Report

on

Training Workshop

"Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy"

Jointly organised by
Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa (FORNESSA) and
IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC)

Supported by
SIDA (Sweden), BMZ/GTZ (Germany), FORMIN (Finland), KEFRI (Kenya),
Austrian Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management,
and Korea Forest Research Institute

Kenya Forestry Research Institute
Muguga, Nairobi, 04– 06 December 2007

Abbreviations

AFF	African Forest Forum
AFORNET	African Forest Research Network
BMZ	German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CIFOR	Centre for International Forestry Research
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
COFO	Commission on Forestry (FAO)
COMIFAC	Commission des Ministres en charge des Forêts d'Afrique Centrale
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council of the United Nations
EFI	European Forestry Institute
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORMIN	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland
FORNESSA	Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
GTZ/IWP	GTZ/International Forest Policy (sectoral project)
IAF	International Arrangement on Forests
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre (former International Centre for Research on Agroforestry)
IFF	Intergovernmental Forum on Forests
IPF	Intergovernmental Panel on Forests
IRAD	Institut de la Recherche Agricole pour la Développement
ITTA	International Tropical Timber Agreement
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature – The World Conservation Union
IUFRO	International Union of Forest Research Organisations
IUFRO-SPDC	IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Institute
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
nfp	National forest programme
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
TFAP	Tropical Forestry Action Plan / Tropical Forests Action Programme
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCHE	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFF	United Nations Forum on Forests
WB	World Bank
WFSE	World Forests, Society and Environment
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development

Table of Contents

Annex:

Presentations and supporting documents are provided separately on CD-ROM

1. Background and Introduction

1.1. Background and rationale

The need for sound scientific information in the development of public forest policies at the local, national and international levels has grown significantly in recent years. So too has the need for such information within the private forestry sector and among non-governmental organizations, whose role in the development, sustainable management and conservation of forest resources in all regions of the world is steadily increasing in importance. Despite rapid advances in information technology that has, in theory, the potential to significantly improve the flow of research findings to policy-makers and forest managers, communication and interaction often is inadequate between the research community and the users of the information they generate.

Also, often research is planned and conducted before giving adequate thought to exactly how the results will be transformed into usable information. In order to generate value for society, research results should be used by someone – policy-makers, forestry practitioners, landowners, educators and other researchers. The science-policy interface is all about utilising scientific knowledge more effectively.

1.2. Objectives and target groups

The IUFRO Training Workshop "Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy" took place at the Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Muguga, Nairobi, 04–06 December 2007. It was jointly organised by Forestry Research Network of Sub-Saharan Africa (FORNESSA) and IUFRO's Special Programme for Developing Countries (IUFRO-SPDC), with support by SIDA (Sweden), the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (FORMIN), the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, and the Korea Forest Research Institute.
Resource persons were provided by the Finnish Forest Research Institute (METLA), Forestry Research Institute Ghana, Institute of Agricultural Research for Development IRAD/CEREFEN Cameroon, Forestry Research Institute Malawi, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, the African Forest Forum, and the FAO Regional Office for Africa.

The overall objective of the training workshop was:

- To provide concepts and methods to researchers on how to plan, conduct, and organise research activities so that results can more quickly and easily be transformed into usable information for problem-solving and policy-making.

Although not all research is specifically focused on policy-relevant questions, best practices in transforming research results into usable information can increase the impact of

science on forest policy and improve the practice of forestry, thereby creating more value for society from forest and tree-related research. Towards this end, the training workshop specifically aimed at improving the understanding of policy- and decision-making and the roles scientists can play in informing such processes.
The training workshop brought together scientists from developing countries in Sub-Saharan Africa who wished to increase the impact of their scientific work (i.e. research, advocacy, supervision etc.) on policy-making through adequate contribution of research results and scientific knowledge to policy-making processes, addressing broader environmental and socio-economic issues.

1.3. Contents and methodology

The three-day training workshop was designed to provide latest thinking on concepts and tools for the improvement of the interface of forest science and forest policy. The workshop content is built on a "best practices guide" for working effectively at the interface of forest science and forest policy. These guidelines have been developed and published by the IUFRO Task Force on Science Policy Interface (IUFRO Occasional Paper No. 17, 2005) and is available online at http://www.iufro.org/publications/series/occasional-papers/en/).

The course specifically focused on the following issues:

- Selecting research questions that are relevant to policy issues;
- Conducting research in a communicative and collaborative manner;
- Understanding, serving and engaging in policy processes;
- Creating organisational capacity and culture that enables and encourages work at the science-policy interface; and
- Demonstrating – with the help of case studies – the interaction between scientists and policy makers.

Science-policy interactions and best practices were explained against various backgrounds and contexts. These included (a) international policy processes, (b) national forest programmes; and (c) policies and management practices at the local levels.

Resource persons from national forest research institutions and other expert organisations presented a wide spectrum of case studies from Sub-Saharan Africa that demonstrated successes and challenges of working at the science-policy interface.

Emphasis in the training workshop was placed on interactive sessions and group work so that participants could obtain significant insights in the complex nature of issues to be addressed in the science-policy interface. Towards this end, participants were asked to compile examples of research work from their own countries with linkages to policy- and decision-making, providing the basis for analysis and discussions.

The workshop programme is presented in Annex 1. All presentations given during the workshop by trainers and resource persons together with the results of group work and

supporting material have been provided to the participants on a CD-ROM after the workshop.

1.4. Participants

The workshop comprised a number of 21 participants and resource persons from 8 African countries, namely Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, and the United Republic of Tanzania. The training was facilitated by trainers/resource persons from GTZ and IUFRO. The list of participants is presented in Annex 2.

2. Day 1: International and National Forest Policy Processes

2.1. Introduction: IUFRO-SPDC Initiative on Science and Policy Interface

The training workshop was opened by Dr. Paul Konuche, Director of the Kenya Forestry Research Institute. After introduction of participants and presentation of the workshop objectives and the programme, Michael Kleine, Coordinator IUFRO-SPDC, gave an overview on IUFRO and the IUFRO-SPDC Training Initiative on the Science-Policy Interface. In his presentation he outlined the specific tasks and challenges of linking science to policy.

During the subsequent discussions participants raised the following points:

- How to address cross-sectoral aspects in the science-policy interface, especially linking to other ministries beyond the one in charge of forests?
- Involvement of stakeholders: Focus on stakeholders' needs is required, but local stakeholders are often forgotten. Research could have a role in informing and advocating. Interaction with stakeholders is important, including policy-makers who are also stakeholders in the process. The key question is who determines the research agenda.
- Impact assessments as a task of research in monitoring and analysing policies.
- Capacity building is required at all levels to unfold the potential of African scientists, however there are resource constraints.
- Research should seek practical approaches and find solutions that respond to problems of research users.
- Extension capacities in Africa are weak. Better linkage of science and extension is needed.
- Institutions should serve the needs of stakeholders, especially at the local level, which is often neglected.

2.2. International forest policy processes and agreements – challenges for science and research

As a starting point for discussions on the science-policy interface in international forest policy Bernd-Markus Liss, AGEG Consultants eG on behalf of the GTZ International Forest Policy Project IWP, presented an overview on international forest-related policy processes and agreements and the involvement of research and science. He outlined processes on sustainable development, the forest policy dialogue under the Intergovernmental Panel and Forum on Forests IPF and IFF, and the United Nations Forum on Forests UNFF and highlighted the commitments and obligations that derive from the so-called international forest regime, including the non-legally binding instrument (N-LBI) on all types of forests adopted under UNFF-7 in April 2007 and also the forest-related commitments from multilateral environmental conventions such as the CBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC.

The discussion focussed on questions with regard to the international forest policy processes and challenges for the science community, with the following contributions by participants:

- The role of FAO COFO in the international forest policy processes: FAO is owned by member countries. Through regional commissions and COFO they could shape the agenda and strategy of FAO. FAO has a prominent role in the collaborative Partnership on Forests CPF that supports UNFF and the implementation of the international forest regime.
- Science needs to define specific responses to international policy issues, e.g. climate change
- African participation in international forest policy processes: there is an urgent need to enhance and mobilise the contribution of Africa, specifically in harmonising positions with the objective to speaking with one voice for more impact at the international policy level. Specific institutions have to be set up for a coordinated and well-prepared input into international processes. Specialised knowledge is required for qualified negotiations. Various information channels are to be used in policy negotiations.
- With the establishment of the so-called African Group since UNFF-5 some efforts have been made to enhance the informed participation of African countries in the international forest policy dialogue and also to more effectively involve scientists. The African Group approach can help to provide continuity in participation and sufficient coverage of different fora and working groups in UNFF Sessions. In this context scientists could act as advisors to the African Union to back up negotiations. They could also contribute to fulfil monitoring, assessment and reporting obligations.
- Feedback from international level into research and implementation is important. However, there are many constraints in communication and systematic feedback. Sometimes only UN Diplomats go to international forest policy meetings without

any linkage to forest policy experts or any knowledge on forest policy issues. There is also little or no systematic feedback to own constituencies.

- Regionalisation of the international forest policy dialogue will gain increasingly in importance. There are opportunities for Africa to highlight specific regional and sub-regional concerns and to shape the agenda accordingly. Support of national governments is needed and the willingness to overcome national politics and to harmonise positions in order to have an impact that would benefit Africa.
- FORNESSA should be reactivated as a platform for coordinated response to current challenges emerging from international level, e.g. for exchange of information and experience how to deal with specific programmes for implementation such as carbon sequestration projects.

2.3. African Forest Forum

With regard to forest science and policy in Africa, Godwin Kowero presented the African Forest Forum (AFF) as a regional initiative to mobilise expertise and advice for forest policy and sustainable forest management. He presented a project to elaborate lessons learnt on sustainable forest management and to disseminate these lessons widely. AFF had also worked to prepare the participation of African countries with a joint position during UNFF-5. In general, AFF is established to act as a platform for policy and technical issues, development of programmes and projects and for advocacy on forest issues. It would work through its members (presently about 270) in five sub-regions, and through national forest associations and societies. AFF has a wide range of partners, including the African Development Bank, FAO, UNFF, IUCN, COMIFAC and others.

During discussion participants raised questions on the MoU of AFF with different agencies and institutions, and the membership of AFF. It was clarified that membership is open to all actors from inside and outside the forest sector. On the question what are the major positive and negative lessons on sustainable forest management in Africa it was explained that lessons need to take into account the diversity of conditions in African countries, therefore no general positive or negative lessons could be mentioned. As a cross-cutting aspect it was stated, however, that in all African countries the capacity to participate in international policy processes is quite weak. Though there seemed to be a certain similarity of the tasks of AFF, AFORNET and FORNESSA there is no duplication. AFF is a platform for policy debate and advocacy, and uses its members and existing forestry expert networks to mobilise the necessary scientific information and knowledge. It welcomes other networks to join for a strategic cooperation.

2.4. World Forests, Society and Environment

Heidi Vanhanen from the Finnish Forest Research Institute METLA gave a presentation on World Forests, Society and Environment (WFSE), a IUFRO Initiative for the elaboration of global and regional policy briefs and related capacity building material. She outlined the general characteristics a policy brief should have and the recommended process

to elaborate such documents. She informed participants on the regional forest policy brief for Europe and the process to produce a policy brief for Latin America. The elaboration of a policy brief for Africa is planned for 2008-2009, for which an African Task Force should be formed. Ms Vanhanen called on participants to engage in the process.

During the discussion the issue of short-term and long-term perspectives with regard to interests of stakeholders (policy-makers) was raised. It was stated that policies and policy decisions are made at various levels and it has to be clarified for each specific context who actually are the policy-makers to be addressed. Participants felt that marketing of research was important to raise understanding among policy-makers. Forests and forestry in most countries are a low priority for policy-makers. It was suggested that IUFRO could play a role to raise awareness on forestry issues and to lobby for a more important role of the forest sector in African countries. However, it was also mentioned that raising the profile of research and its impact on local policy making is primarily the responsibility of national research institutions. At the most, IUFRO can assist these institutions through research networking and capacity development.

2.5. CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology

As an additional input to the discussion, Michael Kleine presented the IUFRO-led CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology as an effort to provide scientifically sound information to the UNFF process. UNFF members had chosen ‘Adaptation strategies to climate change’ as the priority topic to be elaborated under this initiative. The process will include the review of existing research and the elaboration of a report for policy-makers until UNFF-8 in April 2009.

The discussion clarified that members of UNFF are policy-makers at the international level. They could benefit from inputs of scientists from Africa with regard to regional and sub-regional concerns. It was questioned again who drives the science agenda, whether the demand for policy briefs and related research is from top-down or from bottom-up by lobbying of scientists. With regard to climate change there are many indigenous adaptive strategies which could be documented and mobilised for a learning process. This could be a possible area of activity for FORNESSA. It was suggested that sub-regional research networks should be included in the CPF initiative. Participants complained that the regional chapter of the International Council on Science that should promote regional research networks did not pick up forestry issues in its interdisciplinary research programmes because of other priorities. With regard to cross-sectoral research priorities it was informed that the linkage of climate change, energy and water will be an issue of key importance for Africa with dramatic implications on the continent. A broader and more inclusive approach will be needed to address research on natural resources management in Africa effectively with the given challenges.

2.6. National forest programmes

In his presentation on national forest programmes (nfp) Bernd-Markus Liss outlined the concept of national forest programmes as an inclusive country-specific process for forest policy formulation and implementation towards sustainable forest management, based on multi-stakeholder consultation, communication and capacity building. He highlighted the nfp principles and the approach, and emphasised that nfp processes should be embedded in sustainable development policies and address a wide range of issues at the micro- and macro-levels, taking into account cross-sectoral linkages. He further explained that nfps do not confine to central policy planning but also include sub-national and local level policy-making and implementation. Beside, nfps include also the positioning towards the international forest policy dialogue and integrate the implementation of international forest-related agreements and commitments according to country priorities and specific conditions. They can provide an effective framework for collaboration and partnership at all levels and for donor coordination. The role of different actors was explained with specific focus on the role of science and research and related challenges.

The following discussion included questions on the added value of nfps, and whether they are substantive policy processes or only symbolic ones. It was stated that the capacity of science should be tapped for demonstrating the need for changes in policy processes, and that the nfp process can be a good framework for that. Participants also claimed that the rather complex forest policy processes should be simplified. Nfps can help to tap opportunities from the international level, e.g. deriving from the climate change discussion, and science needs to back up nfp processes.

The nfp principles include the consistency with national laws and the constitution. However, this does not mean that the legal framework can not be changed if it is not conducive to transparency in the forest policy process and participation of local stakeholders in forest management. Examples were quoted from Costa Rica, where even changes in the constitution have been made to allow for the establishment of a system of payment for environmental services, and from Vietnam where the land law and forest law had to be changed to provide the framework for the involvement of local communities in forestry.

As a next step Atse Yapi presented an overview on the status of nfp processes in West and Central African countries and the support that is being provided by the National Forest Programme Facility hosted by FAO. He reminded participants that nfps are hard work but are also rewarding, and that science and research can play a significant role with regard to forest policy formulation and implementation. He quoted a few examples where nfp processes have helped to involve local communities and traditional governance structures in discussions on forest policy.

Participants embarked on a lively discussion with the following points:

- Consultation processes with local communities are not scientific, but very important for strategy development. Communities very often own a lot of knowledge, which need to be tapped.

- The problem often lies with centralised forestry institutions that prevent benefit-sharing from forest use. Nfp processes can help to clarify the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders and the sharing benefits.
- User rights are often the source of conflicts between state and local communities, administrative procedures and bureaucracy frequently pose bottlenecks to sustainable forest management and benefits for local users, e.g. the requirement to apply for a cutting permit for trees, even when they have been planted on own land.
- Local governance structures are important for forest management, e.g. in Ghana, where the government and the traditional system of chiefs exist in parallel. The regional forest forums in Ghana were mentioned as a good example for involvement of traditional leaders in the nfp process.
- Social responsibility agreements can contribute to more equity. An open debate is needed to create transparency and to find solutions. In this context a gradual opening up of traditional structures can be observed in favour of a participatory societal dialogue. Young leaders are more open for changes.
- Very often interest groups such as local leaders and political elites capture the policy negotiation process to their advantage. The problem is that there is often no real representation of local stakeholders. Science can help to package local interests and bring them into the policy process.

3. Day 2: Best Practices for Improved Science-Policy Interfacing

The day started with a summary on the previous day by Michael Kleine, highlighting the key issues discussed with regard to international policy processes and national implementation. He pointed at the programme that would pick up again the contributions of participants while working on the practical application of the science-policy interface.

3.1. IUFRO Guidelines on science-policy interface

Then Michael Kleine presented the IUFRO Guidelines for Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy - Guidance for Scientists and Research Organizations that had been elaborated by the IUFRO Task Force on the Forest Science-Policy Interface. The publication was made available to participants as well as a summary table with the major recommendations.

Michael Kleine highlighted the key aspects of the Guidelines with regard to the involvement of scientists in policy process and how to conduct research in this regard. The interactive session triggered many remarks of participants on the relevance of research to policy, on the involvement of stakeholders at various levels, the interlinkage of scientists with

policy-makers and the best way to engage in policy processes. Communication and packaging research projects and results adequately to meet the demand of policy-makers are important preconditions that science can provide targeted input into policy processes at all levels based on factual information. Policy concerns should be addressed by scientists in all research projects; they should be relevant to policy-makers and take into account their demands. Societal needs are the key starting point for research, and emerging issues should be picked up to raise awareness at policy level. Only in this way, research can attract attention of policy-makers and adequate funding. As an important output the policy implications of research results should be effectively communicated.

3.2. Presentation of country cases

In the following session resource persons from four African countries presented examples of best practices for work at the science-policy interface.

Joe Cobbinah, on behalf of Forestry Research Institute of Ghana, provided a few examples on how scientific research was incorporated into policy. Along the practical cases of forest fire management, felling limits, protection of biodiversity hotspots, the modified Taungya system, identification of species for plantation development, and felling intensity he illustrated how research results were relevant to policy and had an impact on the decision-making in the forest sector.

Dennis Kayambazinthu, Forestry Department of Malawi, explained the institutional structure and process for planning and prioritising forest research with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders. As a best practice example he mentioned the change from state driven forestry to collaborative forest management with the involvement of local people. In this context he outlined the process to set the research agenda, the research outcomes and the impact in terms of policy change, and on the related policy and legislative framework.

Grégoire Ngono, Institute of Agricultural Research for Development, Cameroon, introduced ways how research could strengthen institutional capacities in the development of conservation and utilisation strategies, methodologies and tools for sustainable forest management and use. He gave an example on how to address policy issues with research on non-timber forest products and their potential to improve local livelihoods in southern Cameroon.

Ben Chikamai, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, presented practical experiences from KEFRI in addressing the science-policy interface. He specifically outlined the process and structures for strategic planning and interaction with policy level in programming, funding and monitoring of research. He further highlighted ways on how research results were made available for policy levels and for the public, and what kind of services KEFRI provides in this context.

In the discussion participants expressed their experience with work at the science policy interface highlighting the following issues:

- Based on the examples presented there would be the need –whenever possible - to add a policy component to each research project.
- It was also felt that research needs to address problems and issues of concern to society and that research should not merely react to demands by policy makers. It was recommended to incorporate this point into the science-policy guidelines.
- As shown in the example from Cameroon, long-term research in the utilisation of NWFP was necessary to mainstream NWFP into forest management planning.
- Contrary to the desired situation where local research institutions and stake-holders identify needed research topics and projects in many countries research remains largely donor-driven.
- It was also highlighted that at the level of rural communities the focus of discussions is primarily on concrete problems and not on policies.
- There are also considerable institutional constraints to interdisciplinary research.

3.3. Group work on science-policy interface

The participants split into four groups, each led by one of the resource persons. On the basis of concrete examples of research projects the groups were asked to

- Evaluate specific research projects against the IUFRO best practices guidelines;
- Present research projects to the group members explaining the process on how the research has been conducted;
- Discuss the project based on the following guiding questions:
  - Which of the elements in the best practices guide have been implemented?
  - Have these practices helped to make the project more useful for policy-making? If yes, how?
  - Should additional elements given in the best practices guide be included into the project? If yes, which ones?
- Select one project and develop the research process explaining the elements of the best practices guide that you would apply to make this particular project a role model for science-policy interfacing.

4. Day 3: Building Organisational Capacity for Science-Policy Interface

After briefly summarizing the activities and results of the previous day, Michael Kleine announced that the IUFRO Board Meeting will be held at ICRAF in Nairobi on 28 and 29 April 2008, followed by a Symposium on Forests and Human Health on 30 April for which

the IUFRO Task Force in charge is seeking contributions from African scientists. He invited participants to get engaged in the Symposium and to contact the IUFRO Task Force to participate and to provide relevant inputs. There is rich knowledge available in Africa, e.g. on forests and medicinal plants that could constitute a valuable contribution to the topic.

4.1. Presentation of group work: model research projects and science-policy interface

The whole morning was then used to present and discuss the results of the group work on research projects with regard to the application of the IUFRO guidelines on science-policy interfacing.

Group 1 under the leadership of Joe Cobbinah (Ghana) presented a project on the adaptability of indigenous tree species in the context of rehabilitation of degraded watersheds in Ethiopia, where the involvement of local communities in the design and implementation of the project played a major role.

The discussion highlighted the importance of a communication plan and the collaboration with extension, and the importance to involve local farmers to capture and use traditional knowledge. Understanding of policy processes was mentioned to be important for developing a strategy that research results will have an impact on policies and investments in forest rehabilitation programmes. In this way results can possibly also have implications on investment policies in other areas in the country. Concern was raised whether the short duration of the project (4 years) is sufficient to provide substantive results and reliable recommendations on potential species selection and their adaptability to degraded site conditions. In this context it was concluded that research has to be forward looking and to anticipate future problems and potential impacts. Generally, the long time frame of forestry collides with the interest of policy-makers to get results in a relatively short term. Despite the long gestation period of forestry, e.g. for timber production, also short-term impacts can be identified by research. Examples were mentioned from Kenya, where closing of forests against grazing or testing of different clones had yielded results in a fairly short period that could be clearly shown in demonstration plots. To overcome the dilemma of long-term research versus requirement to deliver results in a short-term, a complementary approach was recommended that included both aspects. Research projects can only influence policy-makers if they are interesting to them. This requires a better understanding by scientists on policy processes.

Group 2, led by Dennis Kayambazinthu (Malawi), elaborated on two examples: a research project on collaborative forest management in West Africa and one on the impact of an invasive species (*Prosopis juliflora*) on productivity of rangelands in Ethiopia.

In the following discussion on the application on the IUFRO Guidelines participants said that sometimes traditional knowledge was not applicable. However, research can contribute to transfer traditional knowledge into policies. Research needs to set priorities to make

best use of results for policy and the people. Taking into account values and needs is often not enough. There is a dilemma that policy-makers need to get results and precise advice in the short run, but research has to live with insecurities. It was concluded that research has to be forward looking, anticipating future problems. Policy-driven research can create disadvantages (example of introducing *Prosopis* in Ethiopia that was driven by policy and research). Policy level may be misleading, so science has to include the precautionary principle. With regard to the Guidelines it was mentioned that not all research has to be policy relevant. However, there is an international trend towards applied research in forestry, especially in developing countries. Therefore availability of funding for basic research is limited. It was further explained that the IUFRO Guidelines had been developed over a period of 7 years, based on experience in more than 100 research projects, with 3 regional workshops, thus including a broad range of experience. The outputs of research are usually scientific publications and reports to donors. Policy-makers may not understand scientific papers, so the best way has to be sought for the science policy interface. Different products may be needed for practitioners and policy-makers, but also the ambitions of scientists need to be fulfilled.

Group 3 under guidance of Grégoire Ngono (Cameroon) presented four projects: (1) socio-economic aspects related to the mangrove extraction in Chwaka Bay, Zanzibar/Tanzania, (2) the potential threat and colonisation potential of black wattle (*Acacia mearnsii*), an alien invasive species in Malawi, (3) identification and evaluation of potential uses of indigenous fruit trees of the Arsi zone in Ethiopia, and (4) impact of human activities on non-timber forest products in Cameroon.

Participants embarked again on a discussion on local knowledge and the fact that there are knowledge gaps between local people and scientists, who should take into account local knowledge, which can be used to improve management systems for natural resources. But there was also a word of caution: resources are diminishing due to the application of local land use techniques which are not adapted to changing conditions and thus lead to over-utilisation. Innovative adaptive approaches have to be found and locals convinced to change utilisation patterns when resources are under pressure. When there are conflicts over resources, research should establish multi-level communication channels for joint learning right from the beginning of a project. Communities usually are aware how to diversify livelihood opportunities. Religious leaders can play a role, since they have access and influence to local groups. They should be involved for better acceptance of projects and dissemination of results. An example was mentioned from Zanzibar, where one of the islands is being conserved due to religious norms. Another topic was that leaders often do not pay attention which puts limits to partners and stakeholders. Relevance and attention are closely related. Researchers have to distinguish who to collaborate with and where to disseminate research results. Substantive participation is required, this needs to be well coordinated, but one should also be realistic. The right timing is often decisive for getting the attention of stakeholder and policy makers.

Group 4 led by Ben Chikamai (Kenya), presented a farm forestry project in Ethiopia that dealt with assessment of the feasibility of alternative energy saving technologies in reducing the rate of deforestation and improving family health. As a main output the project is

aiming at the introduction of fuel saving devices that have an impact on forest. Training of local people, especially women, is a major part of the project.

Participants noted that the project was dynamic with several outputs that had implications on natural forest. With its focus on women it was found to be very gender sensitive. This is a quite rare feature of research projects, though a gender differentiated approach is often needed to tap traditional knowledge and modify technologies and change behaviour in natural resources management. The project applied a stratified approach to involve women and their ideas and capacities, including traditional knowledge and coping strategies. There was a debate on how to address priorities of local people in research. In this case the selection of research topics was confined to natural resources management. But it also linked health aspects to sustainable forest management. Participants suggested that research programmes can facilitate the involvement of other disciplines to also address other priorities of local people. Researchers have to understand policy-makers, who often focus on authority only. The IUFRO Guideline is not confined to government authorities but has a broader approach. For problem-solving policy-making practical aspects of forestry have to be addressed. It was recommended to identify the users of the research results and then define an appropriate communication strategy. For the use of results a learning process is necessary. Policy-makers are not confined to government authorities; they have to be defined in the specific context. Policy-making starts at grass-roots level, since also private sector companies and local people shape policies and decide about their implementation.

4.2. Organisational capacity for science policy interface

Michael Kleine introduced the topic along Chapter IV of the IUFRO Guideline on improving the policy-science interface. He highlighted that organisational capacity includes intellectual but also non-intellectual capacities. The latter comprise resources available for research and dissemination of its results or positions, such as a communications officer in a research institution. In order to provide for these resources investment is necessary. However, as world-wide examples show, this investment pays off, since with better, targeted communication of research results policy-makers become more aware of the contribution of science and research to societal objectives.

4.3. Presentation of country experiences on organisational capacity for science policy interface

In this session, resource persons presented country examples on how to establish and improve organisational capacity for science policy interface. Emmanuel Marfo from the Forestry Research Institute of Ghana presented some lessons learned from a study in the forestry sector of Ghana on institutional arrangements and information flow in the science-policy interfaces. Clement Chilima, Forestry Research Institute of Malawi, showed how institutional arrangements and the organisation of forest research fostered stakeholders participation in Malawi. Grégoire Ngono, Institut de Recherche Agricole pour le Développement, presented the approach and organisational arrangements to establish a strategic

research programme in Cameroon under the Scientific Programme 2008-2012. Ben Chikamai presented the case of KEFRI on organisational capacity and culture in improving the science-policy interface, focussing on human resources and governance aspects.

4.4. Panel Discussion

In the Panel discussion, the resource persons were invited to provide statements on the progress made and lessons learned from science-policy interfacing activities in their respective countries. The Panel highlighted the following issues:

- In Cameroon significant progress has been made over the past several years since the introduction of participatory research planning involving a wide range of stakeholders. The work of the national research institution has opened up to policy makers at national and international levels through various events and consultations.
- The Forestry Research Institute in Ghana has been re-organising its research work since 1995 implementing a shift from bio-physical to environmental and social research with the main focus on poverty reduction. Another restructuring step was taken recently with the start of new programmes on forests and livelihood and climate change. However, reaching policy makers has remained difficult exemplified by poor response by policy makers to FORIG's call for meetings and briefings.
- In the case of Malawi it was stated that this country has a lot of commonalities with other countries in research and the science-policy interface. The past has shown that occasionally engaging policy makers in scientific events is not enough. There must be a continuous process of engagement and debate among scientists, practitioners and policy makers. In the Malawi the uptake of research results is very poor, thus there is very little investment in and commitment by the government for research. Improvements are possible through participation in international fora and networks with focussed work on topics of highly relevant to policy makers. The best practices guide on science-policy interfacing presented and discussed in this workshop is an important checklist for future work.
- Good progress in the interaction between science and policy can be reported from Kenya. The work of the Kenya Forestry Research Institute became much more relevant after the establishment of closer interaction with policy makers and stakeholders. The new strategic plan is being monitored in close cooperation between scientists and policy-makers. However, KEFRI is committed to further expand science communication through employment of communicators and advanced training.

4.5. Conclusions and follow-up action

The Panellists provided some ideas on how to follow-up the issues discussed in the workshop:

- Submit project proposals on science policy interfacing activities to potential donors.

- Pass on the knowledge of the workshop to young scientists at home.
- In formulating future research programmes and projects take into account the needs and interests of a wide range of stakeholders, not only of policy-makers.
- "Cascade" the knowledge from the workshop into own institutes and discuss how to better apply the science-policy interface.
- Analyse and address the reasons why scientists have not yet been able to engage in policy processes, start a broad discussion to get the views of other on this issue.
- Start a process to create a common voice of scientists to overcome the gaps between different sector or fields of science to avoid the splitting up of scientists in research.
- Try to bring scientists from different disciplines together to initiate interdisciplinary research that responds to new challenges; for this purpose forest science has to engage in various and changing alliances with other disciplines to adequately respond to policy issues.
- Conduct a similar workshop / hold a forum on science-policy interface with actors and scientists from various backgrounds.
- Disseminate the IUFRO Guidelines on science-policy interface also to colleagues from other disciplines, because they can be widely applied; this would create a larger audience and provide a broader feedback on the guidelines to IUFRO from African countries.
- Link up with various beneficiaries and users to make research results more valuable and useful for them.
- Build capacities of people and institutions to link up and communicate more effectively by using the Guidelines and also the IUFRO Public Relations Handbook.
- Maintain networking and continue to build capacities among African forest scientists.

The workshop was concluded by the Director of KEFRI. Participants received their certificates of attendance along with the documentation of the workshop on CD-ROM.

ANNEX 1

FORNESSA/IUFRO-SPDC Training Workshop

"Working effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy"

Workshop Programme

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Monday, 3rd December	**Whole day** **19:00**	Arrival of participants and registration Dinner and Icebreaker	Local Workshop Organisation
Tuesday, 4th December	**09:00 – 09:15**	Welcome address and opening of the workshop	Director KEFRI
	09:15 - 10:30	Introduction of participants, trainers/resource persons: experiences and expectations	M. Kleine/ B. Liss Participants
		Objectives of the workshop Organisation, programme and daily routine	M. Kleine/ B. Liss
		IUFRO-SPDC Training Initiative on Science-Policy Interface	M. Kleine
	10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	11:00 – 11:30	International Policy Frameworks and Agreements • UNFF, UNFCC, CBD, UNCCD	B. Liss
	11:30 – 12:30	Interactive Session: Science contributions to international forest policy processes: Challenges and Opportunities	B. Liss
	12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	
	14:00 – 15:30	Examples for science contribution to international forest-related processes + African Forest Forum: A regional initiative to mobilise expertise and advice for policy and management + World Forests, Society and Environment: Analysing changing paradigms in the forests-society-environment interface + CPF Joint Initiative on Science and Technology: A global initiative to promote science input into international policy processes	G. Kowero H. Vanhanen M. Kleine
	15:30 – 16:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	16:00 – 17:30	National forest programmes • processes, issues and challenges • science contributions Status of national forest programmes in West- and Central Africa	B. Liss A.Yapi
	19:00	Dinner	

Table continued

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Wednesday 5th December	**08:30 – 08:45**	Summary of results obtained on previous day	M. Kleine
	08:45 – 10:30	Best Practices Guide: Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy • Recommended practices • Examples and case studies	M. Kleine/ B. Liss
	10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	11:00 – 12:30	Local examples of best practices for work at the science-policy interface • FORIG/Ghana • FRIM/Malawi • IRAD/Cameroon • KEFRI/Kenya	• J. Cobbinah • D. Kayambazinthu • G. Ngono • B. Chikamai
	12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	
	14:00 – 15:30	Group Work: Evaluation of research projects based on best practices guide • Group discusses individual case studies • Identification of strengths and weaknesses • Developing a role model for science-policy interfacing	Participants M. Kleine/ B. Liss
	15:30 – 16:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	16:00 – 17:30	Group Work continues: • Describing the role model for science-policy interfacing • compilation of a group presentation	Participants M. Kleine/ B. Liss
	19:00	Dinner	

Table continued

Date	Time	Subject (Description)	Responsible
Thursday 6th December	**08:30 – 08:45**	Summary of results obtained on previous day	M. Kleine
	08:45 – 10:30	Presentation of group work Discussions	Participants
	10:30 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	11:00 – 12:30	Presentation of group work Discussions	Participants
	12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	
	14:00 – 15:30	Create organisational capacity, culture and role in improving the science-policy interface • Country experiences from Ghana, Malawi, Cameroon, and Kenya	M. Kleine/ B. Liss • E. Marfo • C. Chilima • G. Ngono • B. Chikamai
	15:30 – 16:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
	16:00 – 17:00	Panel Discussion: • Progress made in science-policy interfacing • Lessons learned • Identification of follow-up action	M. Kleine/ B. Liss, Resource persons
	17:00 – 18:00	Closing of Workshop and Handing-over of Certificates	Director KEFRI M. Kleine/ B. Liss
	19:00	Dinner	
Friday 7th December	**Whole day**	Departure of participants	Local Workshop Organisation

ANNEX 2

IUFRO-SPDC Training Workshop Working Effectively at the Interface of Forest Science and Forest Policy
KEFRI, Nairobi, Kenya 4-6 December 2007

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Mailing address	Telephone	Fax	Email	Country	Position
Mr. Ibraheem BALOGUN	Tropical Forest Network Box 38471 Dugbe Ibadan Oyo State Nigeria	+ 23-428704067	+ 23-422008935	tfnnigeria95@yahoo.co.uk	Nigeria	Programme Director
Mr. Grégoire NGONO	Institute of Agricultural Research for Development IRAD/CEREFEN P.O.Box 2123 Yaounde Cameroon	+ (237)77663434	+ (237) 22 23 35 38	g_ngono@yahoo.com	Cameroon	Chief of the Specialised Research Centre for Forest and Environment
Mr. Lemma YIGREMACHEW SEYOUM	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research/Kulumsa Agricultural Research Centre P.O.Box 489 Assela Ethiopia	251-0911435846	+2510223311508	Yigremachewsey-oum@yahoo.com	Ethiopia	Forestry Research Division Head and Forestry Researcher

Mr. Simon MWANSASU	Institute of Resource Assessment University of Dar es Salaam P O Box 35097 Dar es Salaam Tanzania	+255 787 881277	, +255 22 2410393	smwansasu@ira.udsm.ac.tz	Tanzania	Assistant Research Fellow
Mr. Deribe GURMU	FORESTRY RESEARCH CENTER BOX: 30708 ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA	+ 25116456615	, 251-6-460345	DERIBE12@YAHOO.COM	Ethiopia	Associate Researcher
Mr. Kassim Hamza MADEWAYA	Department of Commercial, Crops, Fruits and Forestry, P. O. Box 3526, Zanzibar, Tanzania.	+255 024 2235741		k_madeweya@yahoo.com	Tanzania	Head of Central Administration
Mr. Paulo Jorge SITHOE	Eduardo Mondlane University Faculty of Agronomy and Forestry, Department of Forestry, PO Box 257 Maputo, Mozambique	+ 258-828953470	+ 258 21 496238	psitoe@uem.mz	Mozambique	MSc in NRM

Mr. Biruk Asfaw HUNDE	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research , P.O.Box 32 Debre Zeit Research Centre	+ 251911761837	+ 251-11 4-338061	birashu@yahoo.com	Ethiopia	Forestry research sector head
Mr. Girma Kelboro MENSURO	Wondo Genet College of Forestry and Natural Resources P.O.Box 128 Shashemene", Ethiopia	+ 251 46 1109904 or + 251 916 831588	+ 251461109983	Girma75@yahoo.com	Ethiopia	,"Lecturer of Social forestry and forest policy"
Mr. Benard GUEDES	Faculty Of Agronomy And Forestry, Eduardo Mondlane University Maputo, Mozambique	+258-21-496238	+258-21-496238	besoguedes@uem.mz	Mozambique	Researcher
Mr. Emmanuel MARFO	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana, University Box 63 Kumasi, Ghana	+233 244 627274 /+233 244 627274	+233 51 61376	emarfo@forig.org	Ghana	Researcher
Mr. Clement CHILIMA	FRIM P.O Box 270 Zomba Malawi	+265 01524866 +265 09270170	+265 01 524548	cchilima@frim.org.mw	Malawi	Assistant Director of Forestry Research
Mr. Paul KONUCHE	Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), P.O.Box 20412 - 00200, Nairobi	+254 (0) 722 259 781/2		director@kefri.org		

Mr. Bernard KIGOMO	Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), P.O.Box 20412 - 00200, Nairobi	+ 254(0)722 7916556		bkigomo@kefri.org	Kenya	Deputy Director Research and Development
Mrs Ebby CHAGALA-ODERA	Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), P.O.Box 20412 - 00200, Nairobi	+254 (0) 722671027		chagalaodera@yahoo.com	Kenya	Assistant Director, Service Program
Mrs Sheila MBIRU	Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Karura P.O.Box 64636-00620, Nairobi	254 202020623		sheilambiru@ngara.org	Kenya	Senior Research Officer
Mr. Moses KARACHI	Egerton University	0725-933263		karachimoses@yahoo.com	Kenya	Senior Lecturer
TRAINER/Resource Persons						
Mr. Bernd-Markus LISS	AGEG Consultants eG	+49 8191 942010	, +49 8191 942009	bm.liss@ageg.de	Germany	Head of Natural Resources and Rural Development Department
Mr. Joe COBBINAH	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana KNUST Box 63 Kumasi, Ghana	+ 233-51-61378	233-51-60121	jcobbinah@forig.org jrcobbinah@yahoo.co.uk	Ghana	Chief Research Scientist (Immediate Past Director)

Mr. Dennis KAYAMBAZINTHU	Forestry Department, Ministry of Energy and Mines, P.O.Box 30048, Lilongwe 3	(265)9 911 504 or (265)1 771 000		d_kayamba@hotmail.com	Malawi	Director of Forestry
Mr. Atse YAPI	FAO, Regional Office for Africa, P.O. Box 1628, Accra	+233-21-675000 Ext. 3195		atse.yapi@fao.org	FAO	National Forest Programme – Facility
Mr. Ben CHIKAMAI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Karura P.O.Box 64636-00620, Nairobi	+ 254 202020623		benchikamai@ngara.org	Kenya	Assistant Director, KEFRI Exe. Sec. NGARA
Ms Heidi VANHANEN	METLA IUFRO-WFSE/Finnish Forest research Institute	+358 10 2112233	+358 102112104	heidi.vanhanen@metla.fi	Finland	Editor and author of WFSE Policy Briefs
Mr. Godwin KOWERO	Africa Forest Forum (AFF), c/o World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), P.O.Box 30677-00100, Nairobi	+254 20 7224000	+254 20 722 4001	g.kowero@cgiar.org; godwinkowero@yahoo.co.ke	Kenya	Executive Secretary
Mr. Michael KLEINE	IUFRO SPDC, Hauptstrasse 7, 1140 Vienna	0043-1-8770151-22	0043-1-8770151-50	Kleine@iufro.org	Austria	SPDC Coordinator