia; the University of Canterbury, New Zealand; and RECOFTC. The focus of the project was to develop new curricula, including course structure and content, for a regional ‘Community Forest Management’ under-graduate course. The course content concentrates on providing international experiences and solutions, balanced by local contexts and realities. It provides students a broad range of examples and reveals the cultural differences related to social forestry issues. Institutions in the region are now able to use the new curricula to guide their own course delivery on social forestry issues. This project provides good example of the type of initiatives and projects that could be significantly enhanced through the development of a formal regional network as suggested in this proposal.

Mekong Learning Initiative (MLI)

The MLI is a small network of natural resource-related higher education institutions from around the Mekong Basin. MLI facilitates the sharing of ideas and approaches to teaching and learning on the social science of natural resource management in the Mekong River Basin, including linkages between

educational institutions and regional agencies. In addition MLI experiment with different approaches to teaching and learning on the social science of natural resource management in support of curriculum development in the Mekong Region. MLI has been particularly active in facilitating linkages between universities to develop case studies. Through this process, MLI aims to support of a Mekong 'body of knowledge and practice' on the social science of natural resource management. Again the development of this proposal would ensure that the learnings and experiences from MLI initiatives reach wider audiences and their impacts maximized. Specifically, the natural resource management case studies that have been developed through MLI activities would greatly enhance regional CBNRM curricula.

Malaysian-German Forestry Education Project (MGFEP)

The Malaysian-German Forestry Education Project (MGFEP) is a bilateral technical assistance project between the German and the School of International Tropical Forestry (SITF) at the University Malaysia Sabah (UMS). The German Government provides long-term and short-term experts in forestry education and funds for capacity building and human resource development at SITF. The project's prime targets are the adjustment of academic curricula towards the latest developments in sustainable tropical forestry and the professional qualification of academic instructors for research and teaching.

The review and adjustment of curricula has included 'tracer studies' of previous graduates and analysis of competencies required in the market place for recent graduates. MGFEP would have significant experience to offer Phase I of the proposal. In addition there is also a commitment in the MGFEP project documentation for collaboration in the region. Similar to SEANAFE, this proposal will assist in the delivery of that commitment.

Netherlands Development Organization (SNV) – Laos & National University of Laos (NUOL): Non Timber Forestry Product Curricula Development

The Faculty of Forestry of NUOL is currently working with SNV Laos to improve its curriculum on NTFP. Together, they have undertaken a Training Needs Assessment amongst existing and potential employers in the NTFP sector. In addition, they have also developed NTFP case studies. RECOFTC was recently consulted to this project to co-facilitate a workshop which brought together key NUOL staff, SNV Laos, training providers and employers of NTFP graduates to begin the curriculum development process. Next steps in the project will be to finalize the curriculum, facilitate training sessions for NUOL staff, implement and monitor the new curriculum. Again, this project would benefit for broader exposure and other higher education institutions would benefit significantly from a greater understanding of the process adopted in this project. This proposal offers such an opportunity.

Wageningen University and Research Centre

Wageningen University are beginning to utilize core competencies to guide the design of their forestry related degrees. General descriptions have been specified according to the work level of the graduate (operational, tactical and strategic) and according to the level of complexity of the work situation (basic, integral and innovative). These descriptors are subjected to both academic and professional validation. The agreed definition of competencies and sub-competencies is obviously only the beginning of the curriculum development process. Learning objectives, knowledge contents, materials, courses, lessons, and tests will have to be developed within each of the core competence areas defined. Though some of this process is still under development, further information could be derived from this so as to guide similar efforts in the region, if universities were interested.

Appendix 10. SEANAFE's notes on proposed collaboration, August 2006

SEANAFE-RECOFTC Collaborative Options

1. On RECOFTC's Option to complement current ToT activities of SEANAFE

SEANAFE's Situation:

SEANAFE has conducted several training courses in the past. These courses will be reviewed to determine their marketability as in-country fee-based courses for resource generation. A core training team per country network would have to be organized and their capacity to handle and manage training courses should be ascertained.

Suggested Course of Action:

RECOFTC's Course on "The Art of Building Training Capacities" could be:

- a. A required course for the SEANAFE training team
- b. Included in the list of courses that SEANAFE may want to offer in the immediate future as one of the foundational courses

2. On RECOFTC's Option to complement SEANAFE's Landscape Agroforestry Project

SEANAFE's Situation:

SEANAFE is still finalizing the program content of its first regional workshop on Landscape Agroforestry which is supposed to be held in December 2006. The course could be scheduled in mid-February 2007 to incorporate some lessons to be drawn from the International Conference in Luangprabang, Laos in December 2006 and the RUPES workshop in January 2007 in Lombok, Indonesia.

Suggested Courses of Action:

- a. RECOFTC's Agroforestry Landscape Planning Course content may be revised a bit to suit the needs of SEANAFE. Issue-laden topics could be included. The program could be designed in such a way that the outputs required for SEANAFE participants could be different from the regular participants of RECOFTC to help achieve SEANAFE's project objectives. This could be done by allotting a one-day action planning for SEANAFE's group.
- b. RECOFTC could give a session on the state of the art of landscape agroforestry landscape planning as part of the SEANAFE first regional workshop for its landscape agroforestry project
- c. Selected SEANAFE representatives from the country networks could attend RECOFTC's Agroforestry Landscape Planning Course and re-echo the same essence of the same training during the Network's 1st regional workshop

3. On RECOFTC's option to complement SEANAFE's Forest and Environment Policy Project

SEANAFE's Situation:

SEANAFE has followed up the concept paper initially developed by Per Rudebjer with Peter Durst of

FAO early October. SEANAFE is waiting for any update from FAO.

Suggested Course of Action

SEANAFE could sponsor one appropriate session during the Forest Policy Workshop that FAO and RECOFTC will sponsor in March 2007. The session is expected to lead to finalizing the regional workshop on Forestry Policy Project that is expected to take shape in early 2008. Mr. Ron Triraganon of RECOFTC will discuss the matter with Peter Durst

4. RECOFTC's proposed collaboration in conducting a research to determine required competencies of BS graduates for CBNRM-related jobs

SEANAFE's Situation:

SEANAFE welcomes this option as there is a plan to come up with an umbrella program in which to anchor all activities of the project e.g. BASIC of ANAFE. Such research could provide a good input to the drafting of the program proposal. The Involvement of SEANAFE member-institutions would certainly enhance their capacities and allow them to get a scenario on where they stand among other learning institutions in the region. Selection of universities/colleges to be involved is critical including the period when the study would be conducted.

Suggested Course of Action:

RECOFTC will finalize the concept paper for comments and suggestions of the Board

5. Other Matters Discussed

- a. Membership of SEANAFE country network institutions to the Trainers' Network of RECOFTC – an electronic platform is being developed and membership is open to agroforestry trainers for info sharing in training management and developing project proposals for funding, etc.
- b. Collaborative Hosting of a regular international course with RECOFTC and its partners
- c. Possibilities of exchanging technical support in facilitating training activities between RECOFTC and ICRAF (needs to draft an MOU between ICRAF and RECOFTC)
- d. Participation of SEANAFE member-institutions in E-forum on CBNRM of RECOFTC and its partners.

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 07/44 Programme of Cooperation between the Government of Sri Lanka and UNICEF Final Report**
Hugh Goyder, Alison Lochhead, Lalili Rajapaksa, Raghav Regmi, Frank Noij
Asia Department
- 07/45 Swedish Support in the Education Sector in Zanzibar, 2002–2007**
Mike Wort, Suleman Sumra, Paul van Schaik, Elifuraha Mbasha
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 07/46 Replicating the Model of Land Administration under the One Stop Shop (OSS) Mechanism in Five Provinces in the Central Region of Quang Tri Public Administration Reform (PAR) Project**
Adam McCarty, Do Duc Hao, David Fallows, Nguyen Van Dinh
Asia Department
- 07/47 Assessment of Comparative Advantages of Swedish ICT Support in Tanzania**
Alan Greenberg
Department for Africa
- 07/48 Sida Supported Infant and Young Child Feeding Networks. An Evaluation of Activities, Achievements and Aspirations**
Kim Forss, Elisabeth Kylberg, Gaynor Maclean
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 07/49 Informe Global de Evaluación de Modelo Integral de Salud Implementado sobre la Base de la Rectoría, la Participación Social y la Gestión Local en Guatemala**
Iván Darío Puerta, Alicia Borges Månsson, Marta Medina Sandino, Edwin Haroldo Mayén Alvarado
Department for Latin America
- 07/50 Healthy Support? Sida's Support to the Health Sector in Angola 1977–2006**
Kajsa Pehrsson, Lillemor Andersson-Brolin, Staffan Salmonsson
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 2008:01 United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (UNLIREC)**
William Godnick, Heido Ober, Charlotte Watson
Department for Cooperation with Non-Governmental Organisations, Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict Management
- 2008:02 Swedish Democracy Promotion through Non-Governmental Organisations in Bolivia, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Peru Outcome Oriented Evaluation of Diakonia's Latin America Programme**
Staffan Löfving, Charlotta Widmark, Roddy Brett, Victor Caballero, Miguel Gonzalez, Cecilia Salazar, Fernanda Soto
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 2008:03 Phasing-out Swedish Health Support in Luanda, Angola A study of the Evolution of Reproductive and Child Health Services, 2006–2007**
Kajsa Pehrsson, Kenneth Challis, Tazi Maghema
Department for Democracy and Social Development

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 43
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>