ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry & Climate Change (ASFCC)

Report of the external review March - April 2013

Final draft version for discussion

From *Climate and Development: A Double Divided*, SDC, 2012

Eduardo Queblatin, Hans Schaltenbrand

Jakarta, Manila, Zollikofen, 24 April 2013

<ASFCC External Review April 2013 (v7).docx>

Executive Summary

DONOR	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
REPORT TITLE	Report of the external review on the ASEAN-Swiss Partnership Program on Social Forestry & Climate Change, ASFCC, Phase 1, 01 May 2011 to 31 December 2013
SUBJECT NUMBER	KA 7F-07476.01 (BLG)
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	All 10 ASEAN member states
SECTOR	Social Forestry, Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation
LANGUAGE	EN
DATE	24 April 2013
COLLATION	24 pages, 5 annexes
EVALUATION TYPE	External / Mid-term
STATUS	
AUTHORS	Eduardo Queblatin, Hans Schaltenbrand

Subject description
Partnership program with all ten ASEAN Member States (Association of South East Asian Nations) to share and strengthen sustainable forest management and the principles of Social Forestry linked to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. The Program contributes to the ASEAN's strategic Framework approaching Climate Change and Food Security in a joint manner.

Evaluation process and methodology
Studying reports and elaborating a list of questions along the Program's logical framework established in 2011 followed by a number of semi-structured interviews (face-to-face, by skype/phone, by mail) and SWOT-type of analysis with some of the involved institutions.

The reviewers analyzed the collected information, triangulated them with the program team, synthesized the shared information and elaborated a review report, also containing an outlook to the immediate future.

Major findings and conclusions
Conceptual frame and strategy:
The Partnership Program is well embedded in the ASEAN set-up. It supports a network, allowing access and exchange to a variety of Social Forestry concepts and approaches, and the possibility to link them with emerging issues on Climate Change in all ten ASEAN countries. There is evidence for leverage to support Sustainable Forest Management and Climate Change related policies in an affirmative and synergetic manner.

Progress along the defined Logframe and recommendation to pursue the Program:
The Partnership Program had a delayed start. First results are promising and show that it moves into the right direction. As the installed mechanisms begin to function and partners gradually increase outputs, it will be important not to change the present institutional arrangement and organizational set-up and to continue along the defined logical frame. However, more strategic foci on country-specific topics and approaches with an installed increasing capacity of the Program team to assess and share best practices will require some adaptations.

Key recommendations

Continue the program along the three defined outcomes Policy Development, Knowledge Sharing and Capacity Building, and Learning Interventions/assessing best practices. Fine-tune some of the strategic interventions as summarized in chapter 3.

Strengthen the national Focal Points, being the platform at country level. Create a flexible funding mechanism, giving them the possibility to kick off national initiatives, in line with the objectives of ASFCC.

Enlarge the present group of Implementation Partners (CIFOR, NTFP-EP, RECOFTC) with ICRAF to strengthen the applied research analysis and to share best practices on agroforestry and other land issues related to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation.

Act, react and pro-act more flexibly to those needs in those partner countries which have a strong effect on policy adaptations, capacity increase at the national level and assessment of applied research results feeding into policies. Open the Program up towards emerging needs from the Climate Change Adaptation.

Keep the coordination set up of the ASFN Secretariat as it is and fill the vacant post with analyzing/synthesizing competence. In addition, give more room for flexibility at all levels and in all fields of action with the possibility to buy-in specific competencies from the Implementation Partners, other appropriate organizations or institutes.

Strengthen and align with similar networks and programs/projects working in the ASEAN region to raise leverage and synergism but to also reduce overlaps and duplication.

To achieve the defined two objectives and to evidently contribute to the goal at ASEAN level, the reviewers recommend the Program to continue for another six years, split into two phases, 2014-16 and 2017-19. An external evaluation at the beginning of 2016 should analyze the state-of-the art by then to have sufficient time to adapt the Partnership Program for the phasing-out period.

Acknowledgements

List of abbreviations

AEC 2015	ASEAN Economic Community; open trade scheduled by 2015
AFCC-FS or AFCC	ASEAN Multisectoral Framework on Climate Change: Agriculture and Forestry towards Food Security
AMAF	ASEAN Ministers of Agriculture and Forestry
AMNET	ASEAN Mangroves Network
APAN	Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network
AFEET	ASEAN Forestry Extension, Education and Training
AMS	ASEAN Member States
ARKN-FCC	ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forestry and Climate Change
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEAN-WEN	ASEAN World Life Enforcement Network
ASEANSEC	ASEAN Secretariat
ASFCC	ASEAN-Swiss Partnership Program for Social Forestry and Climate Change, also named as Partnership Program
ASFN	ASEAN Social Forestry Network
ASOF	ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry
CBA	Cost-Benefit Analysis
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CF	Community Forestry
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
Code REDD	Community Development through REDD+ or Communities Developing REDD+ or Conservation and Development through REDD+
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FLEG	Forest Law Enforcement and Governance
FPIC	Free Prior and Informed Consent
FP	Focal Point = government staff from ASEAN countries involved in ASFN-ASFCC activities; one person generally nominated as coordinating person to ASFCC activities
FS	Food Security
GAP-CC	ASEAN - German Programme on Response to Climate Change (GIZ)
GP-CC	SDC's Global Program Climate Change
IKAP	Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Network
LEAF	Lowering Emissions in Asia's Forests (Winrock International, USAID)
MRV	Measurement, Reporting and Verification
NTFP-EP	Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Program
NWG	National Working Group
PES	Payment for Environmental Services
PNRPS	Philippine National REDD Plus Strategy
RECOFTC	The Center for People and Forests (The Regional Community Forestry Training Center for Asia and the Pacific)
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation. "+" = sustainable forest management, conservation and enhancement of forest carbon stocks
RFD	Royal Forest Department of Thailand
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs)
SEARCA	Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture
SECO	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (Swiss Federal Department of Economic Affairs)
SES	Social and Environmental Safeguards
SF	Social Forestry
SF-CC	Social Forestry approaches linked to Climate Change
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SPA	Specific Plan of Action
SWIT	Strengths-Weaknesses-Improvement proposals-Threats
TA	Technical Assistance
TEV	Total Economic Value Analysis

Table of content

1. Rationale

The *ASEAN-Swiss Partnership for Social Forestry and Climate Change ASFCC* is a support program embedded in and working through the structure of the ASEAN Secretariat of its ten Member States. It functions through the *ASEAN Social Forestry Network ASFN* at various levels within the ASEAN countries' varying economic, political and social environments.

The context

Almost fifty percent of the land areas from the ten countries which form the Association of Southeast Asian Nations are identified as forests. Since decades these forests are under severe pressure from various sides, causing deforestation and forest degradation which in turn contribute to a great extent to global warming. The area hosts 600 million people of which about 80 million are directly or indirectly depending on all kinds of natural resources from forest lands. Moreover, ASEAN is an important institutional partner for Switzerland in many aspects.

The *Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC* has a comprehensive and well proven track record on the sustainable management of forest resources by using locally adapted approaches and methods and by supporting programs that allow a wide range of stakeholders to manage local natural forest land resources in a decentralized, participatory, sustainable, as well as accountable manner. Such valuable experiences, evolved over the last forty years, are currently high on the international agenda in connection with the new mechanisms to *Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+)* and initiatives, focusing on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation. Many of such initiatives are obviously applying concepts, principles, approaches and methods that are connected to *Social Forestry* as explained in section 1 of the 2010 assessment report "*The Role of Social Forestry in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in the ASEAN Region*". This assessment report is the baseline document for the ASFCC's phase 1. Moreover, the connection SF-CC shows interesting but also challenging opportunities, e.g. for future carbon trading within the announced ASEAN Economic Community 2015 with the goal of regional economic integration.

As a response to those contextual elements, the ASFCC program was launched in 2011. Its design emerged from an earlier collaboration of SDC from 2009 to 2011 with the *ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN)*, an initiative endorsed in 2005 by senior officers from the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry and their counterparts from the other nine ASEAN countries.

The ASFCC program is embedded in and thus contributing to the *ASEAN's multi-sectoral framework strategy* which addresses *food security* and *climate change*. Both themes play a dominant role in the portfolio of the SDC's *Global Programs Climate Change (GP-CC)* and *Food Security (GP-FS)*.

The Logframe of ASFCC sets up three components:

1) Social forestry policy framework development,
2) Knowledge sharing, networking, capacity building, and
3) Learning interventions, applied research/piloting and assessment

which shall contribute to the ASEAN multi-sectoral strategy framework through two defined objectives. The Logframe is shown in Annex 1.

External review

This report presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the external review team, consisting of Mr Eduardo Queblatin, independent regional NRM consultant from the Philippines and Mr Hans Schaltenbrand, lecturer from the School of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences HAFL in Zollikofen, Switzerland. The team not only looked at the activities along the Logframe, it also used a great portion of time to discuss possibilities and options to improve the operation in the second phase and to provide – where possible and feasible – advise to the program team for immediate minor adjustments. The Terms of Reference are added in Annex 2.

Methods, processes, approaches

The reviewers developed a number of questions for interviews with involved partners at different levels. Semi-structured interviews were held, partly on an individual basis and partly jointly when both reviewers stayed in Indonesia (10.-18.4.2013).

Before that Eduardo Queblatin visited key partners in *Myanmar* and the *Philippines;* Hans Schaltenbrand had skype discussions with focal point partners in *Vietnam* and visited partners in *Thailand* on the way to *Indonesia*. Partners in *Cambodia* and *Malaysia* were contacted through skype and phones. Key partners in *Brunei*, *Laos* and *Singapore* were not contacted.

With the program team and with one of the Implementation Partners the reviewers held **S**trengths –**W**eaknesses – **I**mprovement proposals – **T**hreats sessions which provided the basis to look ahead and formulate a set of priorities to be discussed prior to plan the second phase.

Report structure

Chapter 2 consists of the assessment part that summarizes the manifold face-to-face or phone/skype discussions, SWIT sessions, meetings and the consultation of a number of progress reports and studies from end of February to end of April.

Chapter 3 looks at the immediate future (phase 2) and beyond and lists up a set of recommendations which the reviewers find it worth to be incorporated to raise the efficiency of the program without setting up a heavy program structure to impose on a country-owned network program. The recommendations presented in this section need further discussion with all involved key partners and SDC as the financing partner.

2. Assessment and conclusions

The review report is a condensation of a number of assessments made with key staff from program partners in seven of ten ASEAN countries, with the three implementing partners CIFOR, NTFP-EP and RECOFTC, and with the program team.

Annex 1 comments the findings along the Logframe.

2.1 Progress along outcomes 1 to 3 and the defined outputs

2.1.1 Outcome 1

A coordinated social forestry policy framework is developed and integrated into ASEAN and the national forest and climate change strategies of the Member States.

Findings

Defining the strategic issues

The findings cited here and subsequent sections are results of program actions. A baseline study from 2010, entitled "*The Role of Social Forestry in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation in the ASEAN Region*" contains synthesized information that is used to support ongoing dialog on the status, issues and opportunities in SF. This is also being updated by the regional learning group consisting of senior planners and technical representatives.

Capacity to reach decision makers

ASFCC has provided learning opportunities for AMS policy makers, planners and CSO members to deepen their understanding of SF as a key form of SFM and CC mitigation/adaptation strategy. These are made through training and learning events (6 RECOFTC regional raining events, 2 country-to-country visits, 2 ASFN conferences, ASOF and AMAF events, and 12 national events). An inter-country learning group is also studying methods to better define and communicate SF issues to decision makers.

The ASEAN Secretariat and the ASEAN CSO community have opened active lines of communication through at least 3 regional sessions that discussed the various ways how CSOs can provide effective and meaningful inputs to ASEAN. At the same time, the Program facilitated the adequate representation of SF communities in national and sub national dialog and decision making processes. This is particularly true in Cambodia, the Philippines and in Thailand.

ASFCC is helping to strengthen the foundations for a reinvigorated CF framework in Myanmar. A multi-sectoral inception workshop (including government) conducted in 2012, led to 6 recommendations. These included creating a CF law; creation of CF working group; participatory action research; establishment of CF practitioner group, expanded training and formation of a CF unit within the DF. A CF unit in the Forest Department headed by a Deputy Director General was immediately established. In Myanmar, the Sarawak Forest Department has adopted an NTFP based livelihood approach to community participation in SFM, a good starting Point for further development of SF.

Policy milestones

The ASEAN Secretariat, with ASFCC support, has adopted the Strategic Plan of Action on AFCC (2012 - 2015) in support of the ASEAN Multi Sectoral Framework on CC Agriculture and Forestry towards Food Security (AFCC). The SPA provides a starting framework to 'walk the talk" in demonstrating the role of SF in FS and CC. AMAF, with ASFCC support,

also presented its position on ASEAN and Forestry to the International United Nations Forum on Forest.

At the national level, the role of forests and SFM is cited in "*generic terms*" in most national climate change plans of countries studied. These plans are the result of multiple efforts of many players (projects) in the environment and natural resources sectors. ASFN Focal Points together with ASFCC partners are introducing and deepening the SF dimension to these statements through various national workshops and information campaigns. In the Philippines the roles of forests and SFM in the national CC plan are well articulated in the Philippine National REDD Plus Strategy (PNRPS) which the government has officially adopted. The ASFCC was a significant contributor to the achievement of this outcome through the support provided to NTFP-EP as Code REDD+ convenor.

In Thailand, the discussion has highlighted the role of community forestry in social justice and sustainable reform. In the Philippines, the role of forests is well highlighted in Climate Change Plans, and government recently adapted improved FPIC procedures based on an ASFCC study. Further, the carbon rights policies are also processed by policy studies supported by ASFCC. Mechanism to ensure equitable distribution of benefits within the community will take-off from these studies. More importantly, the Philippines officially adopted the PNRPS as part of its national climate change strategy. In Myanmar, three action research tasks were launched to identify, among others, implementation problems in current processes for tenure security. In Thailand, the Philippines and Cambodia activities indicate noteworthy pockets of action by Local Authorities who are making local public investments to promote community forestry.

Other notable trends
The prospects of REDD+ are inducing renewed interest in national CF programs which, in the past, generally suffered from benign neglect. The Philippines case demonstrates a participatory process for REDD+ particularly from both standing and rapidly regenerating stock. Cambodia in turn is studying the Philippines experience as it develops its own REDD+ program. In forest rich countries like Indonesia and Cambodia the discussion actually straddles between addressing outstanding basic CF issues such as land tenure security and the more complex opportunities under REDD+. However, in Myanmar, the desire to address first "basic" CF issues (e.g. tenure security, livelihoods, clear rules, etc.) is obviously higher on the agenda than discussion about REDD+ opportunities and needs to be addressed accordingly prior to stepping into REDD+.

In Indonesia and Philippines, both highly vulnerable to CC, stakeholders are expressing a strong need for work on CC Adaptation (Philippines: climate proofing the CBFM program; Indonesia: introduction or improvements of existing agroforestry). In March 2013 the ASFCC group attended the 3rd APAN CCA conference in Incheon, Republic of Korea, to identify good practices that may be helpful in crafting a CCA strategy under the second phase of ASFCC. Because of RECOFTC/ASFCC advocacy, for the first time, APAN included a panel on forest/NRM-based adaptation. APAN organizers recognized and expressed strong appreciation for this enrichment to APAN's understanding of ecosystem-based adaptation and contribution to shape their future agenda. In response to that, NTFP-EP is currently mapping out a CCA program to be tested in Indonesia (West Kalimantan).

A good portion of SF communities are already linked to the market community (e.g. rice, coffee, fruit crops, certain NTFPs, etc). The potential ramifications for the envisioned 2015 ASEAN Economic Community on the forestry sector, particularly on SF, are discussed in ASOF. NTFP-EP has prepared a study on NTFP opportunities within the framework of Green Economy in anticipation of the AEC integration in 2015. The study shall be presented in the ASFN meeting in 2013.

Conclusions Outcome 1

The various activities are on track to produce the 3 outputs that lead to Outcome 1 in the next 3.5 years. Issue and opportunities are being analyzed in various fora. Stakeholders are capacitated to more effectively reach relevant decision makers in all AMS, while community representation is being consolidated in at least two countries. ASEAN will soon implement a policy based Strategic Plan of Action (SPA) that enables SF to demonstrate its role in CC. At the national level, discrete policy gaps are identified to support policy reforms that improve CF as a program and consequently demonstrate its role in CC.

Certain constraints and opportunities can benefit from further attention. As CF or SF programs are reinvigorated, effective baseline information will be needed more than ever and current efforts to update the baseline data (assessment report 2010) will need more strategic attention.

There is a need for policy makers and others to "touch" the possible potential of SF through the elaboration of a number of *Cost-Benefit* or *Total Economic Value Analyses* (study ground for action research by competent regional and national institutions). To support the financing of reinvigorated SF/CF programs, and building on the pockets of innovation so far, it would be good to identify the enabling factors for local authorities to invest in SF not only for the sake of CF, or to gain from REDD+, but perhaps more urgently, to help in local adaptation to CC.

The ramifications of the 2015 ASEAN economic community on SF systems need to be anticipated early to manage the added "shocks" to forest and agriculture dependent communities under SF. Myanmar will require additional support to quickly help build the human resource base for the CF program and to keep pace with accelerated reforms partly facilitated with ASFCC support. Each country has its own major gain that can be nurtured to full maturity.

2.1.2   Outcome 2

Local, national and regional knowledge sharing, communication and networking on Social Forestry and Climate Change is strengthened and put into use.

Findings
ASFN Secretariat is fully operational
The ASFN is fully staffed, although one staff resigned and replacement is under process. Regional conferences and meetings have increased. The Secretariat coordinates eight ASEAN Focal Points, three Implementation Partners and a number of cooperation partners. It provides backstopping to the ASEAN Secretariat and the Ministry of Forestry. More regular and systematic monitoring especially among partners is a felt need. On the other hand it is a principle of this Partnership Program to not become a project-driven system. Further information can be found in section 2.3.

Enhanced knowledge exchange

There is an increase in regional exchange and trainings as planned. Most participants generally appreciate the depth of issues and variety of good practices that are discussed and observed. There is, however, limited self-initiated exchange after the training event among regional participants. ASFN Focal Points are contributing to the website but sustaining regular contributions is a challenge. There are limited visits to both website and the intranet.

State of the art of learning innovations are used in the regional training sessions. However, with some exceptions, it is difficult to trace how learnings from regional events are used because of the possibly insufficient knowledge management strategy beyond the standard post-training follow-up provided by RECOFTC. This difficulty can be traced back to a host of factors such as participant selection, unclear role of partners other than RECOFTC in post-training etc

The effect of country-to-country exchanges can be recognized earlier and more easily than regional events. Examples are the cross visits made by Malaysia stakeholders to NTFP-based initiatives in Kalimantan, Indonesia; and by Cambodia stakeholders to the Philippines on approaches for participation in REDD+. Certain national level, awareness building/training events such as those in Myanmar and Thailand, are leading to discrete actions that strengthen the foundations of national SF programs.

Beyond the core network

ASFN partners facilitated a successful *getting-to-know-you* dialog between the ASEAN Secretariat, ASFN and the CSO community through at least three major regional sessions. Around 33 CSOs have participated through ASFN CSO forum of which more than 50% on their own funds. This reflects interest and own investment in ASFN processes. ASFN has communicated its values to the international community by contributing in a major way to the preparation of position papers adopted by the ASOF and AMAF. The Secretariat is co-facilitating actions that help promote the values of ASFN and provides long term learning opportunities for ASFN member countries. Examples are the collaborative work with GAP-CC, the pipeline work for a new ASEAN – KOREA project and the AFEET (ASEAN Forestry Extension, Education and Training).

Other notable trends

ASFN Focal Points are participating in national discussions on CC and are able to convey the role of SF in CC (Cambodia, Philippines Thailand and Indonesia). This type on interaction is also starting in Myanmar through multi-sectoral dialog.

The creation of a *regional Learning Group* is a notable move to better manage the knowledge being generated. The group presently focuses on the specific targets of updating the baseline data and communicating SF stories. But equally important would be to give more attention to strengthen the learning group or the learning processes which happen during the semi-annual interactions between Focal Points and other partners. Challenges that need to be addressed, among others, may include the selection of participants, methods of sharing, post- event information support and follow-up.

A Communication and Networking strategy has been developed in 2010. The strategy has helped produce an array of publications and events that have generated good understanding and visibility especially at the regional levels. As network members are able to identify discrete policy reform targets, the 2010 strategy may no longer be sufficient to

guide the formulation (and combination) of sharing and learning events and communication products in a way that allows them to have optimum cumulative impact on the policy decision making process.

Conclusions Outcome 2

Overall, the intermediate outputs are in the right direction but higher outcome could be achieved. First, better coordination and monitoring by the ASEAN Secretariat will help optimize synergy of efforts by partners. Second, there is a need to strengthen knowledge management and clarify roles in order to enhance optimum utilization of learning. Third, there is also a need to more deliberately translate the 2010 Networking and Communication Strategy into discrete communication plans at regional and national levels (as recommended by the strategy itself). Combined with the good social capital that has been created, this can better support and stimulate decision making towards targeted policy reforms.

2.1.3   Outcome 3

Learning interventions and best practices conducted in Social Forestry and Climate Change for broader implementation and policy development.

Findings

National Working Groups

NWGs on SF or CF have been formed or are being reinvigorated in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. It is about to be formed in Myanmar. In Cambodia, the NWG will be complemented by provincial level CF Coordination Committees starting in seven provinces. In the Philippines, sub-national REDD+ working groups (Provincial Multistakeholder REDD+ Councils, PMRCs) are complementing the National Multi-Stakeholder-REDD+ Council (NMRC). The NWG in the Philippines are overseeing identification of best practices, capacity building and information campaigns.

Issue analysis / methodology development

Two tracks of research are happening. First, strategic research by CIFOR is helping ASFN understand how traditional Swidden Agricultural practices and social networks can actually enhance benefits from REDD+. Concurrently, more reliable participatory carbon and MRV assessment methods are also developed in the context of complex forest and agriculture landscapes. The research topics were pre-identified at project start up. The practical benefits from these research undertakings do not appear to have been communicated clearly among National Focal Points.

The second modality is the range of participatory action research being done in Myanmar, Thailand and the Philippines, led by Implementation Partners (RECOFTC and NTFP) to study implementation issues on the ground such as land tenure insecurity as well as to develop locally applicable carbon assessment methods. These undertakings have a strong human resources development capacity which concurrently builds benefits.

Up scaling best practices to support policy and practice

Country-to-country sharing sessions invariably include discussions of best practices happening in the AMS. At the national level, the ASFCC provides on-site support to the development of a few best practice sites in Indonesia, Myanmar and in Thailand. NTFP-EP has leveraged funds for Cambodian and Indonesia AMS to participate in regional policy workshops on REDD+ (October 2012) and for Cambodian AMS to learn from best practice on community carbon pool sites (January 2013). Forest departments through its

national Focal Points with the support by ASFCC are conducting a range of awareness building campaigns that in the process show selected SF best practices and the practical benefits from them. National efforts in this regard are most notable in Thailand and PH and more recently in Cambodia and Indonesia. In Myanmar, a recent Presidential order requiring the establishment of CF demonstration sites in each province is creating a strong demand for the development of best practices (not directly linked ASFCC support).

Trends

There are many existing best practice sites that demonstrate pre-REDD+ types of interventions. REDD+ oriented sites are still few but they demonstrate good methods for REDD+ preparedness. Notwithstanding some notable start up work done in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines and in Thailand, the program strategy to identify, assess and document these start-ups is not yet articulated.

Conclusions Outcome 3

The ingredients do exist for the full achievement of the 3 outputs. However, more strategic interventions may be needed, in order that they will achieve the outcome. Strategic and tactical knowledge gaps need to be collaboratively identified and prioritized and the relevance of current research actions need to be clearly and regularly communicated to stakeholders. At national level, technical assistance strategies are needed to help identify assess, document and disseminate best practices that already exist but without direct influence of the Program on particular sites.

2.1.4   Recommendations

For Outcome 1

1.1. AFFC should be supported to put into operation the SPA for AFCC. The ASFN can contribute in terms of knowledge exchange to help develop policy instruments tools and best practices relevant the following illustrative SPA components which demonstrate the link between SF and CC in practical terms:

- Component 2.1: Options for improved land and water use that highlight the role of SF communities in localized watershed as a CC adaptation strategy.
- Component 2.2: The role of traditional agriculture knowledge useful for agro-biodiversity conservation and climate change adaptation.
- Component 2.3: Institutional support to REDD+ readiness in pilot sites and support to the promotion of low cost forest enhancement such as natural regeneration.
- Component 3.0: Human resources capacity for promoting SF through knowledge sharing and networks within ASEAN and with the international community.

1.2. Communicate current knowledge of cost- benefit of SF in order to demonstrate its true economic value, including both, the direct provision of goods and the ecosystems services, especially as ASEAN starts its *full economic integration* in 2015. This will help deepen the interest in SF among decision makers.

- Assemble and communicate current knowledge to ASEAN and AMS on cost benefit of SF and supplement information gaps through rapid studies. This can be done in coordination with relevant research organizations in the region.
- Engage communication and media networks in ASEAN to work with experts to communicate development messages on SF. The "backbone" of such messages could be the following: Fairly large areas of forests, local watersheds and biodiversity (not

just small pilots) which can be protected and sustained through local partnerships between local authorities and communities. Low cost technologies could be used.

1.2. Strengthen current efforts to update baseline information on SF in AMS.

The aim would be to develop an updated baseline. This update should have more in-depth treatment of what is going on in terms of specific policies and policy instruments including sub national/local policy ordinances as well as emerging good practices.

- To update SF statistics, build on the early work done under the Learning Group sessions. The latter has articulated *what kind of* items need to be updated and *why.* There is a need to strengthen the *hows* by ensuring that practitioners are sufficiently tooled to deal with practical challenges of updating information.

1.3. Continue to monitor the developments of the 2015 ASEAN integration – a potential new source of "shock" on livelihood systems of SF communities. As needed, cover this topic in training priorities. When appropriate and in collaboration with other groups working on this, facilitate awareness building of CF National Working Groups so they can factor these in their plans.

1.4. Assess where the Program can make the most strategic contribution on REDD+ preparedness and be selective on where to focus limited resources on the final years to ensure solid results. Consider investing more work on climate change adaptation in SF located in vulnerable localities. This is also discussed under Outcome 3 in terms of best practice assessment and upscaling.

1.5 Continue to maintain the dialog between ASFN and the ASEAN CSO community, taking into account the suggestions put forward by the CSO, but at the same time continue to be sensitive and constructive to concerns by AMS. Consider establishing clearer indicators in the succeeding phase.

1. 6. Consider additional support for Myanmar to immediately support the recent national move to accelerate demonstration and expansion of CF. This is to ensure that the country has access to good sector/sub-sector analysis as a basis for effective planning for expansion.

Outcome 2
2.1 Knowledge sharing is a core value of ASFN. Building on the tremendous gains in the past few years, strengthen the management of the abundant knowledge that is being exchanged to ensure that they support ASFN and AFCC objectives:

- Conduct a collaborative review of the results of post-sharing/-training and post- post training surveys to assess the utilization trend of learnings. Identify short-term and long-term actions to ensure full support to participants so that they can fully use the various knowledge learned. Assign clear responsibilities to each partner (implementation partner, ASFN Secretariat and National Focal Points). There is a possible temporary gap of post training information for the 5 regional training sessions in 2012, implying that follow up has been quite limited for these events. This needs to be addressed very soon.

- Subject to the results of the above review, consider investing more on *country-to-country exchange* in order to increase the chances of early utilization of learnings. Support this modality with amendments in the selection process of participants among other training improvements.
- Re-define website objectives as required, to fit to current realities such as competing knowledge and social networks and other sources of information. Identify practical actions that can generate and sustain interest. Further design of the website can benefit from the results of communication need analysis of target users.
- Maintain and update an organized electronic archive of meetings, conferences and training reports. Gradually develop basic "trends data" such as aggregate profile of participants. Classify basic articles according to themes important to network members and partners. This is now also being addressed by an ongoing website upgrading effort.

2.2 Embed the Learning Group concept under the overarching set of actions that may be identified under item 2.1 above. The learning groups may be considered a subset of the *de facto learning group* that already exists. This is the event-based learning process that happens when members from national Focal Points convene in the annual/semi-annual conference and meetings.

2.3. Policy reform targets (regional, national and sub-national) are getting clearer due to better dialog in the region. With this in mind, consider developing communication plans for selected major policy targets or clusters of policy targets. These plans can guide the formulation, combination, timing and delivery of the various sharing and learning process and communication products, based on respective communication needs analysis. With this guidance, various events may have better chances of earlier impact on the policy and program reform processes. Utilize the core principles and guidance provided by the communication and networking strategy workshop of 2010 to design this. Where the opportunity exits, seek the support of professional associations associated with ASEAN that can provide support while at the same time benefiting from the information useful for communication practitioners.

2.4. Building on the social capital gained by now, new supplemental (and perhaps less formal) forms of sharing and learning can be tried out, to promote deeper exchange and understanding among peers in the region. In defining the plan of action for post-training and post-conference actions described above, consider the experience and lessons learned of previous and ongoing knowledge networks in the region. Examples include that of the Asia Forestry Network (AFN) that involves both government and non-government partners in its networking initiatives.

Outcome 3

3.1. A the national level, develop a joint implementation strategy for identifying, assessing and up scaling best practices that demonstrate the role of SF in CC. Selected sites can also serve as benchmark sites for monitoring impacts of national government based interventions espoused by the ASFCC.

- At the country level, collaboratively identify the range of best practice sites for SF/CF and CC in each country. Assess and document sites prioritized through stakeholder consultation.

- Also identify best practices that are not necessarily about community level actions but also about support actions such as inventory methods, planning methods, communication approaches, enabling legal framework, etc.
- Develop arrangements to identify selected sites as benchmark sites where knowledge opportunities (e.g. training) may be provided to key stakeholders (policy makers, facilitators) by ASFCC and results are monitored and documented to inform both policy and practice.
- Support the exploratory discussions of the ASFN Secretariat and Advisor for tapping research institutions and research funds in the region to help address priority issues.

3.2. In the context of the above national strategy, collaboratively identify research priorities and responsibilities and include research information as an organic part of the range of knowledge to be managed under item 2 above.

- At the national level, inventory all types of work supported by the Program that has or is generating new knowledge. These include the work of CIFOR, RECOFTC assisted CF sites in Myanmar and Thailand and NTFP action research sites in Philippines and learning programs in Myanmar. It may also include sites directly started by AMS countries with ASFN co-financing (e.g. Indonesia sites).
- Assemble different actors and other practitioners to identify and prioritize researchable areas, exchange research objective and results and agree on modes of cooperation.

3.3. Support targeted work on CC Adaptation especially in agroforest landscapes located in forest lands and on themes where current players are not yet deeply involved.

- Collaboratively identify bottlenecks that deter widespread local action on adaptation. One of these is the unclear responsibility for upland agriculture which falls within the grey zone between Forest Departments and Agriculture Departments in AMS. This would be in addition to tenure issues. Based on that, identify best practices and incorporate climate smart intervention strategies in training programs and sharing sessions.
- In the case of Indonesia, support the further development of agroforestry strategies in forest lands that build on both the good traditional agroforestry practices and other successful practices in private lands.
- Consider the involvement of ICRAF as a key implementation partner.

2.2   Institutional arrangement of ASFCC in ASFN

2.2.1   Findings
a) Institutional embedding of ASFCC → high flexibility required
As mentioned in the introductory part, the ASFN was created by ten ASEAN countries and is owned by them. It evolved from a joint will among ASEAN's high forestry officials to combine social aspects with forestry to sustainably manage forest resources in a more decentralized manner with and by people from the localities in and around the forests. In the ASEAN countries and beyond, this approach has developed quite diverging during the last ten years. It tends to create tensions because it deals with the decentralization of not only the management of resources, but also with the access, use and finally the control over rich natural resources. Such approaches need installed control mechanisms (accountability of the stakeholders) and a more social-oriented advisory support from the forestry service if it shall lead to sustainable results. The ASFN is to be seen as an

important "carrier" of assessed best practices. Concurrently it is well placed to act as a "door opener". Seen from that perspective, the ASFCC in ASFN Partnership Program has the right placement and creates leverage.

Due to the increasing pressures and interests on land issues, it is obvious that the ASFN and its operating Secretariat is and will in future be more confronted with a multitude of different perceptions and political barriers, but also with highly interesting changes and emerging needs which would require more flexibility to pro-act, act or react, depending on the given circumstances. With this in mind, the present institutional arrangement of *ASFCC in ASFN* must be seen, understood and adaptable. The ASFCC's success is depending on flexible mechanisms to support the countries' needs at various levels and with different paces. The core principle that the "*ASFCC has to be visible as well as invisible to keep the ASFN → ASOF → AMAF in the light*" should be maintained, even though it remains a challenge for the program team in the Secretariat to evidently show what ASFCC effectively contributed to the two objectives or the defined goal (FS and CC). Some impressive results are explained further up in sub-section 2.1.1. The reviewers hope that the composition of the present Program team will remain during the second phase of the Partnership Program. Staff continuity in such a complex net system is of utmost importance.

Annex 5, stands for all the lively discussions the review team sometimes had. It is the so called "onion sketch". It helped triggering discussions on the present organizational set-up and to find ways of bringing in more flexibility.

b) Partner institutions, their roles and functions → Focal Points are central
One core element of the ASFCC is the small team of the *ASFN Secretariat* and the three *Implementation Partners, CIFOR, NTFP-EP* and *RECOFTC*. They are linked to the countries' *Focal Points* embedded in their departments under the AFOR. It is these Focal Points that decide on the pace and progress of the country plans and field operations and on who should be involved or for example whom to send to what kind of training. The reviewers observed a variation in commitments among the contacted staff of the countries' Focal Points which leads to certain constraints (not sending the right persons to trainings for example). The important *country plans* should be elaborated more thoroughly and shared among key staff from the concerned department. Otherwise the plan remains the idea from a couple of people only and may not be embedded in a sound manner in national SF/CF plans from the government. Another important point is also the *thorough selection of best practices* in the partner countries and the way to assess them. Both activities need guidance.

Knowing that the *Focal Points* play a decisive role in further enlarging the idea of SF-CC, it is obvious that they should have the capacity to catch up with newest SF/CF and Climate Change developments in their country, to open up and further network with the private sector and civil society organizations that lead to multi-stakeholder approaches (see also the recently held 10th UNFF conference in Istanbul which communicated similar messages). They should be able to use some "seed funds" for the assessment of innovative pilots, action research or linking the partnership program to ongoing field work from other partners within their countries (Outcome 3). However, this requires a flexible, clear and easy-to-understand funding mechanism with agreed guiding principles to guarantee that the funds are used to reach the agreed outcomes and objectives.

c) Implementation Partners → open up the "territorial approach"
All three *Implementation Partners* have different competencies and concentrate on key countries (territorial approach). In this kind of present contractual arrangement there is room for improvements. For example the three Implementation Partners could exchange their gained experiences more strategically or they could in certain situations work together in one particular country to raise synergism or respond to newest policy changes in AMS.

d) Funding arrangement → increased flexibility and clarity required
ASFCC funds flow from SDC to the Secretariat and the three Implementation Partners. The jointly agreed plans let little room for the program to act in a flexible manner on emerging needs and to change certain activities or to fund unforeseen but important ones.

The Focal Points of the ASFCC mentioned under b) play such an important strategic and operational role that they should be given more attention to be able to become more active. One possibility could be that some of the program funds could be reserved for innovative actions of the Focal Points and parked in the Secretariat or with the Implementation partners or to another partner that fits to the arrangement of the AMS and would not need country-specific agreements.

Keeping in mind that "*form follows function*", it is this special institutional arrangement that requires attention when slightly revising the present set-up of ASFCC. An easy-to-understand funding concept with a couple of agreed narrowing criteria on what to support and what not (e.g. such as basic trainings, country-specific activities with lots of funds available from other organizations or institutions), would make the work of the staff of the Secretariat and the Implementation Partners more convenient. It is understood that such a funding concept needs to be discussed, jointly approved and communicated well to all involved partners in all countries. The funding concept should also contain a list of indicators for improvements for policy changes, knowledge sharing/capacity building and assessments of pilots/best practices. It needs a common understanding which may not be so easy to achieve and will be a challenge for the coordination of ASFCC. This could be prepared by the ASFN Learning Groups' tasks to update the assessment report of 2010 (ongoing process throughout 2013).

e) Showing the evidence → well on track, but more time required
It is precisely this special institutional arrangement that makes it challenging to evidently show achieved results of the ASFCC at the outcome level. Attribution but also contribution gaps are obvious and need to be considered and communicated. The Implementation Partners and a number of interviewed governmental staff involved in ASFN provided practical examples of ASFCC supported contributions to improve/change/push SF-CC friendly policies, adjust staff competencies and assess pilot activities/action research (see comments made in 2.1). But due to the institutional arrangement and the ASFCC being an actor mainly behind the scene, it will be difficult to list up what has been achieved by ASFCC itself only. Other hindering factors are: too many players involved at the policy as well as at the operational field levels, too many projects working on the same content.

2.2.2 Conclusions and recommendations
- *ASFCC in ASFN* is well anchored in existing governmental structures and strategically positioned to have certain leverage when touching SF-CC themes and concerned changes. If SDC as the financial partner for the ASFCC withdraws, chances are high

that the ASFN function will – in some countries – continue; in some of them the progress will be hampered.

- ASFCC serves the needs of many partners at the right time when the SF-CC becomes an increasing issue. The different pace of development among the AMS makes it worth to continue the support with the same institutional arrangement, but with some minor changes in the organizational set-up of the Partnership Program.

- The mix of Implementation Partners, the country-specific Focal Points and Learning Groups should be more strengthened during phase 2, but also opened up for other local and regional players. Their TORs should be assessed and fine tuned to better integrate the national SF/CF and CC processes into the ASFCC agenda.

- There is no need to orient ASFCC towards sustainability because ASFN partly shows a strong ownership and will most probably remain. If the financial support can be sustained over another six years, there will be more clear evidence by then because most of the countries will have caught-up and improved their move towards a multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder approach in sustainably managing forest resources in a way that the aspects of SF-CC can be addressed effectively. At the same time the Focal Points will have strengthened their competencies and capacities so that the support can be provided through existing governmental structures, donor and CSO sponsored programs and the private sector. Nevertheless, it is important that SDC guarantees continuity over a period of six more years with a slightly higher funding volume in phase 2 compared to phase 1, followed by a gradually reduced phase 3 in 2017-19.

- The Partnership Program is a unique opportunity for the Global Program Climate Change of SDC to position its CC program in the SE Asian region. The ASFCC may create more leverage when closely working with the Regional Program of SDC in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam. In addition, the reviewers advise to closely exchange with the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) with an office in the Swiss Embassy in Indonesia for the sake of early private sector trials on carbon trading (voluntary market) with – according to statements made by Indonesian government officials – established sites which are reported to be ready for the voluntary trade.

2.3 Program structure, coordination & management

The findings placed in 2.2 such as *high flexibility for the Secretariat* to function and the *central role of the Focal Points* relate also to this sub-chapter because both will cause slight adjustments in the setting-up of the Secretariat and the Implementation Partners.

2.3.1 Findings

- The reviewers perceived the *Secretariat* as a kind of combined *management-coordination-facilitation* body. It works efficiently thanks to the highly committed people who complement each other very well. The discussions with partners showed that despite of this commitment – of which the Partnership Program can be proud of – the work load is too high and needs to be corrected as soon as possible. This could be done immediately during the present phase (vacancy of one post).

- The monitoring along the Logframe is not yet done in a consistent, simple and systematic manner. The proposed monitoring support from the GIZ sponsored GAP-CC could not be tapped due to the fact that this program has started only recently. Close links are guaranteed due to the position of the project at the ASOF level, but the monitoring system will be quite different. ASFCC should define less but effective in-built program monitoring instruments that serve the needs of ASFN and SDC in a combined manner

(no double work). Attribution gaps are a fact and need to be accepted or cleverly incorporated.

- Other indications that require adjustments within the present set-up are:
  - Earlier time announcement for trainings and other events (at least one month).
  - Invest more into synthesizing outputs that are worth to be shared.
  - Invest time in analyzing the work that no duplications occur.
  - Install mechanisms to catch up speedy developments.
  - Elaborate standards that clarify what to support and what not to support.
  - Speed up with action research, open up towards other partners as well.
  - Internet/Intranet is hardly used.
- Financial arrangements: The reviewers did not have a mandate to look into the financial administration and flow of the ASFCC. However, comments from the financial supervisor show that the financial arrangement may require some adjustments. Some delays in delivering statements of accounts can be explained and deal with the complexity which, for the auditors too, is difficult to understand. In phase 2 the processes are expected to run more smoothly because they have been practiced repeatedly. Due to the fact that contracts have been signed between the partners and SDC, the overall responsibility remains with SDC at the central level in Bern. This arrangement is necessary because SDC does not have general agreements with all ASEAN partner countries. So the workload at central level remains high.
  The financial overview by end of December 2012 show less spent funds than budgeted in all three outcomes with all four partners having an agreement with SDC. One reason is the delayed start, another one could also be the difficulty in understanding the outcome-based payment processes. This needs to be clarified during the planning process of the next phase.

2.3.2 Conclusions and recommendations

Due to the complexity to operate in all ASEAN countries, the reviewers propose to keep the present structure and operational arrangement as they are, with the following slight adjustments for the continuation in phase 2:

1. Keep the Secretariat small, effective and efficient, but add more staff capacity to increase the competence in synthesizing, sharing knowledge, doing light monitoring, and communication. This varied competence can possibly be bought-in from some of the involved and well known Implementation Partners as well as others. In addition, we recommend to fill the vacant post at the Secretariat to reduce work load from the present staff.
2. Establish an easy-to-apply in-built monitoring that serves the needs of ASFN and SDC at the same time prior to the start of phase 2. Buy-in the required competence for a proper installation.
3. As a starting preparation for phase 2, the reviewer propose to efficiently use the process and the update of the assessment report of 2010 which is right now under preparation. The reviewers recommend to:
   a) Adjust a more deeply SWOT than we find in the report of 2010 on p. 32-33,
   b) add a country-specific priority list of required needs,
   c) perhaps even enrich this 2nd report with the wishes of some government officers to get more economic proves of the potential of SF-CC (CBA or TEV of SF/CF linked to CC) and the need for research results on agroforestry.

4. Elaborate Partnership Program standards (financial, support, monitoring) to ease operation.
5. If possible increase the number of attendants to trainings per partner country or handle this issue more flexible and according to addressed need.
6. Keep the financial arrangement as it is because of the complex arrangement with ASEAN.
7. Internet/Intranet: Keep low profile and for operational purpose only. Concerning subject matters, refer to the sites of the Implementation Partners.

2.4   Main conclusion at the objective level

The question is: Does the program feed the two set objectives?
At the end the Partnership Program must show evidence that in the AMS **it contributed to Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation strategies which integrate applied Social Forestry approaches, resulting in an increased socio-economic benefit for local stakeholders**.

The answer is: Yes, but not yet.
The reviewers found some evidence that the Partnership Program is moving into the right direction. However, it needs more time and strategic guidance to increase this evidence. As the installed mechanisms begin to function, it will be important to keep the present set-up and continue for another three years.

3. Key recommendations for the continuation of ASFCC

The delay at the beginning of phase 1, the reported achievements and challenges of ASFCC shown in chapter 2, the anchorage as well as leverage, the remaining eight months until the end of the present phase, and the commented potential show that a continuation of the program in a consistent manner should be envisaged.

The experienced pace and the ASEAN's Economic Community 2015 call for a bridging support covering ideally two phases of three years each (2014-16 and 2017-19) with a slightly higher funding volume for phase 2 and a lower one in the third phase 3. An external evaluation by mid of 2016 shall analyze the achieved outcomes and define adaptations for a final phasing out period, 2017-19.

What the immediate future for the second phase is concerned, the reviewers present the following key recommendations in line to what has been listed up in chapter 2:

Text ref.	Topic	Key recommendation
2.1.1	**SF Policy Framework Strategic issues**	• Further support the implementation of AFCC SPA focusing on targeted components • Further monitor potential effects of ASEAN integration on SF communities and sensitize NWGs about this • Consider additional support to Myanmar to strengthen the accelerated pace (momentum) of SF/CF program development (most effectively through the Regional Cooperation department of

Text ref.	Topic	Key recommendation
		SDC, East Asia Division) • Provide true economic evidence for the connection of SF-CC with CBA/TEV and share results with decision makers • Invest in a sound planning process for phase 2 with the help of country-updates and priority tasks.
2.1.2	**Knowledge Sharing put into action**	• Increase post-training monitoring and share results to improve training effects and clarify roles of members and partners • Focus more on country-to-country trainings for earlier results • Continue plans to upgrade website but revisit objectives in the light of other competing knowledge sources • Embed the concept of Learning Group within the context of improvements in the learning process around annual meetings / conferences • Consider preparing communication plans for discrete policy targets • Develop supplemental (perhaps less formal) forms of sharing that can promote deeper exchange and understanding.
2.1.3	**Learning interventions, best practices and upscaling**	• Prepare joint implementing strategy at country level to identify, assess and disseminate best practices • Identify benchmark sites for monitoring evidence to support policy work • Collaboratively update research priorities, building on the range of ongoing research-oriented actions • Leverage resources with other research resources in the region • Conduct targeted work on CC Adaptation particularly on institutional issues preventing wide scale local adaptation action in SF areas.
2.2.1	**Institutional arrangement -> Flexibility -> Focal Points**	• Strengthen Focal Points • Work out a funding support via fund parking at Implementation or Cooperation Partners; elaborate criteria to release the funds, increase quota per partner.
2.2.1	**Implementation Partners**	• Let ICRAF to join the Implementation Partners to increase research competence in agro- forestry related to CC • Reflect "territorial approach" and adjust it. • Conduct more joint activities to raise synergism and reduce scattered small individual activities.
2.2.1	**Cooperation partners beyond present ones**	• Establish or further strengthen links and cooperation primarily with GAP-CC, AFEET, SEARCA, LEAF, and ARKN-FCC.
2.2.1	**Swiss Federal Government program in the region**	• Design a synergetic collaboration plan or even a joint program with SDC's Department of Regional Cooperation, East Asia Division, involved in the Mekong Region (Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos, Vietnam) • Regularly exchange progress with SECO at the

Text ref.	Topic	Key recommendation
		Swiss Embassy in Indonesia to seek private sector involvement on the voluntary carbon trade market • SDC to pledge continuity and envisage two more 3-yr. phases, 2014-16 and a phasing out period 2017-19. Communicate this at an early stage to the owners of ASFN.
2.3.1	**ASFCC-ASFN Secretariat (coordination cum management)**	• Fill vacant post as soon as possible; in addition… • …buy-in required competence from involved Implementation Partners (synthesizing, knowledge sharing, light monitoring, communication) or other • Further develop & simplify joint in-built monitoring for ASFN & SDC • Elaborate Partnership Program standards (financial, supporting principles) • Use or enlarge the updated assessment report 2013 for strategic planning purpose (country-specific task list with priorities for 2014-15-16) • Internet/Intranet: Keep on low profile and use it for operational issues.

Annexes

Annex 1: Commented ASFCC Logframe 2011

Goal: to contribute to food security through sustainable, efficient and effective use of land, forest, water and aquatic resources by minimizing the risks and impacts of and the contributions to climate change

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
Overall goal (similar to AFCC-FS)				
To contribute to food security through sustainable, efficient and effective use of land, forest, water and aquatic resources by minimizing the risks and impacts of, and the contributions to climate change	Strategies of social forestry and climate change adaptation and mitigation of all or at least the majority of ASEAN countries are developed and implemented according to cross-sectoral approaches, more specifically in accordance to objectives of poverty alleviation and food security	ASEAN and Member States social forestry and climate change policies and guidelines Evaluation reports of related programs and projects		Please proceed to Outcomes section.
Project objectives				
Social Forestry approaches developed and integrated into the climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies of ASEAN and the Member States	ASFN inputs are included in the overall climate change policy framework of most ASEAN member states (including AFCC-FS and related Action Plans)	ASEAN and national social forestry and climate change policies and principles ASEAN, ASOF and national meeting reports on climate change and forestry issues	Key issues addressed and critical aspects are openly discussed Tradeoffs between efficiency and equity are recognized and minimized	Please proceed to Outcomes section
Socio-economic benefits derived from the inclusion of communities, women and vulnerable groups in social	Improved inclusion and increasing number of different stakeholders (government, communities, private sector, academia,	ASEAN and national social forestry and climate change programs Monitoring reports with data on benefits	Multi-stakeholder decision-making systems are supported Land use, forest	

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
forestry and climate change adaptation and mitigation measures	NGOs) involved in social forestry and climate change adaptation and mitigation combined measures, and parts of the benefits allocated to the civil society Increased skills and shares (incentives, land area, etc.) that communities and vulnerable groups receive in nationally appropriated adaptation and mitigation actions	allocated to communities and vulnerable groups in social forestry, NAPA, NAMA and REDD programs	and climate change programmes include safeguards for poor groups	
Outcomes				
1. A coordinated social forestry policy framework is developed and integrated into ASEAN and the national forest and climate change strategies of the Member States	Strategic issues defined by policy assessments of the ASFN tackled by ASEAN and member countries, at least during each ASOF meeting, and with influence on at least 4 national or joint strategies ASEAN policy interventions and action plans communicated to international climate change and forest fora based on jointly developed messages including and combining social forestry and climate change Integration of social	ASFN and ASOF reports and minutes ASFN Strategic Plan of Actions AFCC-FS Action Plan and other ASEAN-level plans and interventions (UNFF, UNFCCC, etc.)	Willingness to agree on coordinated strategies and approaches Political transparency within ASFN Increased participation of Member States and political recognition of ASFN/AFCC-FS	1. A baseline study has been done on the role of SF in CC. It has identified in concise and thought-provoking manner country-level and regional-wide issues and opportunities. This study is being used in country and regional dialogs. 2. Partially with ASFCC support, the Ad Hoc Steering Committee on CC and FS adopted a Strategic Plan of Action (SPA) for submission to AMAF. Good interaction happening among key players towards synergy. These include the AMS, represented by the Working Groups and Networks related to Climate Change and Food Security, with Partner Organizations such as the GIZ/GAP-CC, FAO, USAID, Korea supporting ASEAN Network on Aquaculture, the ASEAN Food Security Information System. If followed, the SPA provides a starting framework to "walk the talk" and support concrete actions at AMS levels. ASFCC may wish to link with actors for selected components such as 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.0. 3. ASEAN Ministers on Agriculture and Forestry (AMAF) made an ASEAN Ministerial Statement on ASEAN Contribution to the International Year of Forest. ASEAN positions were also shared in the Asia Pacific Forestry Week in Beijing in November 2011, and to the Third International Asia Pacific

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
	forestry as an inclusive process in cross-sectoral ASEAN climate-change related policies, programs and projects			Climate Change Adaptation Conference in Incheon, March 2013. 4. Key messages on the role of CSOs in SF were discussed in events with ASEAN and ASFN including the ASFN 3rd Conference. The CSO inputs are gaining support from policy makers and were endorsed by the 6th Annual Meeting of ASFN. The ASOF in June 2012 has tasked ASFN to develop activities that would serve to follow-up from the ASFN and ASFN secretariat recommendations. 5. The ASEAN Secretariat (ASEC) has been rendering assistance for the ASEAN Member States (AMS) on implementing the ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint. ASFN has annually discussed the dedicated Agenda Item on ASEAN Economic Integration and the ASEAN Economic Community Blueprint to highlight contributions of the ASEAN Cooperation in Social Forestry through the contribution of ASFN to the Strategic Plan of Action of the ASOF. There will be a need to monitor these developments so that national working groups can discuss early and plan for safety nets for SF communities who will likely be affected. At the same time, NWGs can tap into opportunities from the free flow of SF products as well as from the free flow of technical assistance and other capacity building activities to enhance the role of social forestry in climate change The ASEAN Economic Integration may also generate opportunities for more flow of SF products. 6. Heightened discussion on REDD+ and the role of ecosystems based adaptation has renewed interest in the role of SF in national sustainable development particularly on its actual economic contributions. This is also partly echoed recently by the ASEAN Deputy Sec General (see discussion under item 3.1.). This is a topic that can have practical appeal to policy makers. 7. The role of SFM and SF is discussed in National Climate Change plans in Cambodia, Indonesia, and the Philippines. These policy statements and programs are being translated into specific actions for REDD+ and Climate Change Adaptation which are described under the outputs section of this matrix.

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
				8. ASFCC support has helped strengthen the Philippines' National REDD+ Strategy (PNRPS) through policy studies that improved FPIC policy instruments among others while Cambodia is on high gear to develop an inclusive REDD+ Strategy. In Myanmar, the Government has set up a full time CF unit within the Department of Forestry based on recommendations from a multi-sectoral sessions on CF. The government is also reviewing 5 other recommendations, including the creation of a CF law, based on results of CF assessment and planning sessions supported by the ASFCC.
2. Local, national and regional knowledge sharing, communication and networking on Social Forestry and Climate Change is strengthened and put into use	ASFN focal points and Climate Change working groups or key people meet at least twice a year in each Member States to exchange information and experiences and to launch joint initiatives A majority of Member States provide their own contributions to the ASFN website, that is at least monthly updated with new information The visit of the website increase by at least 50% over the program life Increasing audience to ASFN meetings and presence of key ASEAN decision makers	ASEAN and ASFN reports (ASFN six-monthly and focal points' reports) Specific feedback reports and evaluations of knowledge sharing, communications and networking activities Documents related to new initiatives promoted by ASFN and network partners Content and hits on the ASFN website Reports of annual and other meetings	Continuous interest and willingness in knowledge generation and sharing. Limited time and capacity	1. Most planned regional learning events are being accomplished and generally well documented with comprehensive training reports in the case of regional trainings. A basic array of regional and national publications has been produced. There is a functioning website that is being upgraded. 2. ASFN Focal Points are actively interacting with CC Working Groups in Cambodia, the Philippines, and Thailand, and to some extent in Indonesia. Myanmar discussions are focusing more on the basic needs (e.g. tenure security, NTFP livelihoods) to reinvigorate the CF program and with limited reference yet to specific REDD+ opportunities. 3. Regional training/sharing participants are generally positive about their learning experience (see also Output 1.2. for discussion). However, the post-event interaction among Focal Points is currently insufficient and can be increased in the remaining period of the current Phase, for sustained learning and enhanced use of knowledge gained. 4. The actual use of what is learned is currently difficult to track. There are of course good anecdotal cases of how they are used, but it is difficult to establish overall trends. RECOFTC has a system for following-up participants but implementation is a concern (see also Output 2.2, indicator c). 5. Feedbacks from participants indicate room for improvements. It needs to be enhanced through an agreed-upon monitoring system, applied for all ASFCC Implementation Partners, facilitated by ASFN Secretariat, as the current follow-up system for post-training is borne only by one Implementing Partner when in reality, all Partners must be involved.

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
				6. Accordingly, this current practice for the first one-and-a-half year of the Initiation Phase (July 2011 – December 2012) is due to the current understanding of division of focus for Implementation Partners, for instance RECOFTC is designated for ASFCC Implementation Partner on Knowledge Sharing and Capacity Building.
				7. The effect of Country-to-Country visits done appear easier to track (Cambodia to the Philippines and Sarawak Malaysia to Indonesia facilitated by NTFP-EP in September 2012 and February 2013, the Learning Groups and Executive Study Tour facilitated by RECOFTC in September 2012 and February 2013, as well as Malaysia, Cambodia and the Philippines to Indonesia through Exchange Program facilitated by ASFN Secretariat in February 2012).
				8. It is also relatively easy to track the effectiveness of national learning events. A good example is the RECOFTC facilitated inception meeting and subsequent sessions on SF in Myanmar which is resulting in the conduction of participatory action research.
				9. (Note: The preceding 2 observations above are also shared because the outcome statement calls for "knowledge...is put to use". These findings may also match the requirements of Outcome 3 because it matches Indicator 2 of said outcome).
				10. The website has a basic array of information about country SF profile, news features and publications useful for Focal Points and Partners. It is not possible to establish the trend in visits at this time. ASFN Focal Points contribute information but there is need for innovations through increased category, content, and outreach, for the Focal Points and Partners to visit the website regularly; while the intranet is not yet fully used. Plans are being finalized to improve the set up based on suggestions from ASFN Members and Partners.
				11. The presence of many other regional and more competitive online sources of information call for a revisiting of website objectives and its limitations

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
				acknowledged. Further investments in website should ideally be based on the results of a communication planning process described in the last paragraph.

12. Future efforts may also wish to consider how to encourage web-assisted communication/interaction between National Focal Points and their counterpart national players. A good case in point is the planned ASFN Myanmar website among SF key actors in Myanmar, which is a laudable effort. The format and content has actually been prepared and await institutional approval for final launching.

13. Given its almost 2 years experience (plus 2 years in a predecessor project), there is now an opportunity to assess the state of flow of knowledge; and enhance its use, through a more effective mix of learning events for the right people, in the right place and the right time. One suggestion in this regard is to study whether more of Country to Country learning (seemingly early recognizable results) should be done over regional wide trainings (less tractable results).

14. The program now has gradually increasing capacity to pinpoint specific policies or policy instruments to influence. There will be a growing need to carefully formulate, in a purposive manner, the mix of learning oriented activities (training, sharing events, websites, publications, etc.) in such a way that they can have cumulative effect on specific target audience e.g. decision makers etc, for specific policy or program objectives either at regional, national or sub-national levels.

15. A workshop on communication and networking strategies was done in 2010 (pre-project); this identified the range of learning oriented strategies that has become the "template" for the operational plans of Implementing Partners. This communication and networking strategy continues to be relevant but may no longer be sufficient to emerging policy opportunities to influence policy. It needs to be supplemented by communication planning. ASFCC's work in the Philippines has elements of this process that is worth investigating further. |
| 3. Learning | All ASFN-supported | Reports, publication | Sectoral results are | 1. Innovative CF approaches have been shared during ASFN Conferences and |

ASFCC external review, April 2013

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
interventions and best practices conducted in Social Forestry and Climate Change for broader implementation and policy development	innovative approaches and assessed or developed best practices are disseminated at national and ASEAN levels At least 2/3 of the learning interventions are taken up and put into practice by other partners in policies, guidelines or implementation projects	of best practices documents, reports of dissemination events Policy documents, strategies and action plans of the ASEAN Countries Significant changes reported (up to 2 years after the activity), feedback reports, evaluations of activities	disseminated beyond "internal circles"	Training Workshops as well as Country to Country visits. Several "start up" dissemination oriented activities at country level are occurring in Cambodia (e.g. creation of 7 provincial CF committees), Indonesia (support to 2 pilot sites and visits); the Philippines (information road show of REDD+ at sub national levels) and Thailand (awareness building workshops SF actors among CSOs, local authorities, Forest Department and CC agencies). 2. See also discussion under Outcome 2 indicators on the results of regional trainings; country-to-country trainings and national trainings. 3. Emerging best practices in SF and in SF and CC are generally known by Country actors. However, there is limited action so far on the prioritization, assessment and documentation of best practices that can boost dissemination programs to support SF and SF and CC. The Philippines are developing a folio of best practices in Community Based Forest Management which is worth studying further. 4. Outcome 3 is implemented in various activities described above. However, the implementing strategy for Outcome 3 at the country level is not fully clear yet. An implementing strategy would ideally integrate efforts among implementing Partners and with that of the Focal Point. Activities of Partners will need to be mutually reinforcing each other. The strategy will rely on identifying; monitoring and disseminating site based best practices, many of which may not be within the control of the project. Outcome 3 activities have a direct bearing on Objective 2 of ASFCC (demonstrate the actual benefits to communities).
Outputs				
For outcome 1:				
Output 1.1: ASEAN priority policy and strategic issues in social forestry and climate change are commonly identified and assessed	All ASFN review documents used during ASOF and other selected ASEAN meetings Recommendations on linkages between social forestry and climate change measures	ASFN policy brief, ASOF/ASEAN reactions (meeting reports), social forestry guidelines and policies Guidelines and policies on adaptation and mitigation	Member States accept their political differences but adopt a phased and coordinated approach	1. Country briefs (containing issues and opportunities) prepared by AMS focal points, are circulated widely. A baseline study (Role of SF in CC) has been produced and used by AMS. 2. The baseline data is being updated through a regional "learning group." There is good discussion on what needs to be updated and why. There is need to elaborate more on the "how's", especially in overcoming practical challenges at country level such as information access, accuracy, harmony

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
	based on ASFN studies and interventions are integrated into cross-sectoral national and ASEAN policy messages	measures		of different sources etc. Anecdotal cases of communities delineating their ancestral domains or common property rights may be factored into the process where appropriate. The updating study may also consider adding more information about mainstreaming actions including those initiated by local authorities. Expert assistance will be helpful at some point and consultation with FAO and other players will be vital so that the ensuing information can be mainstreamed in official knowledge bases such as the FAO Forest Outlook Series. 3. Also consider the end product i.e. communicating the updated baseline data more effectively. Regional social research groups like the Asia Forestry Network (AFN) might be able to suggest ideas on effective visual presentation etc.
Output 1.2: Capacities of ASFN, focal points and network partners are improved to effectively reach the relevant decision makers and influential stakeholders within ASEAN and Member States	All national focal points and SF "Champions" of at least 4 countries formed in climate change related policies and implementation mechanisms Number and effects of ASFN-Member States-ASEAN interactions	ASFN Focal Points, ASFN Secretariat and Network Partners reports Meeting reports, ASOF reports	Continuous and motivated ASFN Leaders, ASFN Focal Points and Network Partners	1. Anecdotal information indicates generally positive feedback to training activities. However, it is currently difficult to track how these learning's are eventually used towards decision making. The task is borne only by one partner. Focal points and other partners are not yet involved. A possible exception to the situation would be the country-to-country trainings conducted that seems to stimulate immediately recognizable post event actions. 2. Proposal from 30 CSOs in 8 AMS have been prepared and shared with ASEAN as ASFN officers in at least 4 events (4th ASFN conference, Brown Bag seminars etc.) and received encouragement from the ASFN leadership to precede with collaboration particularly at the AMS levels. ASEANSEC and ASFN leaders acknowledge the importance of this initiative and have a better understanding on the role of CSOs in the SF process. AMS countries have varying comfort levels on the extent CSOs may be invited to participate in ASFN activities. There will be a need to continue to implement this engagement in a gradual, confidence building manner. CSO leaders await feedback on the status of their proposal for inclusion in regular ASFN meetings. Regular feedback to CSOs on the status of their proposals will be helpful. 3. At the national level, CSOs are becoming part of dialogue within NWGs in Cambodia, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. Similar initiatives are

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
				being planned in Myanmar. Notable actions are happening at sub-national level to establish multi-sectoral consultation mechanisms (e.g. 7 provinces in Cambodia, 4 provinces in Indonesia, several Tambons in Thailand). See also discussion on Learning Group under Output 2.2.
Output 1.3: Policy recommendations on the contribution of social forestry in climate change are mainstreamed within ASEAN and the Member States	ASFN policy and strategic recommendations are discussed at least once a year by ASEAN/AFCC-FS/ASOF and Member Country decision makers Increased qualitative and quantitative targets of social forestry are included in Member States policies and strategies	Reports from the ASEAN/AFCC-FS Working Groups and Initiatives on climate change Member Country official Forestry Reports related to social forestry and climate change, ASFN Focal Point Reports. Locally Appropriated Adaptation and Mitigation Actions (LAAMAs) and Nationally Appropriated Adaptation and Mitigation Actions (NAAMAs) reported and documented.	ASEAN/AMAF/ASOF accepts that social forestry is an important element in the overall forests and climate change agenda Member States are willing to expand the role of social forestry in addressing climate change Trust, confidence and genuine partnerships for social forestry still have to be tested in some countries before the expansion can follow the principles of free, prior and informed consent of the local people/IPs	**Regional level:** 1. ASEAN (AMAF and ASOF) policy declarations recognizing the role of SF in SFM and CC have been adopted (e.g. position for the International Year of the Forest). AFCC has adopted the SPA for strategic action on SF and CC migration and adaptation. 2. These policy declarations benefitted from contributions of ASFN staff, the use of ASFN knowledge products on SF and CC. ASFN was also asked to help directly redevelop knowledge products for ASEAN forestry sector (e.g. video on ASEAN initiatives). 3. Discussion with the Deputy Secretary-General of ASEAN Economic Community Department on 16 April 2013 at the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta had highlighted areas for focus in the remaining Phase of ASFCC, and for the Next Phase, for instance in valuation of SF practices towards SFM and the Forests, as well as the contribution to the ASEAN Economic Development, by Country and at the Regional level. **National Level:** 4. In Myanmar, the government, based on a project assisted inception workshop, adopted a 6 point action plan to accelerate country wide coverage of CF. A recent presidential order (not ASFCC assisted) requires establishment of CF demonstration models in each of the regions and states of the country. There is a need to keep up with the accelerating pace of MMR's CF program. Support Government plans with good analysis and menu of choices so that they can plan well at the start. 5. In the Philippines, enabling policy instruments for FPIC based on project assisted studies have been adopted. Two other policy studies deal with the drivers of deforestation and carbon rights. 6. In Malaysia, the Sarawak Forest Department established a community

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
				service initiative (CSI) program to support community involvement in forest affairs. Based partly on the information from a country team visit to CF (NTFP) sites in Kalimantan, the Department adopted a strategy for NTFP based livelihood development to support forest management.
Costs of outcome 1: SDC contribution: US$842,367 b) 75% c) ca. 1.1 million US$, counterpart countries, GIZ and implementation partners				
For outcome 2:				
Output 2.1: ASFN Secretariat is fully operational and efficiently managing and sharing knowledge, communication and information	Appreciation of the coordination work and extension of various collaborations supported by the Secretariat Number and appreciation of knowledge management tools and products compiled by the Secretariat and used by Member countries	List of tools and products Use and feedback reports, significant change reports by users and Partners ASFN Secretariat six-monthly reports highlighting collaboration with other Networks and other Initiatives.	ASFN creates its own identity in the landscape of various Networks in Asia Different agendas prevail over collaboration and coordination	1. The ASFN is operational and coordinates contributions of 8 focal points, 3 implementing partners and several cooperation partners. Together with the ASFCC advisor, it supports policy analysis and communication needs of the ASEANSEC as well as the host Ministry of Forestry. It has catalyzed the accumulation of a high level of social capital at least among the countries we have interacted with. It also coordinates all ASFN meetings and conferences. However, ASFN is very understaffed for the range of tasks it does. For more discussion this, please see also the main report, item 2.2.
Output 2.2: ASFN Focal Points and Network Partners effectively participate in the Network and fully contribute to knowledge sharing and capacity development	Increased knowledge management activities on SF-CC joint issues implemented in and among ASFN Member States, e.g. an ASEAN-level learning group Number of coordination and information requests to the Secretariat and network partners Use of the website and other media by ASFN Member States, Network Partners, as	ASFN Secretariat reports for Steering Committee (highlighting the requests and reflection on the collaboration) Website hits and survey ASFN technical and financial reports Evaluations of the annual ASFN meetings	Continuous and motivated ASFN Secretariat Conducive working environment provided by Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia and by ASEAN	1. There is an increasing trend in the number of learning events. There is an observed trend in increase in number of CSO participants. Majority of AMS contribute to website but with decreasing regularity. It is not possible to track the increase in website visits at the time of evaluation. 2. Several regional training participants cited certain areas for attention. These include: preparation time, selection of participants, language, limited allotted time to share, time management of host speakers, availability of directory of participants etc. The occurrence could run between 10% and 40% of the time, based on rough estimates from RECOFTC and from country participants. A collaborative assessment among partners and focal points may help determine the true picture. 3. Staff turnover at RECOFTC in 2012 may have temporarily affected the

ASFCC external review, April 2013

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	<mark>Comments by External Review</mark>
	well as ASEAN Secretariat Increased quality (and regularity?) of the contributions of ASFN Members and Partners to the annual ASFN meeting			availability of information from post-training follow-up of some of the training courses conducted. This can easily be done, but needs to be addressed soonest. 4. Annual meetings are complemented by conferences on important themes that also attract participation of non ASFN members, especially in the host country. Currently, there is insufficient system for organizing and synthesizing the abundant information from the regular sharing events in a way that can be efficiently retrieved by users with varying interests. However, a recent website and intranet upgrading process will be finalized by midyear and is expected to benefit members and partners. 5. ASFN and partners have set up a Learning Group consisting of resident technical experts from participating Ministries. They are learning and sharing improved ways for updating vital SF statistics and communicating SF messages to decision makers. This move will help build a corps of advocates with strong analytical and communication skills. There will be a need to clarify the current and long term "niche" (role) of the learning group vis-a-vis the bigger learning process going on among ASFN focal points. What other pathways /interventions apart from the learning group need to be in place in order to set the process of institutionalizing the sharing /learning process? 6. Some observations indicate that the regional sharing and learning sessions tend to be overly formal which may mean less time for in depth sharing and discussion. This may be partly explained by the need to represent official country positions plus practical language challenges. But since there is already a large social capital being built through frequent interaction, the time may be ripe for developing supplemental mechanisms that might be able to stimulate in depth exchange and discussion.
Output 2.3: ASFN exchanges knowledge beyond its own network and is increasingly recognized	Number of citations of ASFN products and related appreciations Number of invitation to international meetings to present ASFN experiences Recognition of ASFN	Internet and media survey ASFN reports Surveys targeted at civil society groups, , other ASEAN bodies (e.g. ASEAN WEN etc) and international	Network partners provide scientific and communication support to ASFN members	1. The ASEAN CSO community is now engaged in a major way with ASFN and ASEANSEC through the dialogue started in 2012 and will be continued in the ensuing years. The CSO community moves generally united and represents voluntary efforts that can help the network deepen the SF dialogue and promote upscaling. They also come in with their own resources supported by international partners. This is a major milestone and will need to be sustained by promoting the engagement further particularly at the national levels, as

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
	as an influential partner by civil society groups as well as international multi-stakeholder platforms	political and academic / research networks		recommended by the ASFN leadership in 2012. 2. The ASFN secretariat has actively pursued discussions with the organizers on the upcoming ASEAN network on Forest Education Extension and Training or AFEET. AFEET organizers based in Indonesia Ministry of Forestry. While ASFN will focus on policy dialogue and best practices development, AFEET will focus on strategy formulation and capacitating partners for up scaling innovations in forest management and SF. 3. The ASFN Secretariat with its Advisor is also the exploring possibility of engaging the research sector (including forest research departments of focal points) to contribute to issue analysis and tap existing funding windows to make this happen. Examples of support may come from research oriented ASEAN bodies such as SEARCA that provides support for research targeted on topics that can help in policy formulation. This is a good move that deserves further consideration. Note: this portion is also relevant to item 3.2 (research)
Costs of outcome 2: SDC contribution: US$917'411 b) 90% c) ca. 1 million US$, counterpart by Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia (in kind)				
For outcome 3:				
Output 3.1: Multi-stakeholder National Working Groups aiming at developing social forestry approaches and nationally appropriated adaptation and mitigation actions formed and strengthened in selected Member States	Ability of at least 4 national social forestry working groups to organize dissemination activities linked to climate change issues, appreciation and use of results by communities and decision makers	Technical and event reports from the working groups Sampled surveys Integration/invitations of the working groups in national and ASEAN meetings	There is increased collaboration among ASFN Focal Points, Network Partners and different stakeholders The limited collaboration and capacities	1. NWG groups supporting SF exist in Cambodia, and the Philippines. Focal points and CSO partners have contributed to discussions that help elaborate on the role of SF in REDD. Efforts also include the incorporation of CSO voice in NWG discussions. Actions in Thailand include facilitation of discussions between national and sub national decision makers with other sectors, on the role of SF in supporting the Royal Program on Sufficiency Economy, as well as in REDD+ and CCA. 2. In Indonesia, Social Forestry Forum is being established in each of 4 provinces and formation of a national working group is under finalization. The forthcoming CF NWG in Myanmar will be expected to focus on basic CF issues (e.g. land access) before tackling higher level discussion on REDD+ opportunities. 3. The CF NWG in Vietnam has become inactive but the REDD+ program has 4 sub working groups and SF contributions are discussed at this level.

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	Comments by External Review
Output 3.2: Commonly identified thematic issues relating to locally appropriated adaptation and mitigation actions are investigated, analyzed and shared	Scientific publications on operational and methodological approaches and experiments developed and tested by ASFN and used for LAAMAs in forestry Number and quality of regional collaboration possible to use in the development of NAAMAs	Technical and event reports, scientific papers National Readiness strategies and action plans Reports on the social forestry strategies and action plans of ASEAN Countries	There is willingness to integrate innovative approaches in the social forestry agenda in ASEAN member states The limited collaboration and capacities Coordination of research and extension activities	1. Two tracks of research are happening. First, strategic research by CIFOR is helping ASFN understand, how traditional Swidden Agricultural practices and social networks can actually enhance benefits from REDD+. Concurrently, more reliable participatory carbon and MRV assessment methods are also developed in the context of complex forest and agriculture landscapes. The research topics were pre-identified at project start up and are very strategically relevant. However, the practical benefits from these research undertakings do not appear to have been communicated clearly among National Focal Points and will need to be addressed very soon. 2. The second modality is the range of participatory action research being done in Myanmar, Thailand and the Philippines, led by Implementation Partners (RECOFTC and NTFP) to study implementation issues on the ground such as land tenure insecurity as well as to develop locally applicable carbon assessment methods. These undertakings are building skills of specific communities that can then be shared with other counties in the future. 3. There will be a need to synchronize the long term an action research under the two modalities. In fact, there is a need to collaboratively identify research, priorities to support the concept of SF and CC. Develop measures to either fund them directly or seek collaboration with other relevant research initiatives. 4. See also discussion on proposal of ASFN Secretariat and Advisor for the possibility of engaging the research sector (including forest research departments of focal points) to contribute to issue analysis and tap existing funding windows to make this happen (item 2.3 above).
Output 3.3: Adaptation strategies and best practices from selected community forestry initiatives assessed, developed and upscaled for wider implementation and to inform policy	Scaling-up potential of experiences compiled and learning interventions supported in at least 5 Member States with the direct involvement of ASFN focal points, partners and State agencies, and evaluation of	Reports, publications on best practices, scientific papers Independent evaluations of the learning interventions (beneficiaries, benefits) and of the potential of scaling-up	Readiness to accept new strategies and approaches Adaptation potential of the practices to various contexts	1. A number of in country-to=country visits and in country advocacy sessions and road shows have been conducted. Best practice sites in SF and SF in CC exist and several are potential benchmark sites for assessing the contributions of SF on CC mitigation and adaptation. 2. The Cambodia Forest Department and implementing partner has developed a joint plan of action consisting of contributions from various sources to support CF network building work in 7 provinces. In Thailand action research on community carbon monitoring are done in 2 sites. In addition, partners of

Strategy of intervention	Key indicators	Means of verification	External factors Assumptions, Risks	<mark>Comments by External Review</mark>
processes	expected benefits for local communities and disadvantaged people			the Focal Point are conducting consultative workshops that involve practitioners including local authorities, from best practice sites. 3. Indonesia is supporting two CF sites to demonstrate good practices. It has not yet started to document and disseminate good practices from existing sites. There are existing sites on CF oriented REDD+ actions but these are under the purview of another General Directorate. There is a strong advocacy for Agro forestry in production forest areas coming from the Ministry of Forestry. 4. Most AMS know where the best practice sites are but there has been limited effort so far to assess, prioritize, document and disseminate them. A possible exception is the Philippines, which has developed recently a folio of best practices in CF. Cambodia is also working on best practices identification in 2013 with the Ministry of Environment.
Costs of outcome 3: SDC contribution: US$1,919,199 b) 75% c) ca. 3-4 million US$, counterpart by countries, and upscaled funding e.g. UN-REDD				

<Annex 1 Commented ASFCC Logframe v5 (EQ-HS 24.4.2013).docx>

TERMS of REFERENCE

Mid-Term Review 2013 of the ASEAN – Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC)

Please refer to the Program Document and Credit Proposal for the background of ASFCC

Objectives of the Mid-Term Review:

- Provide independent, external review of the progress of work and institutional arrangements of the ASFCC in support of the ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN)
- Assess if the ASFCC programme is on the right track and if the institutional arrangement which has been set up for phase 1 is serving the purpose of the programme overall
- Provide an external assessment of the ASFCC's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
- Serve as input to the planning of the second phase (2014-2016)
- Provide an indirect assessment of whether and to what extent the current mode of collaboration and support is working

Scope and Focus of the Review:

- The review will broadly relate to the log frame of the ASEAN Multisectoral Framework for Food Security and Climate Change (AFCC) as developed by ASEAN decision makers;
- The review will focus on the ASFCC programme's two objectives:
  (1) social forestry approaches developed and integrated into the climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies of AMS; and
  (2) socio-economic benefits derived from the inclusion of communities, women and vulnerable groups in social forestry and climate change adaptation and mitigation
- The review will assess progress on achievement of ASFCC's three expected outcomes:
  (1) coordinated social forestry policy framework developed and integrated into ASEAN and AMS climate change strategies;
  (2) strengthened knowledge sharing, communication and networking at different levels;
  (3) learning interventions and best practices conducted in social forestry and climate change for broader implementation and policy development

- The review will assess the degree of achievement of expected specific outputs under each of the outcomes (3 outputs specified for each outcome)
- The review will critically assess the institutional arrangements that support ASFN, the functioning of the ASFN Secretariat and implementation partners, and the relationship between ASEAN, ASFCC and its implementation partners;
- The review will assess the arrangements in place with other developing partners, in particular GIZ and Korea, and reflect on possible synergies and collaboration
- The review will also capture other outcomes, unplanned outputs, (e.g. additional resources mobilized and the long-term financing of ASFN).

Furthermore, the review will:

- provide a broad assessment of ASFCC's progress to date in supporting ASEAN Social Forestry Network and its partners;
- provide a brief assessment of country progress based on the experiences of ASFN Network partners. For this some country examples could be studied in more detail (e.g. Philippines by one of the consultants, Myanmar, etc.);
- assess the collective progress based on degree of achievement and movement towards expected ASFCC Outcomes and Outputs, including:
    - ✓ To what extent ASFN/ASFCC messages penetrate or are picked up in ASOF, AMAF discussions, documents and decisions?
    - ✓ How can we advance towards more coordinated social policy framework within ASEAN?
    - ✓ How far have AMS advanced in their understanding, approaches and actions to link Social Forestry and Climate Change (national level); are we on the right path?
- also, make proposals in respect to the future, including:
    - ✓ Next steps given where ASFCC currently stands and where it will be by the end of phase 1?
    - ✓ What direction should ASFCC pursue in the future phases?
    - ✓ What areas should ASFCC emphasize, de-emphasize, add or reconfigure in future phases, including themes and issues needing greater attention?
    - ✓ How do we deal with the research input to the programme?

Proposed Team of Reviewers:

- ✓ A team of two reviewers (one from ASEAN and from Switzerland)
- ✓ Background in Social Forestry and intergovernmental processes, organizations, institutional arrangements and overall Climate Change
- ✓ Knowledge of Asia and/or ASEAN and of international and regional institutions

✓ Knowledge in institutional arrangements to conduct networks, to monitor and evaluate cooperation programs and projects.

Review Report:

▪ The report of will consist of a maximum 25 pages. Supporting tables may be attached if necessary.
▪ The report will be written in concise and constructive language, providing suggestions for improvement and course correction if and where needed.

Review Process and Time Line:

✓ Review and finalization of TORs (February 2013)
✓ ASFCC, supported by the ASFN Secretariat and the implementation partners, will request AMS for information related to the Logframe and provide template and guiding questions to AMS
✓ Draft report to be presented at the planning meeting (End of April/Beginning of May 2013), ASFN and partners to comment and suggest revisions if needed
✓ Revision and finalization of mid-term review by end of May 2013
✓ Final report to be reported to ASFN Meeting in Laos (June 17-21, 2013)

Annex 3: List of contacts / mission program

1) X: Discussion through skype or phone contacts; (EQ) = Eduard Queblatin only,
(HS) = Hans Schaltenbrand only

Date	Venue	Person(s) met	Function / additional comments	X 1)
25.2./27.2. 28.3.2013	Zollikofen	Jürgen Blaser (HS)	SDC	
18.3.2013	Zollikofen	Ms. Van, VN Forest MARD (HS)	Focal point Vietnam	X
26.2./4./11. 14./16./25. 26./28.3 6.4.2013	Zollikofen, Manila, Myanmar	HS & EQ 14.&16.3. + Doris and Sagita	Various skype sessions to prepare the review mission 2 skype conferences w. program staff	X
26.3.2013	Bern	Mr. Sreeram Koottala (HS)	Financial supervisor to ASFCC	
1.4.2013	Nay Pyi Taw, Myanmar	U Zaw Win Myint Prof Ohn Lwin Dr Tin zar Kywe Ms Zarchi Hlaing (EQ)	Focal Point , Director Forest Res Institute Former Focal Point, Univ. of Forestry, Yezin Sr Research Staff Ranger Officer	X
8.4.2013	Manila	Mr Maung Maung Thant (EQ)	MMR RECOFTC Coordinator	X
9.4.2013	BKK	RECOFTC staff (HS)	Implementation Partner and all involved staff	
11.4.2013	Jakarta	Doris Capistrano & Sagita Arhidani	AFSCC – ASFN & Secretariat	
	Jakarta	Mr Sugeng Mr Marsudiarto Mr Nikolas Nugroho, Mr Ari Sulistyo	Directorate of Social Forestry Development/SFD; Focal point	
	Jakarta	Mr Christoph Berg Ms Myriam Fernando Mr Agus Suratho	GAP-CC project staff	
	Jakarta	Doris & Sagita	Round up of the day and further fixing mission schedule	
12.4.2013	Jakarta	Doris, Sagita, Patti	Program staff SWOT visualization and fine tuning	
	Jakarta	Mr. Iman Santoso	DG of Forestry Research and Dev. Agency (FORDA and ASoF Leader Indonesia	
	Jakarta	Mr Sugeng Mr Marsudiarto Mr Nikolas Nugroho	Directorate of Social Forestry Development/SFD; Focal point	
	Jakarta	Mr. Yurdi Yasmi	Former staff of RECOFTC now stationed at ICRAF in Hanoi, Co-author of assessment report 2010	X
	Jakarta	Doris/Sgita	Logframe discussions	
13.- 14.4. 2013	Jakarta		HS & EQ Summing up of the gathered information	
	Jakarata	Ms Joana de Rozario (EQ)	NTFP – EP Malaysia	X
15.4.2013	Jakarta	Ms Crissy Guerrero	Director NTFP-EP	
	Jakarta	Ms Dr. Yetti Rusli	Senior advisor to the Minister Forestry, Envirnment & CC, initiator of ASFN	
	Jakarta	Dr. Hadi S. Pasaribu (HS)	Senior adivor on Economic and international Trade	
	Jakarta	Mr Suwito (EQ)	Member of Forest Governance Working Group and Community empowerment	
	Jakarta	Mr Ricky Martin (EQ)	Focal Point Person, Malaysia	X
	Jakarta	Dr Ir Techrir Fathoni (EQ)	Dir. General , Min of Forest and currently convening discussion on ASEAN FEET	

Date	Venue	Person(s) met	Function / additional comments	X 1)
	Jakarta	Ms Femy Pinto Phnom Penh (EQ)	NTFP EP Cambodia,	X
16.4.2013	Jakarta	Mr Heinz Walker-Nederkorn, Mr Jürg Schneider (HS)	Swiss Ambassador SECO, 1st Secretary	
16.4.2013	Jakarta	Ms Pouchamarn Wongsasa (EQ)	Senior Officer, AINR Devision, ASEAN	
16.4.2013	Jakarta	Mr Lim Hong Hin	Dy Secr. General of ASEAN	
	Jakarta	Mr Tomi Haryadi	RECOFTC Coordinator for ASFN, Bangkok	X
17.4.2013	Bogor	Whole CIFOR team & Mr Peter Kanowski (welcome speech)	CIFOR Implementation Partner Dy. Director of CIFOR	
	Jakarta	Mr Billy Hindra	Human Resources, Ministry of Forestry; former Director of SF department	
	Jakarta	Mr. Sigit Pramono	Director of Bilateral and Regional Forestry Cooperation	
18.4.2013	Jakarta	Dr. Haryadi Himawan (EQ)	Dy. Dir. of SF Department and Chair of ASFN Secretariat	
18.4.2013	Phom Penh Jakarta	Ms Hean Bun Hiang Ms Rithny Mr Viriya Ms Femy Pinto (EQ)	AIPP Mekong Coordinator, Chiang Mai Cambodia NGO Forum NTFP EP NTFP EP	X

Annex 4: Guiding questions for f2f discussions

Besides the guiding questions shown below in this Annex, a more detailed questionnaire with connections to the Logframe was used by the reviewers. Some distant discussions via skype or phone were adjusted with a questionnaire. Those data are kept with the reviewers.

Mid-Term Review 2013 of the ASEAN – Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC)

Interim List of Topics for Discussion, March 31 2013

Background

The ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC) that has provided substantial support towards the advancement of programme activities of the ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN) includes a Mid Term Review for the implementation of the Partnership, as discussed during the ASFCC Supervisory and Planning Meeting in Indonesia, in October 2012, which was attended by Delegates of the ASEAN Member States, the Swiss Government through the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), and the Implementation Partners of ASFCC, namely the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), the Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Programme (NTFP-EP), and The Centre for People and Forests (RECOFTC).

During the Debriefing Meeting co-chaired by His Excellency Heinz Walker-Nederkoorn, Swiss Ambassador to ASEAN, and Dr. Somsak Pipoppinyo, Director of the Directorate of the ASEAN Secretariat that is overseeing the ASEAN Cooperation under the purview of the ASEAN Ministers on Agriculture and Forestry (AMAF) held at the end of the ASFCC Supervisory and Planning Meeting in Jakarta on 11 October 2012, it was presented that a Mid-Term Review of the ASFCC will be conducted in April 2013.

Review Process and Time Line:

1) Mid-Term Review to be conducted in April 2013, with inputs from ASEAN Member States, Partner Organizations and ASEAN Secretariat.

2) Draft report to be presented at the Planning Meeting scheduled to be held on 29 April – 1 May 2013 at Hua Hin, Thailand. ASFN and Partners to comment and suggest revisions if needed.
3) Revision and finalization of Mid-Term Review by end of May 2013.
4) Final report to be reported to ASFN Meeting in Lao PDR (June 17-21, 2013).

Objectives of the Mid-Term Review:

▪ Provide independent, external review of the progress of work and institutional arrangements of the ASFCC in support of the ASEAN Social Forestry Network (ASFN).
▪ Assess if the ASFCC programme is on the right track and if the institutional arrangement which has been set up for Phase 1 is serving the purpose of the programme overall.
▪ Provide an external assessment of the ASFCC's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT).
▪ Serve as input to the planning of the second phase (2014-2016).
▪ Provide an indirect assessment of whether and to what extent the current mode of collaboration and support is working.

The external review team would like to interact with ASFN Country Partners on the following key topics. In addition, follow-up communication will be made with ASFN Focal Points.

PROPOSED TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

1. In the past two years, what have been the key in national policy dialog and program formulation to strengthen Social Forestry (SF) in the Country; and promote the link between SF and Climate Change (CC)?
   - recent milestones,
   - outstanding gaps,
   - emerging opportunities in the past two years.
2. What do you think are the key contributions of the ASFCC program with respect to SF and CC in terms of:

   - Regional consensus on strategy?
   - National policy dialog and program formulation,
   - Human resources capacity building.

3. What do you think has the Country contributed to the development of an ASEAN framework for SF and CC in terms of

   - Inputs to policy formulation,
   - Knowledge exchange.

4. How do you assess the interaction between the Country and various Regional Partners under ASFCC CIFOR, NTFP-EP, RECOFTC, ASFN Secretariat) in the implementation of

- Research-based evidence to support Policy (including action research at community level),
- Knowledge exchange to support practice;
- Learning interventions to support human resources capacity building.

5. What similar programs that promotes regional and national knowledge exchange on SF and CC are you helping the Country? What do you think is the key value added of ASFCC?

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS:

1. Does the sharing of experiences (platforming) of ASFCC translate into more (or effective) Climate Change (CC) and Food Security (FS) relevant actions (e.g. carbon storage and SF; community/women/group inclusion)?
2. Does ASFCC effectively transform gained knowledge among partners (AMS) into country-specific policies and practices with effects on SF / CC / even on FS?

Annex 5: Who contributes to whom ("Onion sketch")

ASFCC inter-relationship: What contributes to What - Who contributes to whom?

GAP-CC	ASEAN - German Programme on Response to Climate Change
AFCC-FS	ASEAN Multisectoral Framework on Climate Change: Agriculture and Forestry towards Food Security
AMAF	ASEAN Ministers of Agriculture and Forestry
ASFCC	ASEAN - Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change
ASFN	ASEAN Social Forestry Network
ASOF	ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry