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## Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADSDPP</td>
<td>Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA</td>
<td>Asian Farmers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>ASEAN Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFCC</td>
<td>ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFN</td>
<td>ASEAN Social Forestry Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>Avoided Unplanned Deforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWG-SF</td>
<td>ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+WISER</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAU</td>
<td>Business As Usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMB</td>
<td>Biodiversity Management Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>Peatland Restoration Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFM</td>
<td>Community-Based Forest Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFMA</td>
<td>Community-Based Forest Management Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBFM-CARP</td>
<td>Community Based Forest Management - Comprehensive Agrarian Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBA</td>
<td>The Climate, Community &amp; Biodiversity Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Climate Change Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM</td>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>Clean Development Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENRO</td>
<td>City Environment and Natural Resources Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Community Forestry Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFN</td>
<td>Community Forestry Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFNWG</td>
<td>Community Forestry Networking Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFUG</td>
<td>Community Forest User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Term or Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIFOR</td>
<td>Center for International Forestry Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CliPAD</td>
<td>Climate Protection through Avoided Deforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRMF</td>
<td>Community Resource Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRMF</td>
<td>Community Resources Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENR</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOF</td>
<td>Department of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Emission Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAF</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture and Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>Forest and Farm Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPPI</td>
<td>Forest Inventory and Planning Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEGT</td>
<td>Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMB</td>
<td>Forest Management Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOMACOP</td>
<td>Forest Management and Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Foundation for the Philippine Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPIC</td>
<td>Free Prior and Informed Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREL</td>
<td>Forest Reference Emission Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRI</td>
<td>Forest Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSSWG</td>
<td>Forest Sub-Sector Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUGs</td>
<td>Forest User Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCAs</td>
<td>Indigenous Community Conserved Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRAF</td>
<td>The World Agroforestry Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Coastal Resources Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRI</td>
<td>International Forestry Resources and Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKSP</td>
<td>Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDC</td>
<td>Intended Nationally Determined Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Indigenous People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPO</td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples' Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Implementing Rules and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBA</td>
<td>Key Biodiversity Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLHK</td>
<td>Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSWS</td>
<td>Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Local Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGU</td>
<td>Local Government Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULUCF</td>
<td>Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>Ministry Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRMMC</td>
<td>Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIR</td>
<td>Monitoring and Implementation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOECAF</td>
<td>Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td>Monitoring, Reporting and Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTLAS</td>
<td>Myanmar Timber Legal Assurance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFRI</td>
<td>National Agriculture and Forestry Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMA</td>
<td>Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMRIA</td>
<td>National Mapping and Resource Information Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCFP-CC</td>
<td>National CF Program Coordination Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIP</td>
<td>National Commission on Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDC</td>
<td>Nationally Determined Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFUM</td>
<td>National Federation of Forest User Groups in Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGAs</td>
<td>National Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGP</td>
<td>National Greening Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP-EP</td>
<td>Non-Timber Forest Products - Exchange Programme Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMB</td>
<td>Protected Area Management Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PanNature</td>
<td>People and Nature Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAREDD</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participatory Land and Forest Management Project for Reducing Deforestation in Lao PDR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VCS</td>
<td>Verified Carbon Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCUss</td>
<td>Verified Carbon Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF</td>
<td>Village Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFG</td>
<td>Village Forest Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFM</td>
<td>Village Forestry Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFWG</td>
<td>Village forestry working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSU</td>
<td>Visayas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARSId</td>
<td>Indonesian Conservation Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

The adoption of the Paris Agreement in 12 December 2015 created a momentum across the world for more ambition and cooperation to address climate change. At present, countries are undergoing their respective domestic processes for the ratification of the Paris Agreement and moving towards implementation of respective Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The challenge at hand is for countries to turn these contributions into public policies and investment plans for mitigation and adaptation. Now is an opportune time for the new ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF) and the ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC) partnership to highlight the potential contribution of social forestry in supporting and strengthening actions by countries in operationalizing the Paris Agreement.

Forestry in the Paris Agreement

The role of forests in climate change adaptation and mitigation was formally recognized under Article 5 of the Paris Agreement. Parties agreed to take action to conserve and enhance forests as sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases and implement and support REDD+ and alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests. The increasing importance of forest was also evident in the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) submitted by countries ahead of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Conference of Parties (COP) 21 in Paris where majority of the countries identified forestry as key area for both mitigation and adaptation. In ASEAN, all of the ten ASEAN Member States submitted their INDCs and identified mitigation and adaptation actions in the forestry and land use sectors. ¹

There is increasing evidence that social forestry provides opportunity to increase national resilience to climate change, through diversifying rural livelihoods, increasing food security and leveraging social capital and knowledge. Researches and pilot projects have demonstrated that engaging local communities and promoting socio-economic benefits with conservation can be an effective long-term strategy for slowing deforestation and forest degradation. This growing body of evidence and demonstrated results suggest that making social forestry integral to NDC implementation can enhance its relevance and effectiveness and ultimately benefit forest-dependent communities in ASEAN countries.

So far, despite the recognition of social forestry in the region, there is no systematic and coordinated process to link and include social forestry targets and goals in national climate change actions plans and NDCs of ASEAN Member States.

Thus, the ASEAN Forestry Working Group Regional Meeting on Social Forestry and NDCs was organized. It envisaged to raise awareness and facilitate efforts of the AWG-SF to champion the linking and inclusion of social forestry strategies and activities in their national climate change related plans, NDC planning and implementation and other UNFCCC frameworks, such as Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+), taking into consideration the ASEAN Vision on Food, Agriculture and Forests (FAF). Specifically, it aimed at the following:

1. To increase awareness of initiatives and strategies on Social Forestry and Climate Change in ASEAN, in the context of the Paris Agreement;
2. To distil good practices, approaches and strategies in social forestry that can strengthen implementation of NDCs and REDD+;
3. To identify synergies and complementation between social forestry and NDC implementation and REDD+;
4. To explore potential planning and facilitation tools and institutional arrangements to effectively incorporate social forestry in NDC development and implementation.

**Expected Outputs**

- A set of recommendations (means of implementation, strategies, good practices, activities) towards the development of voluntary guidelines for ASEAN Member States for integrating and mainstreaming social forestry in their NDCs and other UNFCCC frameworks such as REDD+, NAMAS, NAP.
- A practical planning exercise, including facilitation tools suitable for use in integrating social forestry in NDCs planning, is also proposed.
- The output/s should be ready for uptake and dissemination by the ASEAN Member States for them to pursue discussions and develop action plans in their countries. At the same time, ASFCC may use this as input for future plans especially ASFCC Phase 3 on AWG-SF capacity building and policy development.

**Participants**

The regional workshop was participated by AWG-SF National Focal Points and representatives from National Forestry Agencies involved in social forestry/community forestry and CCM/CCA/REDD+ programmes and/or implementing associated initiatives. *(Particular attention to ASEAN countries with high forest cover/ high forest emissions (Indonesia, Myanmar) and working social forestry programs countries with identified forestry actions and REDD+ in their NDCs (Cambodia, Vietnam, Philippines, Myanmar)*

It was also joined in by representatives and resource persons from ASFCC implementing partners- ASEAN/ASFN Secretariat CIFOR, RECOFTC (The Centre for People & Forests), ICRAF regional partners, as well as representatives from development partners like GIZ, PTFCF, and PEF and CSO Forum on Social Forestry in ASEAN specifically from NTFP-EP, WARSI, and AFA.
Methodology and Approach

The two-day regional workshop adopted a seminar-type approach combined with plenary presentations and break-out sessions. The plenary was used to present context and framework of social forestry (SF) and climate change (CC) and how SF can contribute to the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) as well as sharing of experiences from participating countries. The breakout session on one hand was maximized for more elaborated discussion on integration of SF and CC and understanding better the link of SF in NDCs.

Preliminaries

Welcome Remarks

The workshop was officially opened with welcome remarks from Forester Orlando Panganiban, Chief, Forest Resources Management Division DENR-FMB and AWG-SF Leader, Philippines and Ms. Femy Pinto, Executive Director of Non-Timber Forest Products – Exchange Programme Asia (NTFP-EP).
For. Orlando Panganiban, recognized the presence of Dir. Calderon of DENR-FMB, delegates from the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF) working group from the social forestry in the ASEAN, colleagues, and partners in Social Forestry.

On behalf of the FMB, For. Panganiban warmly welcomed the participants to the first regional workshop as a Working group on Social Forestry – a subsidiary body under the ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry with an objective of enhancing sustainable forest management through social forestry programmes in the ASEAN Member States.

He emphasized that workshop for the next two days aims to raise awareness and facilitate efforts of the AWG-SF to champion the linking and inclusion of social forestry strategies and activities in national plans to address climate change, including the countries’ Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs), and the National Strategy for Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+), taking into consideration the new vision of the ASEAN Cooperation in Food, Agriculture and Forestry (FAF) 2016-2025.

For. Panganiban hoped that the event would open the hearts and minds to distill good practice, approaches, and strategies in social forestry that can strengthen implementation of NDCs and REDD+ and identify synergies and complementation to social forestry. Finally, he encouraged everyone to join in recalling the goals of the Paris Agreement and turn those words into actions in the two-day workshop.

Ms. Femy Pinto extended her warm welcome to delegates from the ASEAN Member States, colleagues from the development sector, international research institutions, and civil society organizations, and representatives from people’s organizations.

The Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Programme NTFP-EP Asia as a convenor of the Civil Society Forum on Social Forestry in ASEAN has had productive exchanges and engagements with the ASFN (now the AWG on Social Forestry)
Forestry) since its formation in 2012. Under the auspices of a collaborative programme- the ASEAN Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change, the group have tackled jointly through learning, knowledge sharing, dialogue and exchange activities, the task of consolidating good practice and recommendations out of social forestry experiences – community based forest management, community forestry, village forestry as it is coined in different ASEAN countries, in order to contribute to food security, income improvement and building community resilience to the impacts of climate change collectively in ASEAN. The task is long-term and so is the partnership.

She reiterated that the workshop is an initial effort to ratchet up the collaboration through a capacity building and exchange process whereby the social forestry good practice in one country or another can be brought to scale and from which may form basis of proposals and recommendations of effectively mainstreaming social forestry in climate change plans and actions in ASEAN.

Thus, ensuring that people are consistently at the centre of the discussion, and that the process engages all stakeholders in forestry; adopting a rights framework and social justice principles as explicitly as technical measures and indicators. Forests are not only seen for the trees and carbon, but also for the sustainable and equitable development of people and our planet.

On behalf of the Non-Timber Forest Products Exchange Programme NTFP-EP Asia, Ms. Pinto stressed that it is a privilege to have been given the trust to partner with the Forest Management Bureau – of the DENR, chairing the AWG-SF this year - in the hosting of this significant workshop. She thanked the generous supporters and partners who have made the workshop possible and also the consultation process at the national level, firstly from the DENR Forest Management Bureau itself, the Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation (PTFCF), The USAID B+WISER Program, GIZ Philippines, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Secretariat of the AWG on Social Forestry and all the practitioners, expert and advisers participating and engaging fully with NTFP-EP in this last two weeks. This is seen as initial steps and we look forward to the follow through in the field and in policy improvements from the collective recommendations we will come up with in integrating SF to CC.
Key Messages: Framework, National and Regional Perspectives of Social Forestry and Climate Change

The welcome remarks were then followed by key messages from Dr. Maria Brockhaus, Director Ricardo Calderon, and Dr. Dories Capistrano. The session provided a platform to level off with the framework and perspectives on social forestry and climate change both at the national and ASEAN levels.

1. Framework on Forestry and Climate Change

Dr. Maria Brockhaus, Senior Scientist, Forestry Policy and Agricultural Economy Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)

Forests have been highlighted in the climate change agenda since the beginning of UNFCCC. From Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) negotiations to Paris Agreement, the role of forest is well recognized in climate change adaptation; however, it is equally important to also recognize the adaptation of forest to climate change.

For the first time, forests are explicitly mentioned in the Paris Agreement under Article 5. It encourages action for REDD+ and linking to climate actions to ensuring poverty alleviation. However, there was an apparent mismatch of what is committed in INDCs and what would be needed to achieve the 2° goal, let alone 1.5°. Therefore there are certain conditions that should be set in place in order to fulfill the potential for forest-based adaptation and mitigation:

a. Forests need to be standing;
b. Forest stewards at all levels; and
c. Mainstream local forest stewards, as they have long managed forests in social forestry systems in highly dynamic economic, social, and political environments.

Along with the developments at the global level, there are already varying changes in the context of REDD+ based on a global comparative study conducted in 15 countries. The preliminary findings pertain to:

- Changes on the ground both for non-carbon and carbon outcomes. Non-carbon outcomes include tenure security, improving gender relations, and investments in safeguards and benefit sharing mechanism, while carbon outcomes include behavioral changes of land users and reducing tree loss.
• Change in policy processes but needs more clarity on measurable progress on zero-deforestation promises, role of forests in NDCs, and definition of green growth as sometimes the language puts burden on policy processes.

REDD+ supposed to change everything but there is a need for change in REDD+, otherwise it would be difficult to do REDD+ and unfold its full potential. This pertains to a radical reform to address the continuing struggle of business as usual.

Therefore, in unleashing the potential of forests to realize the 1.5° goal there is a need for:

• **Vision and Ambition.** Strong political will to keep the forests standing and transformation of vision and ambition beyond a project approach;
• **Evidence and Courage.** Quantifying drivers of deforestation and breaking business as usual (BAU) patterns;
• **Creativity and Action.** Moving beyond existing development paradigms for instance, the idea of development is deforestation.

Social forestry in all its formal and informal shapes can make major contributions, but requires enabling conditions – facilitated by forest stewards and agents of change.

2. **National Perspective on Linking Social Forestry and Climate Change**

*For. Ricardo Carlderon, Director, Forest Management Bureau (DENR-FMB), ASOF Leader, Philippines; Chairperson, AWG-SF*

Director Calderon expressed his gratitude to partners of FMB for the continuous support and to representatives from the ASEAN Member States for participating in the workshop. He emphasized that social forestry is very close to his heart, as he was involved in the shift from punitive to partnership approach in the context of Philippine forestry. His experience trained him as community development forester working with the people.

The challenge of the workshop is very clear, specifically highlighting the potential contribution of social forestry in strengthening actions of the countries in operationalization of the Paris Agreement. It is a very tall order, because the Philippines has more than 20 million upland communities, where 1,884 are community-based forest management people’s organizations (CBFM-POs) nationwide. Since the country has been doing community forestry for more than 20 years, DENR-
FMB is reviewing the forestry program to know which areas need improvement to effectively cater to the needs of the local communities, hence moving towards achieving sustainable forestry management. A very crucial initiative, given the CBFM-POs occupies more than 1M hectares out of the 15.2M hectares of forestland in the country.

Along with this, the Philippine government has invested PhP 655 million funds from 2011-2016 for the rehabilitation of 1.5 million hectares with the goal of planting and growing 1.5 billion trees. As of to date, there are 1.3 billion trees planted and growing, hence FMB is thankful to technologies and partners in the implementation of the program. But the concern is getting bigger given the figures of 8.1 million hectares degraded and denuded forests, where 85% of communities situated in these areas are below poverty line. How to bring these people into the mainstream of development and uplifting through sustainable livelihoods is a major challenge for the government.

The new administration is very crucial for any change in leadership and political climate, and it is fortunate that the National Greening Program (NGP) for rehabilitation of degraded forests is part of the priority programs of the government. However, NGP is not a standalone program as there is a need to address the drivers of deforestation and to provide sustainable livelihood to communities, along with the evolution of social forestry from merely providing sustainable livelihood to building community resilience and bringing them in the mainstream of compliance and achievement of the Paris Agreement.

Thus, he hoped that the workshop will facilitate unlocking the windows of how to bring communities not just for livelihood but also bringing the communities into the mainstream of climate mitigation and adaptation. Especially that in the context of NDCs, forestry sector should contribute 40% of the 70% emission reduction.

3. Social Forestry: Lessons and Contributions to the ASEAN Climate Change Agenda  
   Dr. Doris Capistrano, Senior Adviser, ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC)

Dr. Capistrano recognized the presence of guests and delegates from the ASEAN Member States and colleagues from the development organizations, people’s organizations, CSOs, and government agencies.

She recalled that her first environment-related involvement was on social forestry. The work looked at interdisciplinary ecosystem-based experiment, formerly called as watershed rehabilitation, specifically the

Figure 5. Dr. Doris Capistrano on lessons and contributions of Social Forestry in the ASEAN CC agenda (Photo Credit: Earl Diaz/NTFP-EP Asia)
Pantabangan project. And a key learning from the experiment does not relate to technical problem i.e. site-species matching rather more of a people problem, specifically getting people to participate, to be vested in it, and how to incentivize them for long term protection. She mentioned that the most successful plantation project needed to get back at some point because while projects were completed, the established plantation got burned due to lack of livelihood supplement to get people continuously involved. Thus, the success is not really a success the way the normal logframe and monitoring would actually show if stretched overtime and if looked at the perspective of institutional and policy development.

With the developments locally and globally, context has changed from this early experimentation. And the good thing is that the world is looking at social forestry in a slightly different way due to several reasons. First, the climate agreement suggests an important role of social forestry, community and local people which is very utilitarian approach for people’s participation and where you can find spaces to make policies more enabling. Next, is that SDGs identified forests and forest-based interventions as important components of sustainable development, which provides a global vision for shared prosperity, government and citizens, and policies that encourage sustainable and equitable solutions to the world pressing problems including climate change. Hence, the language of sustainable development already provided a wider and creative space for social forestry to proceed. Third, is that Paris Agreement recognizes the important role of the forests and indeed, it is a very important sector because globally, 11% of emission is related to land use change and forestry, where 40% come from the ASEAN region. Hence, forestry is a key response to climate change. Even in terms of livelihood which was the original entry point of social forestry, the study of CIFOR shows across case studies that 28% of household income come from forestry with over 1.3 billion people directly and indirectly dependent on forests, in which 300 million people are situated in the ASEAN region. Hence, having people have access to livelihood, CCA and other benefits of forests is critical not only as a response to climate change but also in contribution to the SDGs.

The 10 countries in the ASEAN region recognize this, in fact over the years, as the Region has been planning to integrate the community, it has launched the ASEAN Economic Community in 2015, with the goal of one production and market system along with a social-cultural and political community – a way of regional collaboration that would aspire toward some shared goals. The vision particularly for the food, agriculture and forestry sectors is ambitious and for the first time this is aligned with the global objectives. Specifically, the ASEAN envisions a competitive, inclusive, resilient, and sustainable food, agriculture, and forestry sector that is integrated in the global economy based on a single market and production-based contributing to food, nutrition security, and prosperity in the ASEAN Community. There are seven (7) strategic thrusts and 57 action programs, to provide a way in situating the national and sub-national agenda to support the goal as a stepping stone towards a contribution to a bigger and global goal level. Hence, relying to neighboring countries to achieve a much more coherent direction and progress in these sectors.

Two of the strategic directions are particularly pertinent to the goal of addressing climate change impacts, socio-economic development, health and environment in which forest is a major part and
enabling or fostering ASEAN position on trade, climate change including forestry-related topics, and promoting sustainable forest management towards enhancing competitiveness and eradicating unsustainable practices. These are larger hooks, where efforts of the ASEAN can contribute to its regional cooperation.

Social Forestry approaches are critical to these efforts. In a study of RECOFTC, local people are key to healthy forests, otherwise even if it works on a short term it will not be sustained in the long-term.

Social forestry is not new to the region. In fact, many variations and models have been implemented, but the only defining characteristic is that people are engaged at some level, even being fully devolved authority for management and in the extreme form is privatized forest for community management and decision-making. In the ASEAN, there are very important programs like afforestation, deforestation, and forest management in various forms and REDD+ related interventions. The most common application is in coastal management towards climate resilience and disaster risk reduction. Technologies are well known and demonstrated, but enabling conditions are necessary for it to work. According to IPCC, forest management is the low-hanging fruit and one of the most cost effective by which risks related to climate change can be addressed.

In the Region, the situation of social forestry is becoming more hopeful and optimistic. Although it is not always a perfect picture and change happens for a long time, but for those who have followed community forestry in other regions including in Southeast Asia, it is known that from small beginnings, bigger movement can grow. For instance in India, small-scale demonstrations can lead to policy changes that then lead to forest rights act, an advocacy relating to tribal demonstrations of how they protect their forests. While the progress is very slow in the ASEAN, there are major progresses in the last 6 years, for instance from 6.6 million hectares to 14 million hectares are now covered by social forestry. The best example are in the Philippines with 25% and Vietnam with 18% under SF. Indonesia on one hand has a large area at around 5.5 million hectares that can provide how well and not so well SF can work.

Social forestry has already evolved beyond subsistence-oriented approach and can do more in reinvesting to community’s own development that is outside the forestry sector and goes beyond forestry to agriculture such as mechanization, development of small-scale enterprises to jump out of dependence on forests and forestry.

Many governments see SF as forest protection and regeneration but there is a wider perspective not only protection but also enterprises that can be built around it. SF and agroforestry can deliver, but unfortunately the livelihoods improvement comes last. From the experience of India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh, benefits for the people come in grips and grabs and trickle overtime. And unfortunately, benefits trickle down to those who are not the neediest rather through the better off farmers, well organized advocates of their own. Thus, there is a need to recognize that in reality success does not mean that the benefits are widely and equally shared.
The fringe benefits to SF not only include climate change mitigation contributions, but also a better law enforcement due to demarcation and patrolling the boundaries by user groups and community forest users. Also, collective action potential is enhanced because people have to work together, multi-stakeholder formed, and conflict resolution is also addressed.

The results of the recent review of Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and International Forestry Resources and Institutions (IFRI) on several cases of community forestry around the globe looked at several factors that contribute to the success of SF:

a. **Nature of resource and biophysical conditions.** There are some areas; community forestry cannot succeed simply because the productive potential is not there. Hence, investing people’s energy would not likely yield to major results. This leads to practical implication that government has to choose sites carefully because it is unfair to provide false hopes to communities.

b. **Size of forest resource.** Medium and larger sizes of forests have greater likelihood of providing major benefits, as expected from the communities.

c. **Varying characteristic of communities.** Not all groups would likely to succeed, there are some groups riddled with conflicts overtime and do not have history of working together would have difficulties in making things work, but the best groups are the ones who have not only face-face interactions but also have shared interests.

d. **Economic conditions.** There are areas that cannot be simply protected effectively. Those areas closer to market, where opportunity cost of land is very high, hence social forestry might not be the best option even if it is economically viable.

e. **Social characteristics and history** are also very important to consider.

The major minimum essential for success boils down to the importance of security of tenure and rights, but taking note that it requires enabling framework, regulatory framework, strong governance, viable technology support, knowledge of the market, and supportive bureaucracies. Therefore, the revitalization of community/social forestry can be seen in the elevation of Social Forestry Network to become a Working Group that is mandated not only to share lessons and information but also to monitor progress, guide policy development, develop and support capacity building and to make assessment how the region is doing over time. It has a leadership role to play in paving the way for more enabling policies within the countries and common interests in line with regional cooperation within the ASEAN context.

For that reason, the Region should be able to marshal all necessary ingredients to push SF forward especially that the SDGs call for it, the Paris Agreement provides space for it, and the governments have enshrined it in their respective NDCs. Similarly, in the ASEAN itself, there is a mechanism for which efforts can be reported, make follow through, and tap resources to make it happen. In other words, there is NO excuse why the ASEAN should not make progress in the coming years.

And while SF has been in the backburner and coasting along for many years, it has renewed interest and constituency and a wide open-space to make things happen. Therefore, one should not only invest in enabling conditions for success but as a Group, SF can be collectively re-conceptualized, looking beyond
forest protection and conservation (a very short-sighted way of looking at SF). There is a need to start linking-up the hooks and other doors opening-up within the ASEAN, like the prioritization of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) development – a clear entry point towards inclusive green market development to expand the space for local communities. There is also a need to invest on organizations that are built around sustainable forest management. To that end, Dr. Capistrano urged the ASEAN group to become creative in shaping the conceptual debate and developing practical policies for social forestry.

Overview of the Regional Workshop

**Atty. Edna Maguigad, Senior Policy and Governance Adviser, NTFP-EP Asia**

Atty. Maguigad provided the framework of the Paris Agreement. She mentioned that the Agreement will take effect after it has reached the requirements for ratification. In the ASEAN, only four (4) countries have ratified the Agreement, while the six (6) remaining counties are still in their processes. The Paris Agreement is a universal, legally binding agreement to tackle climate change under international law, however UN is not empowered to impose sanctions. It has binding and non-binding components, and each country follows its own (long) domestic authorization process and international process must be undergone.

There are legally binding obligations in mitigation, adaptation, financing, and transparency and accountability components of the agreement and the Paris Agreement included an ambition cycle for its operationalization.

During the COP in Paris, mitigation commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) were submitted by all ten (10) ASEAN Member States. The ASEAN state members have identified forestry and/or land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) as potential source for GHG reduction commitment. With such commitment, challenges were raised:

- Encourage the inclusion of Social Forestry strategies and approaches as part of ASEAN Member States’ commitment to reduce GHG emissions.
- Ensure procedural equity in land use decision-making in INDC implementation or NDC formulation through the establishment of transparent platforms for multi-sectoral, multi stakeholder participation and planning processes and mechanisms at different levels.
• Ensure that over-all implementation of the mitigation actions in INDCs employ safeguards to empower and protect indigenous people, communities and smallholder agriculture/forestry from marginalization.

• Develop ASEAN Member States’ competencies, particularly in the following areas: mainstreaming mitigation actions within existing plans; adopting common methodologies for GHG monitoring reporting and verification, strengthening policy and regulatory frameworks, and mainstreaming climate change law into forest management strategies.

• Proactively engage the ASEAN Cooperation in Social Forestry mechanism to provide enhanced platform for generating and exchanging information on INDC implementation and NDC formulation at the national and regional levels.

Thus, Atty. Maguigad reiterated that it is an opportune as a Region to start the discussion on NDC planning and implementation and how social forestry would contribute to this. She mentioned that the workshop aims at the following:

• To increase awareness of initiatives and strategies on Social Forestry and Climate Change in ASEAN, in the context of the Paris Agreement;

• To distil good practices, approaches and strategies in social forestry that can strengthen implementation of NDCs and REDD+;

• To identify synergies and complementation between social forestry, REDD+ and NDCs;

• To explore potential planning and facilitation tools and institutional arrangements to effectively incorporate social forestry in NDC development and implementation.

And shall dwell into five major topics:

• Frameworks and Principles in Linking Climate Change (CC) and Social Forestry (SF);
• Linking SF and CC in the National Programs;
• Building a Country Profile on SF and CC;
• Strategies and approaches and tools on linking SF and CC; and
• Understanding NDC planning.

Plenary Presentations: Linking Social Forestry and Climate Change and Actual Experiences from ASEAN Member Countries

Session 1: Linking Social Forestry and Climate Change
Facilitator: Ms. Sagita Arhidani, Head, Secretariat of the AWG-SF
Rapporteur: Ms. Femy Pinto, NTFP-EP

There were five presentations for session 1 focused on sharing of country’s experiences in terms of policies, strategies, and program implementation where social forestry and climate change are linked together. Representatives from the Philippines, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Vietnam, and Indonesia presented their respective programs on social forestry and climate change.

A. Sharing of Results of National Workshop Integrating SF in NDCs and the National REDD+ Congress
For. Orlando Panganiban, Chief, Forest Resources Management Division DENR-FMB and AWG-SF Leader, Philippines

A slide show presentation of photos from the national workshop on integrating SF in NDCs, participated by DENR-FMB, people’s organizations, development partners, CSOs, and support groups was shown. The workshop resulted to an agreement of key message that social forestry can also be an effective approach to increase resilience to climate change at local levels, by supporting more diverse livelihoods, helping to maintain ecosystem services, as well as building management capabilities and social capital.

It also facilitated the development of recommendations and capacity needs on integrating social forestry in NDC planning and implementation, but prior to this, context were set to level off and opportunities on how to go about it were presented. Recommendations came from four groups/stakeholders present in the workshop, these are the following:
### Table 1. Summary of Key Recommendations from the NDC National Workshop Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Stakeholders</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CBFM Coordinators** | • CRMF Preparation/Updating  
• Consensus building with LGUs  
• Harmonization of policies (DENR & NCIP)  
• Learning events on the ff (immediately): climate proofing, carbon baselining, community organizing |
| **CBFM People’s Organization** | • Decentralization of policies and other related laws of the CBFMA  
• Capacity enhancement of the PO’s with the MDRMMC and LGU  
• Lifting the suspension of issuance of salvaging permit  
• Updating CRMF with climate proofing  
• National CBFM PO desk Central office  
• Development of guidelines, sustainable protocols, baseline data & monitoring systems. |
| **Indigenous People’s Group** | • Mainstreaming of CC in ADSDPP, equally the integration of CRMF in the ADSDPP  
• IP desk/Focal IP person in DENR  
• Strengthen and recognize IKSP in climate change processes and plans  
• FPIC process streamlining especially for IP-led projects and sustainable forest management projects  
• All regions should have their Indigenous Political System to strengthen tribal governance |
| **CSO group** | • Harmonize programs between concerned agencies on conservation programs  
• Issue policies based on existing studies  
• Link academe and experts to CBFM  
• Establishment of a network  
• Common platform for CC and NDC discussions established with plans and targets |

Therefore, as a way forward the group agreed on the following next steps:

- Approval of strategic plan for CBFM CARP 2017-2022.
- Review and assess how far we have achieved in the implementation of the Forestry Master Plan.
- CBFM planning for 2017-2028.
- Roll out of the enhanced CRMF Guidelines.
- FMB and NAMRIA to come up with standards on resurvey.
- Comprehensive research/study on conventional vs. mechanized nurseries.
- Partnership building: closing of gaps between CBFM and LGUs.
- Develop and enforce clear policies on NTFP and Charcoal making.
- Assess REDD+ and how it has contributed to social forestry and building resilience.
- Validation and re-validation of the NGP results.
- More discussions on community-based systems (i.e. IKSPs) and how these can be integrated in policies and planning.
- Integrate Rainforestation in CBFM strategy.
- Application and compliance to sustainable forest protocols.
• Discuss/submit the recommendations on improving the PSF process to CCC especially on accreditation, specific role of the LGU, and downloading of funds to POs/local organizations.
• Network with government agencies, POs/IPOs, CSOs, Academe.
• POs will develop and submit proposals to PTFCF and FPE.
• Implementation of agreed workplan (recommendations with timeline).

B. Experience of Seima Forest Protection and REDD+ Voluntary Mechanism Agreement

Mr. Long Ratanakoma, AWG-SF National Focal Point of Cambodia, Department of Forest and Community Forestry, Forestry Administration, MAFF

In 2008, a feasibility study was conducted for the viability of Seima as a demonstration site and in 2010 the actual project implementation started. Seima is the second REDD+ pilot site and the first in a conservation area in Cambodia. It informed the development of a national system and adopted a carbon mechanism that is owned by the government. It followed the basic technical steps for VCS projects. Under the process, six requirements need to be completed:

Figure 9. Mr. Long Ratanakoma, AWG-SF Focal Point of Cambodia sharing their country’s experience on REDD+ Voluntary Mechanism Agreement (Photo Credit: Earl Diaz/NTFP-EP Asia)

Basic Technical Steps for VCS Projects

Figure 10. Basic Technical Steps for VCS Projects
1. VM0015 Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation (AUD). A methodology that provides technical procedures for carbon accounting.

2. Draft Project Document (PD). This details the application of the methodology to project circumstances. It follows the methodology for carbon calculations to comply with both VCS and CCBA rules and requirements.

3. Validated PD. With the emission factors and baseline created, an independent auditor must have completed the VCS validation, for the case of Cambodia it was completed in December 2014.

4. Monitoring and Implementation Report (MIR). This demonstrates the projects adherence to rules and requirements established in the PD and reports of emission reduction. The first MIR for Cambodia was done from 2010-2015.

5. Verified Monitoring Report. For the case of Cambodia, verification is still on-going that covers upto sixth year of the project.

6. Register VCU. A country is required to register in the Carbon Registry Account.

The project set in place certain conditions to effectively implement the project at the local level:

- a. Community engagement since the livelihood value of the reserve for the community is very high.

- b. Indigenous land titling and an agreement on boundaries and zoning regulations, recognized by the government.

- c. Livelihood development where community is involved in patrolling, sustainable agriculture, and community-based ecotourism.

- d. Development of Keo Seima Project Sharing and Distribution Model. 10% of the gross revenue goes to Ministry of Environment, while 90% goes to the implementation of the Agreed Annual Work Plan. Once the net revenue is derived from the 90%, 50% is allocated for community activities, 25% is allocated for project strengthening, and 25% for operating reserves.
From the implementation of KSWS project, key lessons were derived:

a. Project-level REDD+ is very complex. Project implementation is tedious and getting people to participate requires a lot of time and effort.
b. Many of the technical concepts are new or more rigorously applied than is usual in conservation.
c. Projects can be structured to promote biodiversity and social benefits as well as emission reductions.
d. External factors have a major bearing on project success – policies, markets, and economics.

C. Village Forestry in Lao PDR

Mr. Peter Thavone, REDD+ Office, Department of Forestry, Laos PDR

Data shows that from 70% forest cover in 1940, it went down to 40% in 2010. This drastic loss in forest cover was due to heavy logging activity for export and land conversion for agriculture, infrastructure development, and socio-economic development. Thus, the main goal of the forest strategy of Lao Government aims to address the forest cover loss in the country. Specifically it aims to bring back forest cover to 65% by 2015 and 70% by 2020 through protection and conservation of 16.5 million hectares of forestland, where in 3.1 million will be allocated for production forest.

Village forestry in Laos started in early 1990s under the Village Forestry Unit of the Department of Forestry. There are various projects under the village forestry program of the government. For instance a “Joint Forest Management” in the Dong Khapo production forest funded by Lao and Sweden started in 1993, the Forest Management and Conservation Project began in 1995 in Savannakhet and Khammouane Provinces funded by World Bank, Finland and the Global Environmental Facility, and a Sustainable Forestry and Rural Development project (SUFORD) began in 2004, with support from World Bank. Through these various projects and cooperation with different partners and stakeholders, the Lao government learned key lessons:
• Some Village forests still not reduce poverty, hence there is a need for more support;
• Land use planning is still not completed for the whole country due to lack of funding;
• Lack of funds and weak capacity of government and forest villages (lack staff, less skill and knowledge) has great implications on village forestry implementation; and
• Difficultly in disseminating information or raising awareness in communities in remote areas.

Thus, the policy for Sustainable Forest Management for 2016-2020 focused on the following approaches:

1. Improve legal and technical guidelines on village forestry with appropriate dissemination policy to communities.
2. Expand Forest Management Plan & Rehabilitation to 170,000 hectares, establishment of 300 hectares of indigenous tree species plantation and certification of 30% of forest production area.
3. Development of village forest management plan for 1,500 villages, integrating poverty reduction component.
4. REDD+ development in terms of carbon credit.
5. Improve legal mechanism on Forest Resources Development Fund.
6. Capacity building for communities and government both at the provincial and district levels.
7. Establish monitoring and evaluation system.

D. Vietnam Payment for Forest Environmental Services (PFES)

Mr. Nguyen Hoang Dung, Forest Inventory and Planning Institute, MARD, Vietnam

PFES in Vietnam aims at five (5) key objectives: protection of existing forests, improve forest quality, increase the contribution of forestry in the economy, ease the financial burden on state budget for investing in the forest protection and development, and ensuring the social security for forest workers.

With the advantages of the country, having 2/3 of total natural area are in upland areas, a coastline of 3,260 kilometers, among others, PFES is seen to be a key solution to sustainable forest management and participation of forest end users in forestry. There are four categories under the ecosystem services model of Vietnam:

1. Watershed protection.
The regulations and guidelines for the first and second services were issued by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), while for the third service, the legal framework is being built based on the results of implementing REDD+ and UN-REDD in Vietnam.

According to People and Nature Reconciliation (PanNature), revenues from PFES are positive and quite substantial. In the period of 2011-2015, PFES in Vietnam reached to about VND5 100 billion or USD228.62 million (~ VND 1,000-1,300 billion /year and payment for 3-5 million hectares of forest). This has somehow helped easing the financial burden on annual state budget of Vietnam government by about 22-25%. In Laocai province, PFES account to 52% of total state budget allocated for forest protection and management, while in Kontum province, PFES is 3.6 times higher than the total state budget allocated for forest protection and management. While there are advantages gained from the PFES, lessons are also generated along the way:

- Communities need to be recognized to ensure the legal status of communities for participating in civil contracts.
- The national forest resource database needs to be completed and updated periodically to provide necessary and accurate information on ownership, area and status to stakeholders. This would not only support the implementation of PFES, but also the other programs in Vietnam such as REDD+ and UN-REDD. Especially that the program of national forest resource inventory, evaluation in Vietnam is conducted by Forest Inventory and Planning Institution (FIPI) belonging to MARD and changes every 5 years to contribute to forest status data.
- Third-party supervision or internal monitoring is very important to promote payment for supplying forest ecosystem services. There is a need to evaluate forest protection activities carefully with the aim of increasing its quality through encouraging the participation of other stakeholders, especially service users. Hence, avoiding situation that forest owners do not report about forest degradation to receive money from PFES.
- Transaction and monitoring costs can be reduced through clustering of households based on geographic conditions. However, conditions need to be in place i.e. criteria for grouping, appropriation of the dominant groups, ensuring the rights of households in payment agreement.
- Exchange of information between service providers, users and intermediaries should be done regularly to ensure transparency in payment. Therefore, it is very necessary to develop a system for sharing of information, recording of complaints or feedbacks with the aim of connecting providers and users of forest services as well as increasing the trust of people and extensive participation of communities in PFES.
- Since there is low and slow payment, PFES need to be associated with other forestry programs or poverty reduction programs to have a diversified financial resource. Besides, improving education along with building skills for communities to help improve their livelihood in the long-term.
E. Mainstreaming Social Forestry in the Implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia: A Case Study in Bujang Raba, *Ms. Emmy Primadona, WARSI*

Social Forestry in Indonesia targets 12.7 million hectares from 2015-2019. This is categorized to 5 clusters, village forest, community forestry, community timber plantation, customary forest, and forest partnership. Figure 14 details the definition of three (3) clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Community Timber plantation</th>
<th>Community Forestry</th>
<th>Village forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Individual/cooperative</td>
<td>Community farmer</td>
<td>Village forest agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated area</td>
<td>Production forest</td>
<td>Protected or production forest</td>
<td>Protected or production forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management plan</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>According to function and potency</td>
<td>According to function and potency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legality</td>
<td>MoEF</td>
<td>MoEF</td>
<td>MoEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management period</td>
<td>60 year, 1 X extension.</td>
<td>35 years, can be extended.</td>
<td>35 years, can be extended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14. Social Forestry Clusters in Indonesia*

Under the Social Forestry in Jambi, specifically in Bungo District, community REDD+ project was implemented under the voluntary carbon mechanism of Plan Vivo. It aims to:

a. Document how CBFM scheme contributes to reduction of carbon emission and improvement of livelihood, validated by third party.

b. Increase the community participation, allow community to identify forest resources, to measure carbon, and monitor forest area.

c. Gain public support over the ecosystem services provided from sustainable forest management.

d. See how the market responds to the idea of community REDD+ initiative in Indonesia.

The project was implemented in Bujang Raba, one of the critical areas in Indonesia, rich in biodiversity and wildlife corridor, yet has high pressure of forest conversion, from natural forest to industrial tree plantation (HTI), oil palm plantation, mining and transmigration. The project activities include the following:
a. Forest zonation, forest patrolling, demarcation, and fire prevention.
b. Forest Business Plan through development NTFP i.e. honey, ecotourism, nursery plot, agroforestry (multi-tier commodity).
c. Strengthening Village Forest Groups (VFG) and strengthening the role of village forest council through regular meeting, development of mechanism of monitoring, reporting and benefit sharing distribution.
d. Capacity building that includes establishment of nursery, planting and harvesting, utilization of NTFP, handy crafts, and eco-tourism.

In terms of potential carbon reduction in the village forest in Bujang Raba, it is estimated that for 10 years a total of 664,486 tons of CO₂ can be reduced (66,448 ton of CO₂ equivalent annually). From the project, recommendations were derived to further push the forestry agenda in Indonesia:

- Recognition of community management area through the Social Forestry is very important and relevant to conserve the remaining forests in Indonesia.
- Social forestry can be effective for slowing deforestation and increase national resilience to climate change.
- Facing up REDD+ implementation, all the community initiatives on REDD+ could be counted as national contribution for REDD+.
- Kinds of incentives from REDD+ should be distributed to forest management groups (community).

Open Forum/Discussion Highlights

1. Questions pertaining to Cambodia Experience
   - Is there a policy (existing/proposed) on owning a carbon, as being mentioned that carbon is owned by the government?

   The REDD+ pilot implementation has two mechanisms. First, under community forestry, carbon is owned by the local community and the only involvement of the government was during negotiations with the buyer. The second mechanism is that carbon is owned by the government which co-benefits an NGO-partner (WCF). The revenue goes directly to Ministry of Environment, where part of it is allocated to environment protection related programs i.e WCF manages the income generation in local communities. The buyer will disburse the money based on the workplan developed by the government. And currently, there is a discussion on how to integrate both pilot projects into the national REDD+ strategy.

   - Who bears the risks from the two types of pilot projects given that the government has a plan to scale it up?

   While there are different mechanisms for owning the carbon, the implementation design and risk management are mostly the same. In terms of risks, there is not much difference since risks are usually related to policy reform. The government tries to recognize the illegal encroachers or migrants and to look at concessions in conservative/production forests that affect the project. While regarding the market, only USD 50,000 worth of carbon was sold by
the community forestry and there is no NGO-partner yet to implement in the ground. Hence, there is a high risk because a lot of communities depend on it.

- **What kinds of conditions are considered in assigning the ownership of carbon?**

  The local communities directly benefitted from the first pilot project, but for other pilot, the initiative started from the government with cooperation with NGO partners. Hence, lessons can be generated from both experiences, which would then be important inputs in the National REDD+ Strategy of the country. Although, mechanisms on integrating both pilot areas are not yet clear.

2. **Questions pertaining to Vietnam PFES**

- **What are the tools or mechanisms to encourage the villages to work given the slow collection from the PFES?**

  The PFES aims to increase the capacities of local communities. However since the annual payment process is slow, other programs are being tapped to augment financial resources.

- **Involvement of your office in the PFES implementation?**

  Data from PFES is collected by Forest Inventory and Planning Institution (FIPI), which are inputted in the forest status data. FIPI collects a management plan from the communities every five (5) years, which then become the basis of collection under PFES.

3. **Questions pertaining to Indonesia: Bujang Raba Case Project**

- **What incentives do the villages get for implementing the REDD+ project?**

  The village forests crafted two management plans, one is a long-term plan for 35 years and the other one is an annual management plan which is anchored on long-term plan of village. For WARSI, it documents the experiences and practices of the village forests, which will become a basis for linking such practices to the government program like nursery establishment. While there is no incentive yet from the REDD+, village forests benefit from programs of the government. Also, there is an on-going discussion on providing incentives from the market, through creation of carbon trading and voluntary market.

- **Can the success from Jambi project be replicated in Indonesia, and in doing so, what would be the conditions needed?**

  Replication is possible on the following conditions; intense facilitation so that the community will not lose their way, provision of incentives in the form of capacity, transfer of knowledge to capacitate them in the implementation of their respective management plans.
On planting of indigenous species.

The local community is encouraged to plant indigenous species and certain types of fruits to promote biodiversity and diverse source of livelihood. Also, while there is a demand for timber, local community can only harvest from their own garden but not from the forest.

4. Is there a national program supporting NTFPs in Laos?

There is no specific project yet to focus on, but the existing project aiming to rehabilitate the forest areas would cover this, but no specific kind of NTFP is identified yet.

**Synthesis of Session 1: Linking Social Forestry and Climate Change**

After the open forum, Ms. Femy Pinto provided a synthesis of session 1. She summarized the session into strategies and tools in linking social forestry in climate change, gaps and needs, lessons-learned, and recommendations.

| How is social forestry linking to climate change? | National policy processes, regulatory measures and programs  
Forestry contribution in climate change mitigation – Nationally determined targets to increase forest cover  
REDD+ voluntary agreement in protection forest and conservation area (wildlife sanctuary)  
Demonstration site of REDD+ in conservation areas  
Payment incentives for forest protection and services for prevention of forest degradation |
|---|---|
| Strategies and Tools | National SF programs (expanding participation – upland communities, LGUs)  
REDD+ demonstration site and project development (community REDD+, REDD+ in conservation area)  
Legalization of community forestry  
Assessment of current threats (agents and drivers) – land conversion from plantations, illegal logging  
Community engagement in REDD+ includes indigenous land titling, community patrolling, community livelihood improvement  
Benefit sharing and distribution model (e.g. in Seima 50%-25%-25%)  
Integration of resource management and livelihood and business activities, rainforestation, watershed management, NTFPs, ecotourism, etc.  
Strengthening forest governance, protection and management |
| Gaps | Fragmented implementation as far as SF inclusion to CC is concerned  
Poverty alleviation objectives not met  
Lack of funds and technical skills  
Strategy of dissemination to stakeholders  
Weak legal and financing mechanism  
Data management and monitoring and evaluation  
Challenges in reconciling boundaries and ownership  
Communities have management rights only and not ownership |
| Capacity Needs | Monitoring and evaluation  
Climate proofing of resource management plans |
### Lessons learned

- (+) Harmonization and decentralization = concrete and more demonstrable results to support and concretize policy; suggest improvements
- (-) Complex project level REDD+ and rigorous implementation
- (+) Projects can be structured to promote biodiversity and social benefits as well as emission reductions
- External factors have a major bearing on project access - policies, markets, economics
- Revision of forestry law and completion of land use plans triggered by the shifts in government structure
- Revenues from PFES can be quite substantial and can help ease financial burden on state budget for forest protection and management
- Recognition of communities as legal entities as prerequisite to participation in programs
- Developing criteria, guidelines and systems for payment agreements and making them equitable, transparent and participatory can be challenging
- Project interventions can contribute to addressing deforestation, and can improve forest cover and can reduce emissions – from project site to contribute to national resilience

### Recommendations

- Scale up projects to programs – experience and results as policy basis
- Harmonization of programs between concerned agencies
- Strengthening institutional arrangements and inclusion (i.e. Recognizing tribal governance, CBFM PO/IP desk)
- Decentralization of implementation – strengthen role of LGUs alongside greater inclusion and participation of communities in governance and institutional arrangements
- Strengthen planning process and address financing issues
- Develop and strengthen operational guidelines and roll out effectively with capacity building and technical and tool support

---

**Session 2:** Sharing of Experiences on Integrating Social Forestry and Other Sectors to National Forestry Program and/or National Climate Change Plans and Actions (NAMA, NAP, REDD+, INDC)

**Moderator:** For. Mary Ann Batas, SEARCA

**Rapporteur:** For. Olivia Melendrez, NTFP-EP Philippines

The session focused on the experiences of ASEAN Member States in integrating social forestry and other sectors in the overall forestry program and development plans of their respective countries. Specifically the experiences of Myanmar, Philippines on rainforestation and LAWIN Project, and Indonesia on social forestry livelihood were shared in the plenary.

**A. Role of Community Forestry in National REDD+ Readiness**

**Dr. Thaung Naing Oo, Director, Forest Research Institute (FRI), Myanmar**

Myanmar has 29 million hectares of forest or 42.97% of the country’s total area, which is categorized as closed and open forests. And just as the same with other countries, Myanmar’s biggest challenge in the forestry sector is the evident change in forest cover, having an average of 1.73% deforestations rate at the national level, caused for threats and drivers inside and outside of the forestry sector. Thus,
Myanmar has been implementing REDD+ as a key strategy to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. The country started its readiness phase in 2012 and has already undergone various processes for the readiness phase, along with the establishment of an organizational structure for REDD+ Programme.

In the context of INDCs, Myanmar has identified mitigation actions and policies in the primary areas of forestry and energy, complemented by supporting policies in other sectors. Thus, under the forest policy target, the country committed the 30% of total country’s area for Reserved Forest (RF) plus Protected Public Forest (PPF) and 10% of total country’s area for Protected Areas (PAS).

There are four areas identified as potential sites for REDD+: watershed, key biodiversity areas, corridors forest complex, and mangrove and coastal area, and community forestry is playing a huge role in the REDD+ programme of the country. However, the main challenge is that majority of priority forest areas are largely outside of the Forest Department’s jurisdiction and are in contested areas. Hence, engagement of all relevant stakeholders (especially ethnic minorities and private sector) and coordination and consultation among the line Ministries are the keys to push through with the forestry agenda.

The establishment of community forestry in 1856 aimed at increasing the area linked to support poverty reduction, to lessen hunger, and to enhance land use forestry. It is defined as follows:

- Any land at the disposal of the state can be alienated as community forests;
- Land tenure is initially granted for 30 years;
- The tenure right is inheritable;
- Forest products harvested from CF for domestic use are tax-free;
- Seeds and seedlings needed for the first rotation and technical assistant are provided by FD with free of charge;
- No restriction is imposed on the selling and pricing of the surplus forest products.

From the period of 1995 to 2015, there was an observed increase in areas enrolled in community forestry, especially in the period of 2014-2015 where a huge spike in CF areas was observed. From 2015-2017, the government targets the establishment of about 40,000 has. CF with contribution of RECOFTC in three states and four regions.
The organizational structure for community forestry is also defined in the country, where Forestry Department as the key mandated agency and Community Forest (CF) Unit under the department at the state, region, and district level. Also in 2013, a Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG) was organized to advise the decision makers for comprehensive revised CFI based on CFI 1995 and share knowledge, experience, policy and activities. This is also created to support the timely CF certification with proper channel through the process and seeking of funds, technique, and information from funding agencies, organizations of local and international level. CFNWG is composed of representatives from Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry (MOECAF), seven (7) line agencies, NGOs/CSOs, research institute, University of Forestry, private sector, donors, and technicians. It directly coordinates with the CF Unit of the Forestry Department as well as with potential donor-partners.

The implementation of community forestry in Myanmar has gained the following key lessons and opportunities from the new Community Forestry Instructions (CFI) drafted in 2016.

**Lessons-learned:**

- Success stories should be regarded as motivators for CF promotion
- Not all the success stories are the same model
- Early adopters became models for the rest of the community once their CFs are promising to enjoy the benefits
- Financial benefits are the most effective incentives among the merits of CF
- Leadership and local governance of CFUG plays crucial role in the success of CF

**Opportunities from the new CFI 2016.** The FD will assist FUGs to:

- Improve capacity through technical and business-oriented trainings;
- Form Community Forest product-based enterprise;
- Develop producer-consumer partnership to secure investment;
- Establish township, district, State/Regional networks or associations to strengthen enterprises; and
- Network enterprises or FUGs into a national federation, e.g. National Federation of Forest User Groups in Myanmar (NFUM).
Therefore as way forward, the government would implement the following priority actions:

- Implementation of Community-Based Forestry Enterprise
- Strengthening CF units (from Union to township level)
- Link with training and research institutions
- Mobilizing the resources
- Field oriented Forestry extension
- Endeavor to act Community Forestry Law (it may take time)
- Development of CF Strategic Plan
- Forming CF practitioner network
- Implementation of new Community Forestry Instructions 2016 linking to
  - 10-years National Reforestation Programme (2017-18 to 2015-26)
  - Expansion of Permanent Forest Estate (up to 30% of total country’s area) and contributing to INDC target
  - Increase the forest cover of the country that contribute to the CC mitigation
  - Linking strength of CFNWG and CF Unit organizational structure and REDD+ National WG and REDD+ Core Unit
  - Social and environmental safeguard and SIS
  - Provide lessons learnt about community level consultations, governance, benefit sharing, safeguard (by law), MRV, Management Plan, business model of CF, PES to National level REDD+

B. Scaling-up Rainforestation in Community-based Forest Management (CBFM)

Dr. Pacienza P. Milan, Rain Forest Restoration Initiative (RFRI)

Rainforestation (RF) is a farming system that closely resembles the structure of a natural Philippine rainforest ecosystems or home gardens that promotes the use of native or local trees commonly growing in the area. It considers farming systems to support livelihood as an innovation. It is a tested science-based approach for forest restoration and improves physical stand to support wildlife and improves recruitment of wildlife.

Originally, RF was designed to a) replace Slash-and-Burn agriculture by integrating agricultural crops and fruit trees into a tree farm of native tree species, b) enhance the biodiversity of forest trees and improve soil and water conservation and c) provide sustainable income for farmers from non-timber products.
But with the current developments, it has evolved to respond to other land management needs such as watershed restoration, wildlife habitat restoration, protection of buffer-zone, landslide area rehabilitation. Keeping in mind the two key components of RF:

1. Use of Native Trees or local trees; and
2. Participatory approach which is the involvement of the local community and other stakeholders in the various stages of project development, monitoring and sustainability.

While RF is widely advocated in forest protection and management agenda, the biggest challenge still rests on awareness raising and changing the mindset of the community and policy reforms from the government. Hence, what can be done to address such challenge in policy reform and awareness-raising.

For policy reform there is a need to provide incentives such as payment for ecosystem services among others and mainstream upland dwellers in environmental governance and government programs. While for raising awareness, there should be continuous education and support to empower communities.

RFRI as a network of organizations and institutions engaged on environmental conservation, research and development has been involved in advocating and promoting rainforestation at the national level, in fact, RFRI has been involved in the review and enhancement of the IRR of the expanded NGP Program to address corruption issues, etc. Moreover, it advocates for the relaxing of procurement and acquisition policies in favor for community partners and supports the empowerment of communities in forest restorations, management and governance.

While other development partners and funding institutions like Foundation for Philippine Environment (FPE) and Philippine Tropical Forest Conservation Foundation, Inc. (PTFCF) have their respective initiatives in scaling up rainforestation in community-based forest management.

C. The LAWIN Forest and Biodiversity Protection System

Dr. Ephrain Laureano, Chief of Party, B+ WISER USAID

LAWIN was developed on a premise of protection and management of natural areas for biodiversity conservation. It focuses on the protection of natural forest and the conservation of its biodiversity by systematically addressing observed threats. Hence, achieving a transparent, accountable and socially inclusive forest protection.

Named after the Philippines Hawk Eagle, LAWIN integrates the following:

- Monitoring of biodiversity, forest conditions, and threats;
- Environmental law enforcement and other interventions to address threats;
- Monitoring ecosystem’s response to management interventions.

It has also adopted several innovations like, science-based identification of hotspots and conservation targets, technology-based recording and analysis of observations, evaluation of trends and monitoring
of patrol efforts, spatial presentation of patrol observation and trends, and targeted responses to threats and requires the following:

- **Conservation Area Plan**
- **Regular patrolling.** More than 2,000 DENR Forest Rangers and Community Forest Patrols have been trained in the use of Cyber Tracker through September 2016;
- **Systematic Data Management.** Data managers at the CENRO and PENRO levels are being trained across the country to generate actionable reports with SMART software;
- **Timely responses to threats.** Environmental Law Enforcement patrols responding to observed threats in Mt. Kitanglad and Rizal Province.

To date, LAWIN has been piloted in B+WISER sites since February 2015 and in March 2016, LAWIN was nationally adopted through joint BMB-FMB Technical Bulletin. The LAWIN roll-out trainings were also completed nationwide and the implementation of the protection system initiated in the regions which received the trainings.

LAWIN is recognized internationally as one of 12 innovations that show exceptional potential to positively contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and was presented in the first annual Multi-Stakeholders Forum on Science, Technology and Innovation for the Sustainable Development Goals at the UN headquarters in New York. While at the national level, there are also current developments in terms of mainstreaming LAWIN in the system of the government.

- Establishment of LAWIN data management at National, Regional, PENRO and CENRO level using SMART Connect
- New Web-based Platform and Establishment of an alert system for nationally significant threats
- Strengthening community involvement in LAWIN implementation

Therefore with the continuous implementation of the system, initial impacts were already observed

- Reduces threats and improves forest condition towards desired future forest condition
- Achieves conservation targets and objectives
- Reduces Deforestation and Forest Degradation
• Supports implementation of an MRV system for the forestry sector by providing ongoing reporting
• Provides basis for performance-based PES
• Empowers communities in protecting natural forest
• Provides Support to National Strategies including REDD+ and NDC
  o LAWIN supports: reducing emissions from deforestation, reducing emissions from forest degradation, conservation of forest carbon stocks and to some extend the enhancement of forest carbon stocks under REDD+ eligible activities
  o LAWIN supports the identification, monitoring and addressing of threats – drivers of deforestation and forest degradation – and provides one basis for “result-based finance”

D. Integrating Community SF Livelihoods to National Forestry program

Ms. Sagita Arhidani on behalf of Mr. Wiratno, Indonesia as Host Country of Secretariat of the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF)

The 35-year experience of forest management model through concessions and plantations in Indonesia did not guarantee better economic stance of local community, and raised tenurial conflict potential, and very limited sustainable forest management. The cause of these failures in managing forests according to Handadari (2013) are over-logging and forest encroachments, forest and land fires, forest conversion to non-forest usage, and weak & inappropriate law enforcement. Hence, social forestry is a priority solution to forestry problem in Indonesia. SF in Indonesia is seen to be a policy that provides access to the community in utilizing forest and a solution to tenurial or land conflicts, which should be linked with rural-urban relationship. And as a directive by the President, “providing social forestry management should be secured and should go to the proper community.” Out of the 12 million hectares target for social forestry, more than 1.5 million hectares are already enrolled from 2010-2015. The figure below shows the key factors for successful social forestry.

Figure 20. Key Success for Social Forestry in Indonesia
It is proven that in the forest areas where local community has been given access permit through Social Forestry, there is limited hotspot found due to a clear tenure access rights that provide the basis for the local community to manage the forest areas sustainably.

Moreover, in some parts of Indonesia, communities are already enjoying the benefits of livelihood from SF. For instance, CF in Yogyakarta has successfully established and developed its ecotourism, while in Bulukumba Community Forest the local community manages the processing of palm sugar into a local product labeled “Si Manis” (the Sweet) for community livelihoods.

Below are key activities for improving livelihoods under SF Programme:

• Social Forestry Enterprise Development. Developing Non-Timber Forest Products business development centers (Sentras).
• Upstream and Downstream Linkage: cultivation technology, institutional development (cooperatives), post-harvest handling, products packaging and transporting technology, facilities, marketing, micro-financing.
• Multistakeholder Engagement for Bamboo, Natural Silk, Agarwood, Forest Honey, and Rattan enterprise development.

In terms of research, investments, and multi-stakeholder cooperation:

Research activities:

• Social Forestry Valuation, research results that solidify the economic, environmental, and socio-cultural values of SF;
• Research on the right tree for the right place, scientifically-proven recommendations for selection of trees in Social Forestry practices;
• Research on Market Demands for market potential, risks, and costs.

Investments required for SF and Sustainable Value Chains

• Investment from central & local governments in Budget Allocation for Social Forestry Development;
• Investment from Private Sector through Focus Group Discussions, Multistakeholder processes, in determining relevant added-values to SF products, branding, marketing, benefit sharing;
• Investment from local community for developing ownership and skills.

Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Cooperation in strengthening and developing Social Forestry

• Facilitation in developing institutional, land area, and business management is needed by Community Forest and Village Forest practitioners,
• Permit Request and Post Permit Issuance Processes require multi-stakeholder support (local government, civil society organizations, research organization, and private sector).
Open Forum/Discussion Highlights

1. Questions pertaining to Myanmar’s Experience

- **What are the most critical roles of community in scaling up community forestry?**
  Start at the community level through building partnership at the sub-national and national levels. The most challenging aspect in engaging the community is that stakeholders have different interests, some areas are not yet organized and some still have unresolved conflicts. Hence, consultation is very crucial to better understand the community’s characteristic and situation.

- **What are the indicators to measure performance?**
  For Community Forestry, the target is to have 1 million hectares of forestland. However, in order to achieve this, indicators like conducted proper land allocation process and enhanced capacity of the communities should be observed, otherwise it would be difficult to reach the 1 million hectares. Also, working groups were formed with specific roles to ensure partnership at all levels and linkage of CF to national plans. In terms of REDD+, the readiness phase completion is dependent on four (4) key elements: development of a National Strategy or Action Plan (*which is expected by end of 2016*), set up of a Safeguard Information System (SIS), development of National Forestry Monitoring System including MRV, and determination of Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL).

- **Elaborate on the TWG supporting National REDD+ office including the roles and responsibilities for the REDD+ readiness phase.**
  Each component has an assigned team, with short and long-term TORs.

2. Questions pertaining to Rainforestation

- **Is there available set of data regarding the adoption of RF in CBFM areas?**
  There is one in the Visayas, which is a joint undertaking of Haribon and the Visayas State University (VSU), but not all RFRI projects have while PTFCF has some as well.

- **Is there an existing or on-going study that looks at the advantages and performance of native species?**
  There are institutions like VSU that conducts studies related to the performance of native species vs. use of exotic species. RFRI has a website where you can find useful data.

3. Questions pertaining to LAWIN Project

- **Are IKSPs already integrated in LAWIN system, for instance in key species identification?**
  Currently, there is a limitation in the documentation of IKSPs and how these relate to biodiversity management.

  For the case of B+WISER, a grant was provided for Mt. Kitanglad, specifically for the documentation of IKSPs and its relationship to community forestry. The research was completed this year and participated by three (3) tribes, headed by the chieftain as the lead researcher. A dialogue with PAMB was then conducted, mainly to present the results and to
see how these can be integrated in the policies of DENR, particularly on biodiversity management.

In the context of LAWIN system, it involves programming of data models. Prior to forest patrolling, the data model should be in the system as it is the basis of the forest patrollers for monitoring and reporting. In that particular model, there are open-ended options so patrollers can still record such observations that are not yet in the system.

- **How many alerts received and does the government really respond to such alert?**
  This is still on-going, but there are anecdotes of responses. For instance in Negros, a team was sent to educate the community on the effects of illegal clearing in the area. The identified violators were then enrolled as patrollers to put stop on the illegal clearing activity.

  The system is still on its early phase, but timely responses is key, otherwise people will not be encouraged to do their part in forest protection and management.

- **Are there drivers of deforestation and forest degradation related to policies, if any, can the community report this to the same institution that has allowed such policy?**
  There could be policy-related threats; hence the project provides space to encourage multiple actors’ involvement like LGUs, IPs, community-based organizations, and NGAs. Such multi-stakeholder approach allows multiple data to come in, which can be used to analyze the characteristics and situation of the area. Hence, appropriate actions can be developed in order to effectively manage the forest and its biodiversity.

4. **Questions pertaining to Indonesia’s Experience**

- **Are there existing NTFP centers and how did the government assist in the development of these centers?**
  The government aims to develop 36 centers at the provincial level following several qualifying conditions such as, a) existing market, b) seedlings are available, and c) cultivation area is already established. The complete list of the NTFP centers can be provided to the participants.

**Synthesis of Session 2: Sharing of Experiences on integrating Social Forestry and other sectors to National Forestry Program and/or National Climate Change Plans and Actions (NAMA, NAP, REDD+, INDC)**

After the open forum, Ms. Olivia Melendrez provided a synthesis of session 2. She summarized the session by presenting key experiences and how the countries elevate the integration of SF in their respective national plans and programs:

**Table 2. Country Experiences on Integrating SF in National Plans and Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights from Countries’ Experiences</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• With support from the UN-REDD, Myanmar is implementing the National REDD+ Programme. Because many priority forest areas are outside the jurisdiction of the Forest Department, it is interesting to note that in its organizational structure, there are TWGs on stakeholders’ network to include stakeholders’ engagement and safeguards. Thus,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDD+ in Myanmar is beyond carbon.

- Before 1995, the forestlands are totally managed by the government. The Community Forestry Instructions (CFI) in Myanmar has shaped evolution of CF from mere users of fuelwood, poles, NTFPs into community participation in national rehabilitation programs, REDD+, CSOs, INGOs, Community Forestry Network Working Group (CFNWG).

**Philippines**

- Use of native species or Rainforestation (RF) is a tested science-based approach (restoration/protection, timber production, urban enhancement, etc.).
- DENR (through MC 2004-26), CSOs/POs and IPOs adopted RF as a participatory approach with involvement of the local community and other stakeholders in the various stages of project development, monitoring and sustainability.
- RF is not only promoted in the Philippines but also in Indonesia, Vietnam, Laos, Sri Lanka.
- Named after the Philippine Eagle, LAWIN is a web-based platform focuses on the protection of natural forest and the conservation of its biodiversity by systematically observing threats.
- LAWIN integrates forest protection combining science-based (use of technology, equipment, software, maps) with community needs (alternative livelihood), policies and conservation targets.

**Indonesia**

- SF (CF, village forest, community plantation forest) in Indonesia addresses problems in forestry (e.g. policy, tenure, access) and the target is very promising.
- In terms of SF and Climate Change: showcased wide range of benefit for communities: NTFPs, ecotourism managed by local communities, environmental services, conservation (peatland and wildlife, customary areas).

**Integrating SF in National Plans and Programs**

**Myanmar**

- Consent and Participation is the key to CF and REDD+. It emphasized linking implementation of new Community Forestry Instructions 2016 in Myanmar by strengthening CFNWG (government and CSOs) and CF Unit organizational structure and REDD+ National WG and REDD+ Core Unit; contribute to NDC target; national forestation programme until 2026; Social and environmental safeguards; consolidate lessons learned from various programs such as business models of CF, PES and national level REDD+.

**Philippines**

- Rainforestation does not only increase the resilience of the forest ecosystem but also resilience of forest communities by providing diversified community livelihoods (e.g. integrating agricultural crops and fruit trees; income from NTFPs).
- Awareness and change of mindset of communities as well as policy reforms in the government are needed for RF. Moreover, there is a need for community incentives, mainstreaming in government programs (e.g. enhanced IRR of NGP) and empowering communities.
- Using real-time and measurable data, LAWIN can make information available to forest communities and stakeholders, thus achieving a transparent, accountable and socially inclusive Forest Protection. For instance in Kitanglad, documented IKSPs can be integrated in PAMB policies.
- Not only DENR Forest Patrollers, but can also involve LGUs, IPs and local community patrollers.
- LAWIN can contribute to REDD+ by addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and can be one basis of results-based finance.

**Indonesia**
Breakout Session: Building Country Profile on SF and CC and Understanding the NDCs

The session was sub-divided into two (2) breakout sessions. The first breakout session focused on building country profile on social forestry and climate change, while the second session tackled the links of social forestry to NDCs.

Breakout Session 1: Building Country Profile on SF and CC
Facilitator: Edna Maguigad, NTFP-EP

The participants were group according to their country representations. Prepared country factsheets were given to each group for completion and validation of information and below, questions were posted as guide for the group’s discussion.

a. Identify organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry, forestry and their link with climate change sector in each country.

b. Identify social forestry policies, strategies, experiences and practices that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation; what policies, strategies and practices hinder this? How can this be addressed?

c. What are capacity building and integration needs to enable Social Forestry integration with Climate Change?

See Annex 3 for detailed output of each group.

Breakout Session 2: Understanding NDC planning and Linking Social Forestry to NDCs
Facilitators: Dr. Grace Wong, Senior Scientist, CIFOR and Atty. Edna Maguigad, Senior Policy & Governance Adviser, NTFP-EP Asia

The participants were divided into three sub-groups: REDD+, Livelihoods and Forest Rehabilitation and Restoration, and Conservation and Forest Law Enforcement. The groups were given a set of questions on integrating SF, identifying capacity needs and challenges in integrating SF in their identified and proposed forestry actions. The discussions among groups were facilitated by forestry experts.
### Table 3. Understanding SF and NDCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide Questions</th>
<th>REDD+ <em>(Promises made in NDCs: carbon and non-carbon)</em></th>
<th>Livelihoods, Forest Rehabilitation and Restoration <em>(NGP-focused)</em></th>
<th>Conservation and Forest Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Governance</strong> <em>(Accountability, Inclusion/Participation and Transparency Institutional Arrangements)</em> How to ensure accountability, transparency and performance? Who monitors action?</td>
<td>- Leverage on existing structure in place to strengthen accountability and transparency; - Need for a new structure regarding participation and transparency, linking this to SF since at times, local communities may not be able to participate despite the fact that there is inclusiveness in the process.</td>
<td>- Multi-stakeholder participation in commodity roadmap; - Community-based monitoring systems; - Include third party, CSOs, NGOs, Universities, Faith-based in participatory M&amp;E.</td>
<td>- Access to data and information; - Issuance of MOAs, Resolutions, Ordinances between stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Measures and/or evidence that these actions can contribute to mitigation (low to zero emission) /adaptation (climate resilient) targets of a NDC? What are the indicators that can be used?</strong></td>
<td>- Monitoring with MRV; - Reliability of data: does it measure different types of indicators; - Develop REL, baselines and indicators for monitoring.</td>
<td><strong>Measures</strong> - Diversification of livelihoods; - Sustainable harvesting protocol; - Climate-smart RMPs; - Enhanced Plans through GIS; - Land use plan are implemented. <strong>Indicators</strong> - Biodiversity: no. of indigenous species, biomass; - Increased income, socio-economic and environment conditions; - Presence of ecosystems-based livelihoods.</td>
<td>- Increased forest cover by more than 50% in the Philippines; - Increased in number of deputized POs/IPOs/Community members; - Establishment of national Accreditation Bodies and Certification for Forest Products; - Decreased number of threatened and endangered species; - Establishment of National ICCA Registry; - Increased number of keystone species; - Mainstream the use of native specific in restoration for production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. What are external pressures affecting this sector? What measures are needed to address these pressures?</strong></td>
<td>- Big scale impacts, i.e plantation, forest fire, market demand for wood products; - Political economy issues i.e</td>
<td><strong>Measures</strong> - Measure: Security of income; - Measures needed to ensure sustainability: Government policies and programs, permitting, products,</td>
<td>- Food security and Energy; - Conflicting land use (open access); - Natural and man-made disasters;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measures needed to ensure sustainability?**

- Highlight the difference between small-holder impacts vs. large scale threats, classified drivers which require varying lens of looking at the threats.

**4. What are the roles of stakeholders in delivering results? - government, local communities, CSO and academe, private sector**

- **Government has the role to create policy, facilitate policy structure, and the power to stop actions the degrade forests;**
- For local Communities, there are varied roles, i.e. participate in policy processes that may lead to sustained commitment in SF and REDD+, role in MRV of actions to monitor promises are being kept;
- For CSOs: function as link of local communities to the government, as well as lead in advocacy and participate in monitoring;
- The private sector needs to engage community as main stakeholder and provide financing, commitments in place but need to see how PS implement this and monitored by other sectors as oversight;
- LC and CSOs may play as an oversight, especially that if they are part of a policy market.

- Play role in community-based monitoring;
- CSOs and Academe as capacity builder;
- Create ties with private sector (business companies) including chamber of commerce for market link of forest products;
- Encourage government to look for potential market for forest products.

- Population pressure on resources;
- External debt;
- Over development, destructive to forests.

*For Community and CSOs*
- Multi-sectoral Eco Warriors.

*For government:*
- Allocate enough funds for forest protection;
- More policies on forest protection.

*For LGUs*
- Ensure strict implementation of CLUP/ECAN (interface CRMF and ASDPP).

*For Academe:*
- Influence policy makes on decisions based on scientific investigations.
5. What are the gaps? What further studies are needed? What capacities need to be enhanced/ built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps</th>
<th>Capacities needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Need to have a third party oversight role to build credibility within the program process or MRV, then a system can be agreed upon.</td>
<td>• Building communities for capacities for building enterprise: business planning, VC-related training, resource generation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills and knowledge on climate change and planning, i.e. PCVA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Technologies for value adding, livelihood, resource management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-recognition of indigenous and traditional knowledge systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender and development in SF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps</th>
<th>Capacities Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Indicators to monitor;</td>
<td>• Solve the root of corruption (poverty, etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy Performance to monitor;</td>
<td>• Use of web-based technologies like LAWIN;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand how NDCs are met because there may be trade-offs, i.e. biofuels and food security might impact social forestry, which would then all contribute to NDC review and stocktaking.</td>
<td>• Studies on best practices and success stories (IKSP based studies);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More studies and capacity building activities to address the gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weak political will;</td>
<td>• Lack of funding and incentives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of National Land Use Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of support for community-based enforcement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from the Participants

1. Consider the possibility of having a framework that would govern financing and benefit sharing mechanism, which can be a basis for sharing within the region.
2. Multi-stakeholder participation is very important, but there should be a form of framework to govern itself at various levels, as seen in NGP, key challenges are land use protection and good planning at the community level which is sustainable for long term benefits.
3. Role of tenure in conservation and forest law enforcement, for instance in Palawan, there are open access which are not specific to communities surrounding it.
4. There are still challenges and requirements that need to be addressed around social forestry before putting it in NDCs. Specifically, there should be:
   - More accountable processes like monitoring, MRV system and maintaining its credibility.
   - Full implementation of monitoring of systems outlined in management plans.
   - Strategies to measure which actions contribute to mitigation and adaptation.
   - More participation on the ground at all levels of governance.
   - Identification of data to report and indicators to monitor for MRV.
   - Identify which institution takes the role of an oversight in the country.
5. The questions of identifying key indicators and monitoring of adequate inclusion and participation and how it can be institutionalized within the processes are key elements in preparing such plan.
6. The biggest outcome is not as mechanical and straightforward as expected. In fact, an action does not necessary equate to contribution to NDCs. The REDD+ group has a strong structure that gave emphasis on the role of MRV in understanding links of various components. There is a need to think further in order to ensure that SF stakeholders not only contribute to their own doing but also in complying with NDCs. Hence, strengthening SF to deliver NDCs as well as delivering carbon and non-carbon benefits are crucial in the process.

Closing Dialogue: Generating Feedback and Recommendations from ASEAN Member States, CSOs and Development Partners

Moderator: Dr. Doris Capistrano, ASFCC Regional Advisor

The session aimed to bring together feedback from the delegates and provide a set of agreed recommendations towards developing stronger capacity and a process for better integration of Social Forestry in NDCs. The participants were asked to respond to two questions: feedback on the discussions and from the workshop what can be the priority action/s of the Region in moving forward. It was noted that the inputs will be reflected on the agenda of AWG-SF Network for presentation to the ASEAN Member States.
### Table 4. Closing Dialogue: Feedback and Priority for Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>From ASEAN Member States (AMS)</th>
<th>From CSOs/Development Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>From Myanmar</strong></td>
<td>He was impressed to learn a lot from the individual country’s experiences both at the level of the LGUs and CSOs. For instance, the restoration and conservation initiatives under social forestry agenda which can contribute to NDC. For Myanmar, it would be a great potential for the same work since in 2017 the government will start the review of the 10-year forestry program. Hence, the various models presented from Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos would be very helpful in informing the country’s strategies. It would be important to take note, in Myanmar’s case how safeguards would be implemented to ensure that community is protected; this can be integrated in the PES to create opportunity for the community beyond carbon.</td>
<td><strong>From GIZ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From Cambodia</strong></td>
<td>It is good to learn a lot from the workshop. The reform in policy is more of a political motivation and it still remains a challenge for many countries. The government has to promote livelihood to local community as well as to build their capacity in increasing resilience.</td>
<td><strong>From AFA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From Lao PDR</strong></td>
<td>There are so many projects directly related to the communities. These projects aim to strengthen the community capacity and generate livelihood income through forest protection, hence contributing to poverty reduction. 17 provinces are involved in improving livelihood and sustainable forest protection and conservation of KBA. Rest assured that learnings from the workshop will be disseminated to my colleagues.</td>
<td><strong>From a CBFM-PO (Philippines)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>The implementation of SF in other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
countries and the role of REDD+ has put more relevance of linking this to climate change. Setting the indicators is also important to monitor how SF may contribute to NDCs.

- **From the Philippines.** As the workshop facilitated collection of recommendations, there is a need to consider policy enhancement ensuring that Community-Based Forest Management (CBFM) is connected to CC and NDC.

- **From National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), Philippines.** The country has a big role in the conceptualization of the Paris Agreement. However, challenges still remains for the country to address, specifically on a) overlapping functions between DENR and NCIP on forest governance agenda, b) denying that IPs have big role towards achieving the goal of SF, and c) the limited funding opportunities given to NCIP to carry out its activities to resolve conflict on land tenure. Hence, NCIP hopes that these would form part the priority actions of the government, otherwise it would be difficult to move forward.

- **From WARSI.** Indonesia has already ratified the Paris Agreement last Oct 16, 2016 and the Congress will soon issue a policy regulation related to the fulfillment of the Paris Agreement. The organization would like to believe that the efforts of the government in terms of targeting 12.5 million has for forest restoration, moratorium on oil palm plantation would lead towards carbon emission reduction with its commitment of from 29% to 41% reduction by 2030.

- **From Sagita.** As part of the WG in Agriculture, the government has done its part in developing the priority actions for the sector. There will be an upcoming meeting in Bali and hope to have a continuing discussion between working group of SF and agriculture. Also, there will be a technical consultation on climate change topic on November 13 which can be a venue to share the results of the workshop.

### Priority Actions for the Region

- The region has the advantage of sharing the knowledge and experiences; hence there should be regular platform to do this.
- Facilitate more discussion of SF in NDCs within the AMS and working groups in the ASEAN-level.
- Consider the capacity building activities (*identified in the workshop*) in the strategic plan of action, banking on the support of the partners, consensus building, and partnership within AMS.
- The concern on IPs is not only unique to the Philippines, other countries are also facing the same challenges, being the local community as a backbone of safeguards. Clearly, there is a need to address tenure, overlapping mandates of institutions through collaboration, and resource distribution that are sometimes lopsided, as observed by NCIP. The integration of IP rights as an agenda for a larger group can be looked at in the context of social forestry, with reiteration of enabling conditions such as policy, technical capacity, and adequate support for the implementation such mandate. And link to that is the need to monitor, verify and have transparency on the flow of resources and the level of participation of each institution. Hence, a concrete step which can be included in the strategic plan of action.
Next Steps

As agreed upon, the next steps include the following:

- For the immediate output, the documentation will be disseminated to a broader audience, as basis to start the country discussions.
- From the documentation, NTFP-EP will draft and circulate the recommendations among the participants within one week. A maximum of 10 days will be given for review and comments and after 10 days, the recommendations will be finalized for further circulation within AMS.
- Revisit the strategic plan of action of the AWG-SF to see how inputs from the workshop can be integrated.
- AWG-SF to take advantage of an upcoming ASEAN meeting on multi-sectoral framework on food security and climate change.

Closing Remarks

Assistant Director Mayumi Quintos-Natividad, DENR-FMB

Assistant Director Natividad thanked the delegates from Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Vietnam and the Philippines for participating in the first meeting of the AWG-SF. She also thanked the organizers and partners of FMB for the continuous support given to the Bureau.

She hoped that there will be sharing of outputs from the workshop in the upcoming meeting of FMB on October 27-28, 2016.
Evaluation

A total of 16 participants submitted their respective evaluation forms. And based on the results, the average score of 4.3 shows satisfaction on the workshop, see annex 4 for the tabulated evaluation results. Moreover, 8 out of the 16 respondents agreed that the workshop objectives were met, while majority are highly satisfied with the topics presented and discussed in the plenary.
### Responses to Open-ended Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Social Forestry and Climate Change</th>
<th>Workshop-Building A Country Profile on SF and CC</th>
<th>Sharing of Experiences on integrating Social Forestry</th>
<th>Understanding NDC planning/Linking Social Forestry to NDCs</th>
<th>Closing Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which session/s or topic/s did you find most useful and why?</td>
<td>4 pax Comments: because it is very useful to know AMS contexts relevance to CC, lessons-learned from other countries in terms of social forestry linked to CC.</td>
<td>2 pax Comment: learned so much from Myanmar, rainforestation, Lawin, and there more questions</td>
<td>4 pax Comments: discussed a lot of things that are necessary to find out ideas</td>
<td>2 pax Comment: ties up with the operational strategy for enhancing the role of AWG-SF in NDC implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difficulties did you have?</td>
<td>• Understanding other speakers/Language barrier • Terminologies • Workshop on building country profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you have liked to learn more about?</td>
<td>• NDC • Framework of forestry and climate change • Financing of projects/experiences presented and integrating IP rights in forestry and CC • Rainforestation • More successful experiences from different ASEAN countries • Communities participation in SF and integrating SF to CC • Strategies to implement NDC in the ASEAN Region • Livelihood, information sharing between villages and forest protection units • How UNFCCC can mandate that SF has to be fruitfully engaged in NDC development and implementation • NDC as climate change commitments in ASEAN member countries. • How to promote CF based enterprise and contribute to CC • More elaboration of the learnings from the session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other capacity building and training needs do you need in relation to the topic</td>
<td>• Lawin Process • NDC Planning • Facilitation skills • PAR tool • CBFM • Cross visits/inter community dialogue to improve Philippine compliance • Financing mechanisms and how to access it for SF better and faster implementation to contribute to NDCs and SDGs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments and recommendations</td>
<td>• Congratulations: Successful • Standing board for the group work is awesome • Bottled mineral water and candy in the table would be nice • Bravo. Follow up email from FMB to send very briefly, summarized outputs from the meeting to be communicated to the AWG-SF participants will be useful. • (From Roberto Almonte) Noticed the absence of a resource person from NCIP. I extend our apology. Next conference, if any, may perhaps include me. • More time for sharing of experiences • More and continuous learning exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 13 pax responded to the questions*
## Annexes

### 1. Participants’ List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Email</th>
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<tr>
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<td>WARS</td>
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<td>Department of Forestry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Dr. Thaung Naing Oo</td>
<td>Forest Research Institute</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tnoo71@gmail.com">tnoo71@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Hoang Dung</td>
<td>Forest Inventory and Planning Institute, MARD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleuterio Manaytay</td>
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<td>President</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emc_0812@yahoo.com.ph">emc_0812@yahoo.com.ph</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nida Collado</td>
<td>Region 4B CBFM PO</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97778343278</td>
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<tr>
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<td><a href="mailto:meggycabral@gmail.com">meggycabral@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina Karissa Tobias</td>
<td>DENR-FMB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurreccion Marinas</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:marinas.ccc@gmail.com">marinas.ccc@gmail.com</a></td>
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<td>Regional Director</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:region4ncip@gmail.com">region4ncip@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pacis</td>
<td>DENR-CARP</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:hppacis@yahoo.com">hppacis@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo Mendizabal</td>
<td>DENR-CARP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:romeo.mendizabal@yahoo.com">romeo.mendizabal@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpha Tadiosa</td>
<td>DENR-CARP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:orphatadiosa@yahoo.com">orphatadiosa@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Escuzar</td>
<td>FMB-Region 10</td>
<td>CBFM Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rio.pfms@gmail.com">rio.pfms@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Trining Silang</td>
<td>FMB-Region CAR</td>
<td>CBFM Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:vickysilang@yahoo.com">vickysilang@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corazon Malate</td>
<td>FMB-Region 6</td>
<td>CBFM Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Partners, CSOs, and NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Batas</td>
<td>SEARCA</td>
<td>Project Coordinator of the ASFCC-ASRF Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Apigo</td>
<td>SEARCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Efrain J Laureano</td>
<td>UNDP-B+WISER</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Herzano</td>
<td>FPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>9176793000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Bringao</td>
<td>PTCF</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tonbringao@gmail.com">tonbringao@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Agoncillo</td>
<td>FPE</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oagoncillo@fpe.ph">oagoncillo@fpe.ph</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bernd-Markus Liss</td>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Principal Adviser</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bernd-markus.liss@giz.de">bernd-markus.liss@giz.de</a></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyra Kyle Chu</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Canlas</td>
<td>NTFP-EP Philippines</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ruthpcanlas@yahoo.com">ruthpcanlas@yahoo.com</a></td>
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<td>CSO Forum Facilitator</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>NTFP-EP Asia</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:earl.diaz@ntfp.org">earl.diaz@ntfp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Copino</td>
<td>NTFP-EP</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rita.copino@ntfp.org">rita.copino@ntfp.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Mana-Galido</td>
<td>NTFP-EP</td>
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## Program Agenda

**DAY 1, October 20, 2016 (Muralla 2 & 3 Function Room)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8:30AM - 9:00AM</strong></td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **9:00AM – 10:30AM**  | **Emcees: Ina Karissa Tobias, DENR-FMB & Earl Paulo Lim Diaz, NTFP-EP Asia**  
  Welcome Remarks  
  For. Orlando Panganiban, Chief, Forest Resources Management Division, DENR-FMB  
  AWG-SF Leader, Philippines  
  Femy Pinto, Executive Director, Non Timber Forest Products – Exchange Programme Asia  
  Key Message  
  Framework on Forestry and Climate Change  
  Dr. Maria Brockhaus, Senior Scientist, Forestry Policy and Agricultural Economy  
  Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)  
  Key Message  
  National Perspective on Linking Social Forestry and Climate Change  
  For. Ricardo Calderon  
  Director, Forest Management Bureau (DENR-FMB), ASOF Leader, Philippines  
  Chairperson, AWG-SF  
  Key Message  
  Social Forestry: Lessons and Contributions to the ASEAN Climate Change Agenda  
  Dr. Doris Capistrano  
  Senior Adviser, ASEAN-Swiss Partnership on Social Forestry and Climate Change (ASFCC)  
| **10:30AM – 10:50AM** | Photo session and coffee break                                                                                                           |
| **10:50AM – 11:00AM** | **Overview of Regional Workshop – Edna Maguigad, NTFP-EP Asia**                                                                            |
| **11:00AM –12:00PM**  | **Session 1. Social Forestry and Climate Change**                                                                                         |
|                       | **Speakers and Topics:**                                                                                                               |
|                       | 1. Sharing of Results of National Workshop Integrating SF in NDCs and the National REDD+ Congress  
  For. Orlando Panganiban, Chief, Forest Resources Management Division  
  DENR-FMB and AWG-SF Leader, Philippines  
  2. Experience of Seima Protection Forest and REDD+ Voluntary Mechanism Agreement  
  Mr. Long Ratanakoma, AWG-SF National Focal Point of Cambodia  
  3. Experience in Village Forestry  
  Mr. Peter Thavone, Representative of the REDD+ Division  
  Department of Forestry of Lao PDR  
|                       | **Moderator:** Sagita Arhidani, Head, Secretariat of the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF) |
### Session 1: Social Forestry and Climate Change (cont.)

**Speakers (cont.):**

4. **Vietnam Payment for Forest Environmental Services**  
   Nguyen Hoang Dung, Forest Inventory and Planning Institute, MARD

5. **Mainstreaming Social Forestry in the Implementation of REDD+ in Indonesia: Case Study in Bujang Raba**  
   Ms. Emmy Primadona, WARSI

**Synthesis of Session 1 by Rapporteur**

*Moderator: Sagita Arhidani*, Head, Secretariat of the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF)  
*Rapporteur: Femy Pinto, NTFP-EP Asia*

### Session 2: Workshop on Building A Country Profile on SF and Climate Change

**Country Workshops on the following:**

- **d.** Identify organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry, forestry and their link with climate change sector in each country,
- **e.** Identify social forestry policies, strategies, experiences and practices that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation; what policies, strategies and practices hinder this? How can this be addressed?
- **f.** What are the capacity building and integration needs to enable Social Forestry integration with Climate Change?

Prepared country factsheets will be given to each country group and participants will be asked to fill in, complete and validate the information. Output will be shared via country presentations.

*Facilitator: Edna Maguigad, NTFP-EP*

### Day 2, October 21, 2016 (Muralla 2 & 3 Function Room)

**9:00AM – 9:15AM**

*Emcees: Ina Karissa Tobias, FMB-DENR, Ms. Kate Mana-Galido, NTFP-EP Philippines*

**Recap of Day 1**

**9:15AM – 11:00AM**

**Session 3: Sharing of Experiences on Integrating Social Forestry and Other Sectors to National Forestry Program and/or National Climate Change Plans and Actions (NAMA, NAP, REDD+, INDC)**

**Speakers/Topics:**

1. **Role of Community Forestry in National REDD+ Readiness**  
   Dr. Thaung Naing Oo Director, Forest Research Institute (FRI), Myanmar

2. **Scaling-up Rainforestation in CBFM**  
   Dr. Paciencia P. Milan, Rain Forest Restoration Initiative (RFRI)

3. **The LAWIN Forest and Biodiversity Protection System**  
   Dr. Ephrain Laureano, Chief of Party, B+WISER USAID
4. Integrating Community SF Livelihoods to National Forestry program  
*Ms. Sagita Arhidani on behalf of Mr. Wiratno, Indonesia* as Host Country of the ASEAN Working Group on Social Forestry (AWG-SF)

**Synthesis of Session by Rapporteur**

*Moderator: For. Mary Ann Batas, SEARCA  
Rapporteur: For. Olivia Melendrez, NTFP-EP Philippines*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00AM-12:00NN</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Understanding NDC planning and Linking Social Forestry to NDCs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitated Discussion with Experts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants are presented with key portions of their INDCs and will be given a set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of questions on integrating SF, identifying capacity needs and challenges in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integrating SF in their identified and proposed forestry actions. A facilitated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussion among workshop participants and invited CC and forestry experts follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Grace Wong, Senior Scientist, CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atty. Edna Maguigad, Senior Policy &amp; Governance Adviser, NTFP-EP Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00NN - 1:30PM</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH BREAK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30PM - 2:30PM</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Understanding NDC planning and Linking Social Forestry to NDCs (cont.)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical planning and facilitation tools suitable for NDCs planning to test social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forestry integration into NDCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Country Presentations in Gallery and Peer Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Grace Wong, Senior Scientist, CIFOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atty. Edna Maguigad, Senior Policy &amp; Governance Adviser, NTFP-EP Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30PM - 3:00PM</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00PM - 4:30PM</td>
<td><strong>Session 5: Closing Dialogue</strong> to bring together feedback from the primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delegates of the 2-day Regional Meeting and provide a set of agreed recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards developing stronger capacity and a process for better integration of Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry in NDCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and recommendations by AMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and recommendations of CSOs and Development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Moderator:</strong> Dr. Doris Capistrano, ASFCC Regional Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rapporteur:</strong> NTFP-EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30PM - 5:00PM</td>
<td><strong>Closing Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>For. Mayumi Quintos-Natividad, Assistant Director, FMB DENR Philippines</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>End of Day 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Definition and Models of Social Forestry

Community-based Forest management (CBFM) is the national strategy to ensure sustainable management of forest land resources. It promotes social justice and improved well-being of local communities and stronger partnerships between local communities and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (FMB, 2004).

### Policies on Social Forestry

- **Executive Order No. 263 (1995)**
- **Executive Order No. 193 of 2015**
- **Expanding the Coverage of the National Greening Program (7.1 M ha from 2017-2028)**
- **Technical Bulletin No. 18 – 2015**
- **Documentation of Good Practices in Forest Resources Management**
- **Technical Bulletin No. 20 – 2015**
- **The Indigenous People’s Rights Act (1997) as supporting legislation**
- **DAO 2004-29 IRR of EO 263**
- **NCIP AO 2004-04 (ADSDPP)**
- **MC 2004-06**

### Policies supporting actions on climate change

- **Climate Change Law (2009) and its Amendment, People Survival Fund (2012)**
- **National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (2011)**
- **Philippine Development Plan (2011)**
- **National Framework Strategy on Climate Change (2010); National Climate Change Action Plan (2011)**
- **The Philippine National REDD+ Strategy**

### Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry

![Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry](image)

### Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

### Existing activities on social forestry
1. National Greening Program (NGP) - plant 1.5 billion trees (2011-2016) for mitigation, poverty reduction and alternative livelihoods, now extended and enhanced.
2. CBFM-NGP Congress 2015, Developed and Distributed 4 livelihood manuals; Conducted the “CBFM-NGP Congress 2015”
3. Produced and Distributed copies of 5 Enterprise Development Booklets designed for CBFM
   i. Selecting an Enterprise
   ii. Preparation of an Enterprise Plan
   iii. Implementation of the Enterprise
   iv. Sustaining An Enterprise
4. Produced and distributed copies of the Simple Accounting and Auditing Guide designed for CBFM
5. Development of NTFP policy
6. RFRI activities promoting rainforestation
7. Development of CBNEs (community-based enterprises)
8. Piloting/demonstration of REDD+ in IP areas and CBFM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. REDD+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rainforestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NGP sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CCAM documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CBFM-CARP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ICRMP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices**
Continuous reforestation and forest protection of CBFM POs and IPOs ICCAs (sacred places, sanctuaries, burial grounds)

**Challenges**
- Lack of map sharing tenure, land use overlay
- Lack of support by LGUs in some areas
- Institutional arrangement between DENR, CCC, NCIP, LGUs
- Streamlining of policies for resource use (permitting, FPIC: decentralization)
- Interface of CRMF and ADSDPP to local and national development plans

**Capacity building needs to link SF and CC**
- OD
- Financial Management
- Available technologies on SF and CC
- Monitoring systems
- Capacity building of LGUs on SF and CC (DILG)
Cambodia

National definition and models of social forestry

Community Forests are considered state public property. The community are granted rights to access, use, manage, protect and benefit from forest resources in a sustainable manner. A Community Forest is defined as “the forest plantation of a Community or State forest, where the right is granted to a local Community living in or near the forest to manage and utilize the forest in a sustainable manner, between the FA and a local community”.

Policies on social forestry

- The Forestry Law 2002
- Sub-Decree #79 on Community Forestry Management 2003
- MAFF Guidelines on Community Forestry (Prakas) 2006 Protected Area Management Law 2008

Policies supporting actions on climate change

- National Adaptation Plan, Climate Change Strategic Plan 2014-2023
- National Forest Program (2010-2029)
- Green Growth Roadmap (2009)

Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry

Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

Existing activities on social forestry
- Community Forestry (CF) Forest Cover Statistics and Location Map,
- CF in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: CF REDD+, Rattan association, Wild Honey association, Resin group, Bamboo, Charcoal, Bio digester, Home garden,
- Capacity Building, Coordination and Networking: NCFP-CC (National CF Program Coordination Committee), PCFP-CC (Provincial CF Program Coordination Committee), CFN (Community Forestry Network),
- CSOs Partners engagement
- EF Management Plan Development

### Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Key output and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFP implementation</td>
<td>FA NGOs</td>
<td>EF establishment (500ef=0.5M ha) 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary pole installation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices**
- EF/EPA
- EF based REDD+

**Challenges**
- Policy reform: government provided land title to illegal grabbers to reduce conflicts
- Forest illegal logging and encroachment
- Financing support: very limited support from the government
- Capacity Building: EF Management and REDD+ to local community

**Capacity building needs to link social forestry and climate change**
- Awareness raising related to policy and regulation to LC
- Build capacity to sub-national government and LC on technical related EF management, CC and REDD+
- Build capacity of technical staff on CC and REDD+ (training, GIS mapping, carbon analysis, MRV, stock assessment)
**Indonesia**

### National Definition and Models of Social Forestry

In State Forests and Non-State Forests and in a number of different form, such as: Hutan kemasyarakatan/HKm (community-based forest), Hutan desa (village forest), Hutan tanaman rakyat/HTR (community-based forest estate), Hutan rakyat (private smallholder forest for income generation), Hutan adat (customary forest), Kemitraan (partnership)

### Policies on Social Forestry

- Ministerial Decree on CFM (No. 699/1998); The Forests Minister Decree (No. 31/2001) on administration of Community Forestry; Regulation of the Minister of Forestry (No. 1 Menhut-II/2004); Ministerial Regulation No 37.(2007) and Ministerial Regulation No. 49 (2008) provides legal basis for HKm and Village Forests.
- Direction of the President of the Republic of Indonesia: “Providing social forestry management should be secure and should go to the proper community: poor, lack of land own – no land – within or surrounding forest area”
- Draft Ministerial Decree on the Mechanism to Community Forestry Access Grant
- Director General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership (SFEP) Decree on Guidelines for Social Forestry Business Development
- DG SFEP Decree on SF Working Group Members
- DG SFEP Decree on the Environmentally Friendly Productive Equipment Assistance
- DG SFEP Decree on the Guidelines to Access Conflict

### Policies supporting actions on climate change

- Progress of Addressing Climate Change Indonesia, 2010-2014 (2014)
- National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation (2013)
- Indonesia’s Framework for Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (2013)
- Indonesia’s Mitigation Policy

### Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry

![Diagram of Organizational Structure]

**ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forests and Climate (ARKN-FCC)**
- Ministry of Environment and Forestry
- Directorate General of Climate Change
- Directorate of Resources Mobilization
- Coordinator of ASEAN Regional Knowledge Network on Forests and Climate (ARKN-FCC)

### Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

![Diagram of Institutional Linkages]

**Social Forestry**
- Directorate General of Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership
- Directorate of SF Area Preparation
- Directorate of SF and Private Forest Business Development
- Directorate of Conflict Resolution/Management
- Directorate of SF and triad Partnership

**Provincial Forest Services Agency**
- CBRM Group (CF, SF, etc.)
- Village Forest
- Long-term Management Plan
- Annual Management Plan
### Existing activities on social forestry

- Social Forestry’s contribution to Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation: Promote among others in UNFCCC COP-21
- Social Forestry’s contribution to Reduce Illegal Logging: Research on the correlation between Social Forestry practices and reduced forest fires, i.e. case study in Jambi
- Inter sectoral collaboration (Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Village, Ministry of Tourism, etc.)
- Inter institution collaboration: Govt - NGO - Academician - Key peoples - CSO, etc.
- Inter-level collaboration from Central to Local level
- Integration with FMU Establishment and Operationalization
- Inducing Business Development Planning process within community activities
- Institutional Strengthening (Cooperative as ultimate form)
- Equal partnership between farmer group with business entity
- CBFM ensures conflict resolution
- Utilization and strategic mobilization of CSR and relevant financial resources in support of the development of SF
- Sustainability of funds (CSOs, facilitation of community, etc)

### Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Key output and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effective land use spatial planning</td>
<td>Bappeda/Bappenas</td>
<td>Land use management regular update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restoring degraded ecosystem i.e. the newly set up National Peat Restoration Agency</td>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>Restoring previously burnt peatland of 2M ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expansion of SF scheme (12.7M has designated by the President)</td>
<td>KLHK/Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia/Directorate General of SF and Environmental Partnership</td>
<td>Ongoing development of PIAPS (indicative social forestry area mapping) done by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in Indonesia with inputs from national, provincial, and district, SF stakeholders (govt, CSO, community representatives, facilitators, universities, research academes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Best Practices
- Mitigation: One map policy, planting programme, canal blocking
- Adaptation: NTFP including forest honey, etc.

### Challenges
- Continuous update needed to respond to changes in governmental structure
- Sustainability of resources
- Maintain and champion momentum

### Capacity building needs to link SF and CC
- More discussion (regular and strategic) between SF and CC policy makers and practitioners
- Increasing knowledge and capacity at province, site levels, etc.
Laos

National Definition and Models of Social Forestry

Village forestry, as piloted by the FOMACOP Programme is the official social forestry model. It is defined as a “partnership between the State and organized villagers for the management of designated forests in order to sustain the flow of benefits, which are fairly shared by the villagers and the rest of the national community”. Village forestry focuses on the management of natural forests and is considered to be a process that encompasses a range of approaches to people-oriented forest management, with various levels of participation.

Policies on Social Forestry

- The Forestry Law 2005
- The Forest Strategy to the Year 2020

Policies supporting actions on climate change

- Renewable Energy Development Strategy (2011)
- National Strategy on Climate Change (2010)
- Strategic Plan on Disaster Management 2020 (2003)
- Policies on social forestry
- Land law under revision

Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry

Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

Existing activities on social forestry
- Revising VFM legal framework: Degree, technical guideline,
- Village forestry working group (VFWG) under FSSWG, Sep 2014
- Capacity Building: TOT for 30 technical staff at central, province level
- VFM developed for 11 Villages
- Participatory land use planning (PLUP) in more than 100 Villages have been done, supported by various organizations: RECOFTC, NGOs, CSOs, AFoCo,
- Closely worked with development partners: RECOFTC, CliPAD, JICA, PAREDD, CIFOR through FSSWG

### Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Key output and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Mitigation</strong>&lt;br&gt;- FCPF Project: REDD+ Readiness Phase</td>
<td>REDD+ Office, DOF, MAF, FREDD/GIZ Ministry of Energy and Mine, UNEP Prime Minister Office</td>
<td>Institutional Arrangement (REL/MRV, National REDD+ Strategy, Safeguards/SESA,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renewable Energy Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale up of power capacity from 15MW to 100MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The export of wood product ban</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential Contribution of VF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Adaptation Actions</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Promote climate resilience in farming system and agricultural infrastructure</td>
<td>NAFRI/Agriculture/UNDP</td>
<td>More productivities New technology adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote climate resilience in forestry production and forest ecosystem</td>
<td>NAFRI/UNDP</td>
<td>Efficiency of forest products Communities revenues from forest, NTFPs production Small, medium enterprise villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Best Practices
- Agricultural techniques (new tech adoption)
- Best agricultural practices

### Challenges
- Match the existing policies (trade off)
- Forest encroachment by communities (surrounding the forest area)
- Settlement of minority groups

### Capacity building needs to link SF and CC
- ToT for the National/Sub-national Staff
- Human resources (forestry sector)
- GIS mapping, RS Technique, Socio-econ
- Mitigation and adaptation synergy
- Database management (VF database)
Community forestry is forestry operations involving the local community. Community forestry means afforestation and the establishment of woodlots where there is a lack of fuelwood or other products for community use as well as the planting of trees and the extraction and use of forest products to obtain food supplies, consumer products and incomes at the farmer level.

**Policies on Social Forestry**
- Forest Law 1992
- 1995 Forestry Policy
- Community Forestry Instructions 1995/Revised CFI 2016
- National Land use policy (2016) recognizes customary right, tradition, cultural, ethnic group,
- Draft of Forest Management certifications for natural forest and plantation in Myanmar approved in national consultation workshop on April, 2016,
- Myanmar Timber Legal Assurance System (MTLAS) 2016, consists local community participation,
- Forest Law (1992) being revised to reduce illegal logging participating local communities.
- FLEGT, Land Use Policy (2016)

**Policies supporting actions on climate change**
- Myanmar Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction (2012)
- National Adaptation Programme of Action (2012)
- 10-year district forest management plan for 68 districts
- 20-year National Comprehensive Development Plan
- REDD+ Readiness Roadmap
- National Climate Change Policy Framework
- GEGG Policy Framework

**Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry**

![Organizational structure diagram]
Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

Existing activities on social forestry
- About 113,765 ha of CF have been established. 2,033 Forest User Groups with members of 53,420 (As of May 31, 2016)
- Revising Community Forestry Instruction, CFI (1995) through stakeholders consultation workshops at 8 places covering the whole country, CFI 2016
- FAO-FFF’s Small holder producer become a member of CFNWG,
- SME and Cooperatives proposed as members of CFNWG,
- Reforestation programme being re-formulated,
- “Extension division” promoted into “Social forestry and extension division” under the forest department,
- CF strategy to achieve the target is being developed,
- CBF, community based forestry assessment framework initiate
- CF NWG has been formed

Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Key output and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ Project extend community participation, capacity building, on-site training course,</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native species (plant, animals) to be maintained by communities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous knowledge on conservation and utilization of biological resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year logging ban in Bayo Yoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing logging (under 60% of AAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEGT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+ National Development Strategy being developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year reforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program 2017-2026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Best Practices**

**CF**

**Challenges**
- Land use and Land tenure issues
- Limited livelihood based SF/CC
- Value added products and marketing and linking to SMEs
- Microfinancing/ Illegal logging

**Capacity building needs to link SF and CC**
- CF/SF Management Plan Preparation for local communities
- CF/SF Management capacity and solving social conflicts
- Agroforestry practices and SF/CF
- Livelihood improvement trainings
- Communication/social/facilitating skills and forest field staff/official
- Mapping and data based system and information management of CF/SF
**Vietnam**

### National Definition and Models of Social Forestry

**CCC**

### Policies on Social Forestry

- Forest Protection and Development Law 1991
- The Land Law 2003
- Forest Protection and Development Law 2004

### Policies supporting actions on climate change

- National Action Plan to Respond to CC in Agriculture and Rural Development (upto 2020)
- Orientation toward 2050- approved by MARD in march 14, 2016
- National Green Growth Strategy
- National Target Program to Respond to CC (2008, 2020)

### Organizational structure and institutional arrangements for social forestry

Not Clear in the Illustration

### Institutional linkages of forestry, social forestry and climate change

- **MoNRE>Third Party Monitoring**

### Existing activities on social forestry

- Through Payment for Forest Environmental Services (PFES)
- Decree No.99 (Approved on 24/9/2010 by VN government on payment for forest environmental services (PFES) implementing nationwide
- Achievements:
  - Established 37 provincial funds
  - Annual revenue is from 50 - 60 million USD, Accumulated PFES amount from 2011 to April 2015 is around 213 million USD;
  - PFES payments provided additional capital investment for the forestry sector (account for 22-25% of the total capital for forestry sector)
  - PFES budget supports for forest protection of 3-5 million VND/ha/year
- Created jobs with participation of 348,715 households, 5,734 group of households & communities (2,241 owners and 3,493 contracted);

### Existing actions in adaptation and mitigation (SF and LULUCF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Key output and activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Best Practices

### Challenges

- Scale of forest: difficult to manage
- Small owners
- Awareness about forest protection
- Income of owners is low, they want to change the land use/purpose

### Capacity building needs to link SF and CC

- Management skills for forest rangers on forest protection
- Education of people in the communities, i.e. financial skills
### Annex 4: Tabulated Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Scores/Ranking</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background and Overview of the workshop</td>
<td>1 6 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1: Social Forestry and Climate Change</td>
<td>2 6 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2: Workshop - Building A Country Profile on SF and CC</td>
<td>2 6 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3: Sharing of Experiences on integrating Social Forestry</td>
<td>1 6 9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4: Understanding NDC planning /Linking Social Forestry to NDCs</td>
<td>1 7 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5: Closing Dialogue</td>
<td>1 4 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>3 6 7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop kits including publications</td>
<td>1 2 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics (hotel, venue, food, etc.)</td>
<td>1 1 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations were adequate</td>
<td>2 5 9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop objectives were met</td>
<td>1 8 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of workshop was sufficient</td>
<td>1 2 6 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>1 1 8 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodologies used to deliver training topics</td>
<td>3 9 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnings</td>
<td>2 10 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability to work</td>
<td>2 6 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of / choice of topics</td>
<td>2 5 7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>