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# Introduction

1. The Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) was one of the first “umbrella programmes” within the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The FFF receives funding through a multi-donor trust fund, from donors including Sweden, Finland, United States, AgriCord (through its Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme) and Germany (under the Carlowitz project). The World Banks’ Program on Forests (PROFOR) also provided startup funds through two of the main partners: the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the International Union for Conservation (IUCN). Though the Programme was established with a target budget of USD 50 million for five years, only USD 12.5 million dollars were secured by FAO as of June 2016.
2. The FFF was designed under a partnership co-managed by IIED, IUCN and AgriCord, with inputs from major alliances of forest and farm producer organizations including representatives from the International Family Forest Alliance, the Global Alliance for Community Forestry and the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests. The FFF was implemented through a participatory multi-stakeholder process and informed by scoping studies, resulting in a multi-year work plan that is country and context specific, and designed to improve the Country Programming Framework and to catalyze and leverage existing initiatives. The FFF was set up for a duration of five years, running from December 2012 to December 2017. However, the first significant funding was only received in August 2013, and a decision was made to launch in-country activities in six paired pilot countries during 2013: Guatemala and Nicaragua (Latin America), The Gambia and Liberia (Africa), and Nepal and Myanmar (Asia).
3. Beginning in November 2013, four more countries were selected (Bolivia, Kenya, Zambia and Vietnam) through a comprehensive selection process; work began in the second half of 2014 and the beginning of 2015. Expressions of interest were received in various forms from over 44 countries and 70 forest and farm producer organizations, indicating unmet demand.
4. The project has a monitoring and learning system (M&LS) to monitor progress on a range of indicators under each of the outputs described in the programme theory of change (ToC). An annual aggregated report on the FFF’s M&LS is presented to the Steering Committee each February, summarizing country level achievements and lessons learned.
5. FFF activities are currently underway across the 10 countries, albeit at different stages of intervention; Myanmar is one of those countries. The interventions of the project include work by apex level producer organizations supported through partnership agreements, small grants to producer organizations to support enterprise and other organizational needs, multi-sectoral platforms led by government actors at national and sub-national levels, exchange visits and capacity building.
6. This MTE was conducted in accordance with the agreements signed with donors. With 1.5 years left in the current project, this evaluation provides an opportunity to improve implementation and to envisage its future after December 2017.

## Purpose of the evaluation

1. As mentioned above, the mid-term evaluation is programmed in the FFF project document and financing agreements. The purpose of the MTE is to inform the Project Steering Committee, the Programme Management Team, the Donor Support Group and other stakeholders about the project’s progress and performance toward attaining the expected outputs and outcomes. The intention is therefore to evaluate the programme for planning purposes as well as to inform the multi donor fund of progress to date. The mid-term evaluation is expected to bring valuable external reflections to help strengthen the programme, and to validate and complement the M&L system of the project.
2. The MTE draws specific conclusions and formulates recommendations for necessary further action by the Steering Committee, the Project Management Team and other international and in-country FFF stakeholders. It also identifies good practices and lessons learned for the formulation and execution of other similar projects that address forestry governance and/or utilizing a small grant scheme.

## Intended users

1. The intended users of the results of this MTE include the FFF Steering Committee, the Donor Support Group, the Project Management Team the FFF national facilitators, implementing partners, FAO country office staff, government stakeholders, and other international and in-country FFF parties.

## Scope and objective of the evaluation

1. **Scope:** This MTE evaluates the results achieved from the inception of FFF in December 2012 until December 2015, bearing in mind that activities did not start until mid- to late-2013. The evaluation assesses all key elements of the programme across its interventions as outlined in the ToC, with a representative set of forest and farmer producer organizations (FFPOs) and government partners in the selected five countries, and at the regional and global levels. Additionally, the management and governance structure of the project were assessed as well as the linkages between the project and other in-country and global initiatives in the context of FAO’s Strategic Objectives (in this case SO3 Output 1.1 and SO2 Output 2.2).

**Objectives and Evaluation Questions:**

1. The FFF mid-term evaluation had the following objectives:
2. Assess progress made toward achieving project results; and
3. Identify design and implementation issues that should be addressed in order to achieve the project’s intended results.

In order to achieve these objectives, the evaluation sought to deliver findings under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, partnerships and coordination, normative values, sustainability, and coherence and synergies. In this regard, the evaluation was guided by the below preliminary evaluation questions respective to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, partnership and coordination, sustainability, and FAO’s normative values. In the course of the work, the MTE added a question on the “Likelihood of Impact of the Project” to capture the project’s crucial early effects which were not recorded by its M&LS.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Relevance**

* Evaluation question 1: How relevant is the FFF’s primary focus and logic in terms of its stated mission, in relation to the target countries’ contexts, broader sustainable development initiatives, and smallholder farmers' needs?
* Evaluation question 2: How and to what extent does the project contribute to the broader strategic FAO objectives? Sub-questions: (2.1) How coherent is FFF in terms of how it fits in with the policies, programmes and projects undertaken by the governments, FAO and other development partners? (2.2) To what extent has the FFF integrated its programme with other technical teams within the Forestry Department; with FAO’s internal priorities, building on Country Programming Frameworks and regional initiatives; and especially by linking with the Strategic Objectives (in this case SO3 Output 1.1 and SO2 Output 2.2)? (2.3) Is FFF coherent with other forestry initiatives operating within the target countries?
* Evaluation question 3: Was the project design appropriate for achieving the mission, vision and outcomes?

**Effectiveness**

* Evaluation question 4: To what extent is the FFF on track to achieving outcomes across the three pillars, and what changes are attributable to the FFF’s interventions which are directly linked to the FFF’s main objectives? Sub-questions: (4.1) To what extent were producer organizations strengthened for business development and engagement in policy dialogue? (4.2) Did FFF Catalyze multi-sectoral policy platforms? (4.3) Did FFF link local voices to global processes?

**Efficiency**

* Evaluation question 5: To what extent is the current operational modality contributing to the efficient achievement of the program outcomes?

**Likelihood of impact**

* Evaluation question 6: To what extent is FFF contributing to progress toward the expected outcomes and impact?

**Partnership and coordination**

* Evaluation question 7: Was FFF successful at engaging other partners in the FFF-supported processes?

**Sustainability**

* Evaluation question 8: How sustainable is the FFF concept of investing in the organizational capacity of forest farm producer organizations – and how might this be enhanced?

**Normative values**

* Evaluation question 9: To what extent have gender and human rights been taken into account in the design of the FFF and during the implementation?

## Methodology

1. The MTE adopted a consultative and transparent approach with FFF internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. The triangulation of evidence and information gathered underpins its validation and analysis, and supports the conclusions and recommendations.
2. To assess the contribution of the project toward its stated outcomes and expected impact, five participating countries were visited. In each country, national and sub-national stakeholders were interviewed and field visits were carried out to meet directly with FFF-targeted FFPOs. A sixth mission was planned for Nicaragua, but this was cancelled due to timing and logistical constraints. The five visited countries were The Gambia, Kenya, Guatemala, Myanmar and Vietnam. While these five countries were the primary focus countries for the evaluation, the MTE team also conducted desk reviews of the FFF activities carried out in the other five countries in order to corroborate the findings from the primary evaluation missions.
3. Desk reviews and consultative interviews with the FFF team at FAO headquarters constitute an important aspect of the evaluation approach, primarily in relation to questions of programme management, coherence and synergies. Interviews were also conducted with staff of IUCN and IIED, the two main FFF partners.
4. To answer the above evaluation questions, the MTE’s approach is based on mixed methods and triangulation of information. This approach was selected to ensure that the evaluation findings fully respond to the purpose of the evaluation. The methods used included the following:

* Review of existing documentation on FFF;
* Analysis of FFF self-reported information, in particular the 2014 and 2015 annual reports;
* Semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by the questions listed in the evaluation matrix;
* Targeted FFPOs discussion and direct observation during field visits in the focus countries;
* Validation of MTE mission observations through debriefing discussions with key stakeholders at country and FAO headquarters level.

1. In order to answer evaluation questions 1 and 3 on relevance, country visits and key informant interviews were conducted with in-country stakeholders and beneficiaries. To answer question 2 on the coherence and consistency of FFF with FAO’s strategic objectives and other FAO initiatives, the evaluation team conducted interviews with key informants at FAO headquarters and country level, as well as a desk review. For questions 4 and 9, the MTE used different analytical approaches for assessing progress and impact under each FFF pillar. In assessing progress towards Outcome 1, Pillar 1, the analysis was based on four levels for influencing forest and farm related policies (adapted from Keck and Sikkink, 1998[[2]](#footnote-2)), as follows:

* Getting issues on the political agenda;
* Encouraging discursive commitment from government;
* Securing procedural change at national level;
* Influencing behavioral change in key actors.

1. In assessing the effectiveness of activities under Outcome 2, the MTE analyzed progress made by FFF in supporting interventions aimed at improving forest and farm based value chain governance[[3]](#footnote-3) as well as the upgrading[[4]](#footnote-4) trajectories followed by FFPOs. On value chains governance, three analytical lenses were used:

* Analyzing support to policy and institutional improvements of the environment in which value chains operate;
* Analyzing support to new laws and regulations governing value chains;
* Analyzing the facilitation offered to the negotiation of trade relationships between FFPOs and downstream value chain operators.
* To analyze the upgrading strategies, three analytical lenses were used:
* Analyzing value chain upgrading strategies used by FFPOs with the support of FFF in different countries;
* Analyzing market access models practiced by FFPOs;
* Analyzing the outcomes for FFPOs and their member households.

1. The evaluation also analyzed why some FFPOs derived greater benefits from their participation in value chains. For Question 6 on the project’s expected impact on forest and farm livelihoods, the achievements under each pillar were framed in terms of the assets and capitals identified in the sustainable livelihood approach (i.e. human capital, social capital, political capital, natural assets, physical assets and financial assets).

## Evaluation mission

1. A one-week evaluation mission was undertaken in Myanmar as part of the mid-term evaluation of the FFF in March 2016, with interviews conducted with implementing partners and government stakeholders in Yangon and Nay Pyi Taw, as well as visits to project sites in Kyeinthali and Gwa in Southern Rakhine State, and Ywangan and Nyaung Shwe in Southern Shan State to meet with community forest user groups who have benefitted from FFF support. The full list of people met during the evaluation mission is in Appendix 3.

# Background and context of the project/programme

## Context of the project

1. Forests cover more than 31,000,000 hectares or 47% of total land area in Myanmar[[5]](#footnote-5). Deforestation is estimated at 0.9% per year while illegal logging is estimated at 80% of the total and has been linked to organized crime and conflict in ethnic areas.[[6]](#footnote-6) In 1992 the new Forest Law – followed by the 1995 Myanmar Forest Policy – laid out targets for expanding the permanent forest estate. They also introduced the idea of community participation in forest management, which is further elaborated in the 1995 Community Forestry Instructions (CFI).[[7]](#footnote-7) The emphasis on community forestry came about due to the fears over future timber supply and the consequent need to create incentives for forest restoration. Community Forestry has been increasingly recognized as an important means to protect forest land in Myanmar, and prevent unsustainable deforestation, such that the government’s 2001 Forest Master Plan set a target to establish 918,000 ha under community forest management by 2030.
2. More recently, attention has shifted towards a ‘market led’ approach to community forestry as a means of incentivizing communities to delimit, restore and sustainably use forests. This approach was developed following a stakeholder workshop on community forestry in 2009, organized by FAO, UNDP, the Food Security Working Group (FSWG) and the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry (MoECAF). The Pyoe Pin Programme, funded by DfiD, SIDA and DANIDA, subsequently supported a review of Community Forestry in Myanmar, leading to a national workshop on the market led approach to community forestry, in collaboration with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). In 2013, RECOFTC supported the Government of Myanmar to help establish a Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG), while a Community Forestry Unit has been created within the Forestry Department of the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry. The 1995 Community Forestry Instructions (CFI) are currently being revised, and these will prioritize a market-led approach to community forestry, enabling forest user groups to make commercial use of timber and non-timber forest products (NTFPs) thereby incentivizing forest management and restoration. The 1992 Forest Law is also under revision, and the new forest law is expected to be finalized in 2016.
3. The Steering Committee of the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) selected Myanmar as one of six pilot countries in 2013 in which it aimed to strengthen forest-farm producer organization and their engagement with more coordinated cross-sectorial policy processes. The FFF approach in Myanmar is centered on community forestry (CF), and the empowerment of Community Forestry groups (user groups and producer associations).
4. A launch mission in 2013 was followed by a call for proposals. Small grants were awarded to six civil society organizations in December 2013 to strengthen business development within community forest user groups and develop marketing associations at township levels in Chin, Rakhine and Shan States and to link these groups to national policy processes. A second phase of grants was issued in 2015, through which regional-level producer associations were created in Rakhine and Southern Shan States. The FFF has also provided financial support to the CFNWG in 2015.

## The theory of change

1. FFF developed a generic ToC that links development results at FFPOs level (organizational capacity, access to technologies and access to markets) with voice and participation in policy processes at national and global levels, in order to achieve the intended impact. The strategies to achieve impact are arranged under three Pillars, four outcomes and seven outputs, as presented in Figure 1. The MTE found that on this basis the internal logic of the project is largely sound between the outputs and outcomes level. However, a close analysis shows that it does not express the conditions required to translate development results into impact. The ToC lacks important building blocks in terms of assumptions and impact drivers[[8]](#footnote-8) between the outcomes and impact level.

**Outcome 1:** Strengthened producer organizations engage in policy dialogue

**Outcome 2**: Local communities and producers are organized and thereby have the capacity to invest in sustainable forest and farm management and integrate into market

**Outcome 3**: Cross-sectoral coordination (...) for sustainable forest and farm management operating at national and sub-national levels

**Outcome 4:** National and global agendas and initiatives (…) are informed about the knowledge and priorities of smallholders, women, communities and IPs.

**Vision:** Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes

**Impact:** Smallholders, women and indigenous peoples groups have improved income and food security from sustainable forest and farm management

**Pillar1:** Strengthen smallholder, women and indigenous peoples’ produces’ producer organizations for business/livelihoods and policy engagement

**Pillar 2:** Catalyze multi-sectoral stakeholder policy platforms with governments at local and national levels

**Pillar 3**: Link local voices and learning to global processes through communication and information dissemination

**Output 4.1**: International and regional organizations representing smallholder-, women-, and IPs groups in international fora and negotiations have established communication and information channels to their respective constituencies at national and local levels (….)

**Output 4.1**: International and regional organizations representing smallholder-, women-, and IPs groups in international fora and negotiations have established communication and information channels….

**Output 1.2:** Collaboration for policy dialogue between smallholder, women, community, IPs groups, large scale private sector and government enhanced

**Output 3.1**: Establishment and coordination of government’s inter-ministerial multi-stakeholder platforms/committees (involving local organizations, CSOs, and the private sector) facilitated

**Output 3.2**: Increased information sharing and coordination between sectors results in improved understanding and implementation of different policies and programs affecting FFPOs within forest and farm landscapes

**Output 1.1:** Dispersed local forest and farm smallholders, women, and IPs are organized and strengthened to cooperate in (effective and gender inclusive) networks, alliances and federations

**Output 2.1**: Local FFPOs have knowledge about business development (…) and access to financing mechanisms

**Output 2.2**: Establishment of services such as producer hubs in support of small scale FFF- facilitated (and actively provided) services to female and male members

**Output 2.3**: Experience sharing and exchanges between FFPOs involving men and women result in increased resilience, improved practices and continued networking

Figure 1 FFF Results Framework

1. Between the levels of outcomes and impacts, the project design should express the main changes expected to take place as “intermediate states (IS)”, as the stepping-stones to impacts in the respective pathways. It is therefore important to indicate explicitly in the ToC the assumptions required to transform outcomes into intermediate results, and from there to planned impacts. The MTE reconstructed the ToC based on the original in order to include the missing building blocks (Assumptions and Impact Drivers); this provides a framework that more clearly articulates the conditions that are required to reach the expected impact. The reconstructed ToC does not modify the outputs, outcomes, impact and vision. Rather it places them together with Intermediate Results (the current Pillars), Assumptions and Impact Drivers into a graphic representation of the FFF.
2. The FFF ToC building blocks are illustrated in Figure 2. The original ToC blocks are illustrated in green with connecting black arrows, and are unchanged. Dashed black arrows were added to show the connectedness based on the project implementation experience to date. Other colors indicate the blocks that are missing in the original ToC: blue for the Assumptions, and dark orange for Impact Drivers.
3. During the country visits, the MTE team discussed with National Facilitators and their key partners the conditions necessary to achieve impact. The information obtained was used to identify factors and conditions that influence (or may influence) progress to impact. The reconstructed ToC shows that to achieve FFF impact, the following three Intermediary States (IS) that correspond to the three Pillars must be achieved:
4. IS-1: FFPOs’ capacity for doing business is enhanced and they engage in policy decisions;
5. IS-2: Multi-sectoral stakeholders’ policy platforms are catalyzed;
6. IS-3: Local voices are linked to global processes.
7. To achieve IS1, FFF enhances the FFPOs’ capacity for doing business and engaging in policy decision processes. The MTE found that despite the considerable progress made in implementing related outputs at the FFPO level (as demonstrated later in this report), the real changes for sustainable results can take place if two important Assumptions are met:
8. Governments put in place conditions enabling FFPOs to engage in business and policy formation;
9. Partnerships with Financial Institutions (FIs) and Micro-Financial Institutions (MFIs) can be mobilized to address FFPOs’ finance issues.
10. To achieve IS-2, FFF intends to catalyze multi-sectoral policy platforms. However, this highly political objective can be reached only if, as above, the Assumption that “Governments put in place conditions enabling FFPOs to engage in business and policy formation” is met.
11. To achieve IS-3, FFF intends to link local voices to global processes. This can be achieved if the Assumption that “avenues for exchange at regional and global levels are offered” is met.
12. The vision is stated as “Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes”. This relates to 10 participating countries, which is an understatement because Pillar 3 of the project arguably leads to important regional and global impacts. FFF should integrate these impacts into the formulation of the vision. The MTE therefore added a plain black arrow linking the Intermediary State “Local voices are linked to global processes” to the vision, while the arrow link to impact is dashed.
13. The impact is stated as “Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ groups have improved income and food security from sustainable forest and farm management”. This is also an understatement of the impact. Considering the importance that the vision attaches to livelihood improvement, the FFF should articulate the impact accordingly in order to cover the potential livelihood-related impacts and not a subset of those impacts (e.g. income and food security). Given the wide regional and country scope of project implementation, the livelihood-related impacts should be defined in terms of improved human, social, political, natural and physical capitals.
14. At the impact level, FFF intends to contribute to improving the income and food security of smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ groups through sustainable forest and farm management. This formulation is not wide enough to achieve the level of the vision, which emphasizes improving the livelihoods of smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations and their decision-making over forest and farm landscapes. In addition to income and food security (financial capital and resilience), important impacts can be expected in terms of improved human capital, social capital, political capital, natural capital and physical capital.

**A:** Further avenues for exchange within Asia and globally are offered

Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes

Smallholders, communities and indigenous people groups have improved income and FS from sustainable forest and farm management

Producers are organized for policy dialogue

Producers are organized for business

Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers

**A:** Governments put in place conditions enabling FFPOs to engage in business and policy formation

ID: FFPOs access to national & export markets improved through VCD

**A:** Partnerships with other actors such as ministry of Cooperatives to enhance and institutionalize market-led CF approach

ID: Women’s entrepreneurship is supported in selected value chains (e.g. medicinal plants)

ID: Lessons and best practices from FFF allow sharing experiences

IS-1: FFPOs capacity for doing business is enhanced and they engage in policy decision processes

IS-2: Multi-sectoral stakeholders policy platforms are catalyzed

IS-3: Local voices are linked to global processes

**FFF Outcomes**

**FFF Impact/Vision**

Figure 2 Reconstructed FFF Theory of Change

# Evaluation questions: Key findings

1. This section presents the evaluation team’s findings which were based on a desk review of FFF documents, interviews with the FFF team, a country visit, interviews with target FFPOs at grassroots level, and key programme stakeholders

## Evaluation question 1: How relevant is the FFF’s primary focus and logic in terms of its stated mission, in relation to the target countries’ contexts, broader sustainable development initiatives, and smallholder farmers' needs?

1. The FFF approach of building on developments in the area of community forestry development is very relevant. The rate of deforestation in Myanmar is increasing, and is currently estimated at 0.9% in some areas. Community Forestry has been identified as a way for communities to protect and conserve forests, while benefiting from ecosystem services and livelihood opportunities. One of the greatest threats to community forests is weak legislation and a lack of enforcement of regulations, leading to encroachment by cronies and land grabbing. The FFF approach aims to give community forest users a greater voice at regional and national levels, such that they may be able to better ensure accountable governance to protect natural resources.
2. The FFF in Myanmar is building on the successes of earlier initiatives to develop community forestry, including the support by RECOFTC to the creation of the CFNWG, the DfID-funded Pyoe Pin project, and at the field level, projects including the UNDP watershed project in Southern Shan in 2005 and the Coastal Livelihood and Environmental Assets Restoration in Rakhine (CLEARR) project.[[9]](#footnote-9) Pillar 1 of the FFF framework aligns strongly with the market-led approach to Community Forestry that has become more prevalent in recent years in Myanmar and has been given explicit focus in the revised community Forestry Instructions (CFI), 2016.

## Evaluation question 2: Consistency with FAO’s strategic objectives: How and to what extent does the project contribute to the broader FAO strategic objectives?

1. The project is aligned to FAO’s Strategic Objective 2 (SO2), “Increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner”. FFF has played an important role in the evolution of a community of practice group within FAO on cross-sectoral policy processes, and its publications on this issue stimulated considerable internal interest.
2. FFF is particularly well aligned with FAO’s Strategic Objective 3 (SO3), “Reduce rural poverty”, to which it contributes significantly. Under SO3, FAO recognizes that rural poverty is mostly concentrated among households of small-scale subsistence producers and family farmers. It further recognizes that women are often amongst the most marginalized, and therefore need to strengthen their right to the natural resources on which they depend. Though FFF started its activities slightly before FAO’s current strategic objectives were adopted, its design was based on the same analysis of the factors of rural poverty. Its focus target groups are also poor smallholder farmers whose livelihoods are tied to small forests and farm assets. FFF design also took into account the marginalization of women in smallholder communities, and the streamlining of gender equity into its ToC.
3. Under SO3, FAO’s focus is on a holistic approach to rural development and poverty reduction. Likewise, FFF emphasizes integrated approaches in which forests and other farm components are considered functionally interdependent components of the same rural landscapes, which must be sustainably managed and used to improve the livelihoods of their users. FFF also focuses on opportunities that strengthen linkages between forests, crops and animal production to improve sustainability. In this regard, members of FFF who supported FFPOs in Kenya told the MTE team that they consider trees on their farms as crops.
4. More specifically, the FFF is aligned to FAO’s corporate Outcome 3.1: The rural poor have enhanced and equitable access to productive resources, services, organizations and markets, and can manage their resources more sustainably. The output under this outcome to which FFF is contributing most is Output 3.1.1: Support to strengthen rural organizations and institutions and facilitate empowerment of the rural poor. The FFF objectives under pillars 1 and 2 are closely in line with those of SO3. As such, FFF activities support the indicator for Output 3.1.1: Number of countries in which support was provided to create an enabling environment for rural organizations and institutions as well as the empowerment of the rural poor.
5. Regarding the support to national and local stakeholders, SO3 advocates providing policy tools to identify the critical conditioning factors that would enable sustainable rural development and poverty reduction. FFF contributes to this strategy because in its country level implementation it utilizes approaches and tools that enable sustainable rural development. Examples include the trainings given to smallholder farmers on MA&D, and being empowered to engage in business and to participate in the policy formation process, as well as in forest and farm-based value chains.
6. At the heart of FFF consistency with FAO’s SO3 are FFF’s Outcomes 1 and 2. Outcome 1 is instrumental in enabling poor rural smallholder farmers to engage in policy dialogue on forest and farm resource management and use-related issues. Outcome 2 is instrumental in enhancing the capacity of the same target groups to invest in forest and farm management to participate in value chains and integrate into the markets.

## Evaluation question 3: Was the project design appropriate for achieving the outcomes and the vision?

1. The FFF approach is strongly centered on the market-led approach to CF development, as advocated for by ECCDI, MERN, IIED and the Pyoe Pin programme. Overall, the FFF approach in Myanmar of prioritizing community forestry is deemed appropriate and offers much needed support to existing initiatives. Enterprise development was seen to be a critical need for many of the communities that were visited by the evaluation team. The market training provided through the FFF is very much appreciated. In Southern Shan State, the training delivered by ECCDI was contextualized to the specific needs of individual groups and villages.
2. Many groups have income-generating activities outside of the CF area, such as rice production, tea production or avocado production. For these groups, the primary objective of the community forest certification was conservation and protection of the forest area. The development of enterprises based on CF products may be less relevant for these non-commercial groups, and the FFF could expand its market training to include crops and products that are grown outside the CF area. This approach was observed in Kenya, where FFF beneficiaries were supported not only for tree-nursery establishment, but also for poultry production as a complementary source of income. Similarly, the FFF and partners should continue to ensure that non-commercial groups are adequately represented in the CF network as the focus shifts towards a market-led approach.
3. In terms of the delivery mechanisms, at present, small grants are disbursed to NGOs who then support the establishment and strengthening of village-level Community forest producer associations. In other FFF focus countries, the grants are disbursed directly to the producer organizations. Although it would be ideal to support the producer associations directly, as a first step, the NGOs can provide much-needed support to producer associations in developing business plans and training on specific value chain activities. Some groups have only been formed under the FFF project and therefore disbursement of small grants directly was not possible. The capacity of groups to handle the small grants may vary considerably.

## Evaluation question 4: To what extent is the FFF on track to achieving outcomes across the three pillars, and what changes can be observed that are attributable to the FFF’s interventions and are directly linked to the FFF’s main objectives?

### Output 1.1 Dispersed local producers are organized into effective and gender inclusive groups

1. FFF is supporting over 132 CF user groups in more than seven townships across four states in Myanmar. The support is delivered through local NGOs who provide assistance in the formulation of CF producer associations as well as provide training on CF enterprise development. The first phase of FFF in Myanmar focused on strengthening village-level producer associations, or on upgrading CF user groups to producer associations. Now however, the FFF is focusing on developing township-level producer associations and has already formed two state-level CF producer groups in Southern Shan State and in Rakhine State.

Table 1 Number of groups supported by FFF partner NGOs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NGO** | **Number of organizations** | **Total** | **Men** | **Women** |
| Friends of Wildlife | 1 | 95 | 46 | 49 |
| Social Vision Services | 13 | 250 | 114 | 136 |
| Myanmar Ceramics Society | 4 | 77 | 55 | 25 |
| Swanyee Development Fund | 22 | 151 | 93 | 58 |
| Myanmar’s Heart Development Organization (MHDO) | 5 | 248 | 136 | 122 |
| Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (ECCDI) | 35 (30 village level + 5 township level) | 3515 | 3143 | 372 |
| Rakhine Coastal Regional Conservation Association (RCA) | 45 (44 village level + 1 township level) | 2102 | 1685 | 417 |
| Ar Yone Oo | (not yet reported) | \* | \* | \* |
| **Total** | **132** |  |  |  |

1. One of the most successful outcomes of forming CF producer associations is the dramatic increase in land tenure rights. CF User groups have tenure rights for three years, while producer associations have tenure rights over CF land for thirty years.
2. Inclusion of women on executive committees of CF Producer associations is low overall. The below table shows male/female membership of CF groups supported by ECCDI and is illustrative of the low level of representation by women on CF user group committees.

Table 2 CF Groups supported by ECCDI through FFF

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Township Level CFPPA** | | | | **Village Level CFPPA** | | | | | | |
| Township | Central Executive Committee | | | Village | Executive Committee | | | Number of Members | | |
| Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Ywangan | 8 | 1 | 9 | Myinkyadoe | 11 | - | 11 | 296 | 4 | 300 |
| Nyaungbinkwa | 9 | - | 9 | 146 | 4 | 150 |
| Myay Char | 9 | - | 9 | 76 | 5 | 81 |
| Yay Win | 8 | - | 8 | 30 | 1 | 31 |
| Kayin Pwet | 5 | - | 5 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| Kaing Su | 13 | - | 13 | 78 | 28 | 106 |
| Pyay Thar | 11 | - | 11 | 90 | 3 | 93 |
| Taw Kyal | 11 | - | 11 | 80 | 28 | 108 |
| Yay Hla | 11 | - | 11 | 78 | 2 | 80 |
| Kyaukku Ti | 5 | - | 5 | 153 | 10 | 163 |
| Total | 8 | 1 | 9 | Total | 93 | - | 93 | 1037 | 87 | 1124 |
| Pindaya | 7 | 2 | 9 | Pwe Hla | 5 | 2 | 7 | 34 | 3 | 37 |
| Pwint Lan | 5 | - | 5 | 147 | 33 | 180 |
| Paw San Thee | 7 | - | 7 | 124 | 6 | 130 |
| Kyone | 7 | - | 7 | 184 | - | 184 |
| Myin Mu | 11 | 1 | 12 | 255 | 29 | 284 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 9 | Total | 35 | 3 | 38 | 734 | 71 | 815 |
| Kalaw | 9 | - | 9 | In Ni (Thein Gan) | 10 | - | 10 | 73 | 8 | 81 |
| In Ni (Danu) | 7 | - | 7 | 36 | 4 | 40 |
| In Ni (Myauk Kone) | 8 | - | 8 | 24 | 4 | 28 |
| Taung Pat (Ywar Thit) | 10 | - | 10 | 29 | 6 | 35 |
| Taung Pat (North) | 10 | - | 10 | 84 | 11 | 95 |
| Total | 9 | - | 9 | Total | 45 | - | 45 | 246 | 33 | 279 |
| Nyaung Shwe |  |  |  | Lwal Nyeint | 7 | 3 | 10 | 105 | 33 | 138 |
| Mine Thout | 10 | - | 10 | 118 | 6 | 206 |
| Taung Bo Kyee | 10 | - | 10 | 90 | 15 | 138 |
| Nyaung Wun | 12 | - | 12 | 169 | 37 | 124 |
| Nar Taung Kya | 10 | - | 10 | 110 | 28 | 105 |
| Total |  |  |  | Total | 49 | 3 | 52 | 592 | 119 | 711 |
| Pin Laung | 10 | 1 | 11 | Kone Chine | 11 | - | 11 | 69 | 9 | 78 |
| Lone Kel | 6 | 3 | 9 | 77 | 4 | 81 |
| Kan Hla | 10 | - | 10 | 126 | 5 | 131 |
| Taung Kya | 9 | - | 9 | 94 | 7 | 101 |
| Lein Le | 9 | - | 9 | 168 | 27 | 195 |
| Total | 10 | 1 | 11 | Total | 45 | 3 | 48 | 534 | 52 | 586 |
|  |  |  |  | Total 5 Townships | 267 | 9 | 276 | 3143 | 372 | 3515 |

1. The revised CFI will reportedly include mandatory gender quotas for women on executive committees of CF groups, which will at least increase the numbers of women on management committees.
2. In Southern Shan state, FFF has supported ECCDI to form township level CFPPAs. The leaders of these township level associations have formed a Shan State Community Forestry Product Producers Association (CFPPA). In Rakhine, FFF has supported a local NGO called Rakhine Coastal Regional Conservation Association (RCA) and ECCDI to organize 42 existing Community Forest User Groups into a Rakhine State Community Forestry Product Producers Association (CFPPA).
3. As yet, an apex/national-level producer association has not been formed, although the CF Practitioner Network is due to be created in 2016. Presently, civil society (e.g. MERN, ECCDI) advocate on behalf of CF groups in discussions with the CFNWG.

### Output 1.2 Producer groups work together with government and private sector to improve policy

1. At the time of the mid-term evaluation mission, the apex National Federation of Community Forest Products Producer Associations (CFPPA) had yet to be created. As such, producer organizations do not have direct representation on the CFNWG. The creation of the national CFPPA remains a goal of the FFF. One of the implementing NGOs (ECCDI) provided inputs to the revised CFI (2014) based on recommendations from producer organizations. However, direct representation by producer organizations on the CFNWG would be more transparent and accountable.
2. Some links with the private sector have been created, most notably with the bamboo and rattan association. Similarly, in Rakhine, there are intentions to link CF groups with hotels and tourist resorts in Thandwe – at present these links are small, e.g. the sale of brooms made from forest materials. There is potential for further linkages - e.g. for crab production or furniture production - but this has yet to happen.

## Producers are more organized for business

### Output 2.1 Producer organizations know about business and can access finance

1. In both states that were visited for the Mid Term Evaluation, (Southern Rakhine and Southern Shan), there was varying progress in terms of business development. The capacities of the implementing NGOs vary considerably. In Ywangan in Southern Shan State, ECCDI has provided value-chain specific training to CF groups based on their needs and on consultation with the CF groups. Different groups have received different training based on the products that they have priorities and in general they are very satisfied with the quality of the trainings received. There was however untapped market potential in these villages – mostly relating to eco-tourism opportunities, and with regard to value chains centered on women’s economic activities.
2. In Nyaungshwe, the evaluation team visited two villages where ceramic production is the primary economic activity. The production and sale of ceramic pots could potentially become a lucrative enterprise, particularly given the increasing popularity of Inle Lake and Nyaungshwe as a tourist destination. As yet however, the tourist market has yet to be tapped. Furthermore, one of the villages was still awaiting certification of the CF land, two years after FFF support began. This delay is mostly due to the fact that the land to be certified is currently zoned as ‘bare’ land and therefore requires government approval to be rezoned as forest land.
3. At present, the ceramic groups sell primarily to a small number of wholesale brokers who dictate the price and then resell the pots at a higher value in Aungban. There are potentially lucrative opportunities for exporting decorative pots and pottery crafts, on the back of the strong tourist industry in Inle Lake, for example through the creation of a display shop in Nyaungshwe where tourists could request certain items to be delivered to their home countries. The groups did mention that they have received more exposure to national markets through the support of the Myanmar Ceramics Association (MCS), and there is potential now to sell pots for clients in Yangon. One overlooked aspect of the ceramics case is that most of the crafting work is in fact carried out by women. There is potential to capitalize on this through the creation of a woman’s only brand, which may carry favor with international customers. The FFF support has focused primarily on gaining certification for CF land which the group intends to use as a sustainable source of fuel wood (currently one of their biggest expenses). They also wish to use the CF land as a source of clay for the production of ceramics, although this will most likely need to be negotiated in developing the CF Management plan.
4. In Rakhine, the CF groups had yet to receive the training on market analysis and development at the time of the MTE mission. One of the biggest needs expressed by the groups in Rakhine was that they needed business ideas on how to utilize the CF areas. They had intentions to develop small industries in bamboo and rattan production from the inland CF lands, and small-scale crab and fishery production in the mangrove areas, although they as yet had no clear plan or direction as to how to proceed with this. The CF groups in Rakhine are much newer than those in Southern Shan State. FFF has built on a previous MERN project, Coastal Livelihood and Environmental Assets Restoration in Rakhine (CLEARR), which was a $3 million project funded by the y Livelihood, and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT).[[10]](#footnote-10) The original goal of the CLEARR project was to create community forest user groups to help restore mangrove areas that had been nearly destroyed by typhoon Nargis in 2007, while also supporting livelihood and food security enhancement in the affected areas. The CLEARR project focused on Gwa and Kyeintali townships, and the FFF is now continuing the support to each of these Townships through the Rakhine Coastal Regional Conservation Association (RCA) and ECCDI.
5. There are potential markets for CF products in the Thandwe tourist resort. The CF user groups interviewed had intentions to sell rattan furniture and other small crafts to hotels in the tourist areas. Similarly, there may be potential markets for crabs produced in the mangrove areas. However, the CF groups may have to compete with already established large-scale crab producers in Thandwe if they decide to pursue this idea further. ECCDI is also encouraging linkages between CF groups and the Bamboo and Rattan Producers Association, whereby CF groups will produce bamboo and rattan for the Association, and will also develop skills in making furniture and other value-added products from the raw materials.
6. The market-led CF approach is much stronger in some areas than in others (for example, it is much stronger in Ywar Ngan, Southern Shan State compared to Gwa, Southern Rakhine State). There may be further scope for FFF Myanmar to enhance non-CF livelihood activities of beneficiary groups in tandem to CF activities. Many of the communities that were visited by the evaluation team had other economic activities outside of the CF activities, such as the production of avocado, rice or tea. In other FFF countries (e.g. Kenya), the FFF has supported similar non-forestry related livelihood activities in tandem to forest-related activities as a means to economically empower forest and farm communities.[[11]](#footnote-11)

### Output 2.2 Establishment of services in support of small forest business

1. At present, the CF groups under FFF are most reliant on NGOs like ECCDI or MCS for small forest business development. Government support at the village and township level through the forestry department is primarily focused on the provision of seedlings and may not have the capacity to adequately deal with the concerns and problems faced by CF groups. The Forest Department at the national level is aware of this gap and it remains to be seen how the CF groups can benefit from business support from government bodies at the township level. One potential option is for the Ministry of Cooperatives to play a greater role on the CFNWG (depending on any restructuring to government ministries and departments under the new government).
2. The current support offered by NGOs, particularly by ECCDI is seen to be relevant to the needs of the CF groups, although the sustainability of this support may be questionable if government services are not sufficiently empowered to provide this support in the longer term.

### Output 2.3 Experience sharing between producer organizations in-country

1. An in-country exchange workshop was held in Southern Shan in April 2014, as well as a reporting workshop in Yangon. Participants expressed appreciation for the exchange, and some organizations who had less experience in CF received advice from government and other NGOs about how to apply for CF certification during the Shan State exchange.
2. National Exchange visits are potentially very valuable given the different levels of progress between CF groups in different regions (e.g. between Rakhine and Southern Shan State).
3. There have also been international exchange visits to Nepal and Vietnam. Participants on these visits come from NGOs, Government, as well as CF user groups, and as such, these exchange visits also present a valuable opportunity for lessons-learning and the sharing of experiences.

## Catalyzing multi-sectoral policy platforms

**Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management**

### Output 3.1 Establishment and coordination of multi-sectoral policy platforms

1. The Myanmar Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG) was created in 2013 through support from RECOFTC. Members of the working group are representatives of line departments from the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry, the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, the Ministry of Fisheries, Livestock, and Rural Development, the Ministry of Home Affairs, and Attorneys’ General Office. Civil society organizations are also members, including the Myanmar Timber Merchant Association, ECCDI, EcoDev, the Forest Resource Environment Development and Conservation Association (FREDA), the Food Security Working Group, network MERN and Metta Development Foundation. The CEO of MERN (who is also the FFF facilitator) is the current treasurer of the CFNWG.
2. In 2015, the FFF provided financial support the CFNWG, through a letter of agreement (LoA) with MERN. The FFF initially sought to create and LoA with the Forest Department, but it was soon decided that the existing LoA with MERN would be a more efficient way of channeling the funds for the CFNWG.
3. At this point the CFNWG does not yet have a producer group representative as a member. Civil society organizations represent CF User Groups (CFUGs), based on consultations with the groups. Therefore, producer associations need to rely on advocacy of civil society representatives on the CFNWG to raise issues to the CFNWG. There are plans to form a CF practitioner Network from the regional CFPPAs that are being formed. The CF Practitioner Network will serve as the direct representative of CF organizations on the CFNWG. However, the CF Practitioner Network has yet to be created.
4. Successful outcomes of the CFNWG include the revised Community Forest instructions (CFI), and the drafting of the new Forest Law. Bot h of these have been discussed by the CFNWG, with representatives from government and civil society present.
5. Many stakeholders consulted by the evaluation team admitted that there are somewhat weak linkages between the Agriculture Ministry and the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry. Agriculture-based livelihoods of CFUGs may therefore be overlooked in some cases. Given that nearly all the communities visited by the evaluation team were also practicing farmers, the CFNWG may benefit from including a representative of the Myanmar Farmers’ Federation to represent stallholder farmers, similar to the FFF approach in Vietnam.

### Output 3.2 Increased information sharing results in improved understanding and better policies for producer organizations

1. The CFNWG has already provided a consultative platform for discussing revisions to CF policies in Myanmar. In this regard, ECCDI prepared a draft revised CFI to the CFNWG in 2015. Similarly, discussion on the revision of the Forest Law will likely be on the agenda of the CFNWG. However, at present, CFUGs depend on civil society (such as ECCDI, MERN) to advocate for their needs on the CFNWG. In this regards, linkages between FFF pillar 1 and Pillar 2 remain a challenge in Myanmar.
2. There is a FFF focal point in the Ministry who communicates with field-level forest department offices regarding CF matters. In theory, it is this person who communicates the learnings from the FFF M&L system back to the field level forest department staff. However, a review of the annual reports finds that there may not be sufficient detail in the M&L reporting system for it to be of use at the field level.
3. The capacity of government forest department staff at the field-level remains a challenge. At present, township-level offices mostly provide tree-nursery services to CF groups, and the evaluation team was informed that these offices do not have the capacity to solve disputes or deal with other concerns of CF groups.

## Linking local voices to global processes

**National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers**

### Output 4.1 Organizations representing local producers influence global processes

1. The evaluation team did not directly observe evidence of FFFPOS from Myanmar influencing global processes, although several people (from government, civil society and from CF user groups) attended the Committee on Forestry (COFO) in Rome.

### Output 4.2 Learning and practices are shared within and between countries and regions, and globally

1. The Exchange visits to Nepal and Vietnam were very highly appreciated by all stakeholders interviewed in Myanmar who participated. The exchanges are seen to be of particular value in Myanmar given the political and historical context. At the village level, farmers reported learning from the experiences of other farmers/producers in other countries. Meanwhile, representatives from the Forest Department who participated in international exchange visits appreciated the exposure to the different systems in Vietnam and Nepal.
2. The exchange visits also provide an opportunity for information exchange and learning between the participants, as they consist of representatives from the forest department, CFNWG, NGOs and CFUGs.

Evaluation question 5: To what extent is the current operational modality contributing to the efficient achievement of the program outcomes?

1. The gap between phases one and two of the project in Myanmar created problems for some communities. One group reportedly lost some CF land to land-grabbers during the gap between FFF phases as they had not secured adequate tenure during the first phase. Similarly, some communities reported a gap of up to 1 year between the project phases. The delay between the phases was due to several factors, including the reporting and reviewing requirements following phase one, as well as administrative delays in the disbursement of funding for phase 2.
2. The 6-month duration of the project phases was considered too short by many stakeholders, both at the community level and also by implementing NGOs, particularly in cases where the initial funds were received late. Nonetheless, where necessary, there was some flexibility in extending the project phase if activities were not completed during the 6 month time-frame.

### Programme governance structure

1. FFF implementation and facilitation is handled by Myanmar Environment Rehabilitation-conservation Network (MERN), a national umbrella network for over 21 NGOs.[[12]](#footnote-12) The CEO of MERN is the FFF facilitator. FAO Myanmar interacts with the FFF through a national forestry officer, but his workload is already considerably large. As such, given the capacity constraints of the FAO Myanmar office, MERN is taking the lead in terms of coordinating and implementing FFF activities in Myanmar.
2. Rather than providing small grants directly to CF groups/Producer organizations (as has happened in other FFF focus countries), the grants in Myanmar have been disbursed to local NGOs that are facilitating the emergence of forest-farm producer organizations in Myanmar. The first call for proposals was issued in May 2013, and six NGOs were initially selected for Phase 1. The second call for proposals was issued in December 2014, and small grants were issued to four NGOs. In addition, two agreements were made directly with ECCDI and the Rakhine Coastal Regional Conservation Association (RCA) to facilitate the establishment of state-level producer associations in Southern Shan State and Southern Rakhine State.
3. MERN and ECCDI are key players in the implementation of FFF in Myanmar. While MERN is the overall facilitator, ECCDI plays a crucial role in providing technical assistance, especially with regard to market training and development. A key agent of change for CF activities in Myanmar, and therefore for the entire FFF approach in Myanmar, is Dr. Kyaw Tint, the chairman of MERN and ECCDI. Dr. Tint is a former Director General of the government Forest Department and as such, both MERN and ECCDI have strong and valuable connections with the Forest Department and the CFNWG. The FFF facilitator is the CEO of MERN, and he has also been nominated as the treasurer of the CFNWG.
4. While MERN presently plays a crucial role in the coordination, facilitation and promotion of FFF activities in Myanmar, the intention is that the Forest Department will ultimately take over the promotion of market-led CF activities and scale up FFF activities using the achievements under FFF as a model. The creation of the CF Unit in the Forest Department is an encouraging sign that the government is taking CF more seriously, and there is considerable optimism with the recent change in government in March 2016. Nonetheless, there does not to be a concrete ‘exit strategy’ in place yet as to how this handover of responsibility from MERN to the Forest Department will be handled once FFF support ends. This is a major assumption in the theory of change which requires further consideration by the FFF team in Myanmar. There are some concerns about the long-term sustainability of the role of ECCDI and MERN in facilitating the entire process. At present, there is a strong relationship between the Forest Department (FD) and the NGOs. Sufficient steps may need to be taken or considered by the FFF in terms of providing capacity development to the Forest Department to take over similar activities in order to ensure long-term sustainability. Most worrying is the lack of capacity of township level forest department staff to deal with the problems and concerns of newly created CF groups.

### Appropriateness of M&L System for program monitoring and progress reporting

1. The M&L system consist of annual reports by implementing NGOs which are synthesized by the FFF facilitator in the form of the annual FFF country report. The annual synthesis report does not provide extensive details on field-level activities, but is geared more towards the reporting requirements of the FFF management team at FAO HQ. Many of the reporting questions in the M&L system were not completed, or did not provide in depth information. Similarly, the individual reports from implementing NGOs varied greatly in their quality, with some reports providing extensive detail, while other reports tended to be limited in the quality of information provided.
2. It is not clear to what extent the results of the FFF M&L system are utilized by stakeholders in country. In theory, the system could be useful for forest department staff as a learning tool, particularly in terms of identifying issues and needs at the township and village levels and in facilitating local Forest Department Staff in understanding the needs of CF groups. However, at present, the reporting style does not contain sufficient detail on the challenges and obstacles faced by CF groups in different regions.
3. An additional point to consider is the capacity of village and/or township level groups to provide reporting if they are to receive direct grants in the future. CF groups already have a reporting requirement to government, which the evaluation team learned is often misunderstood by the CF groups or sometimes not conducted. Sufficient training on this reporting aspect may need to be conducted if CF groups are to receive direct grants in future through the FFF.

Evaluation question 6: What is the likelihood that FFF will contribute to the expected impact?

1. **There is a strong likelihood of reaching the Impact of the Project and contributing to its Vision.** Full project impact is normally reached some time or many years after completion of its activities. At this stage, the MTE can only assess the likelihood for reaching that Impact and for contributing to the Vision which is “Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes”.
2. The likelihood of FFF rural poverty impact can be assessed by looking at the main livelihoods “building blocks” as follows:
3. Human capital. The strongest FFF results are in the fundamental domain of human capital development, in which there are considerable achievements in enhancing the stock of skills in FFPOs members (organizational, managerial, technological, MA&D). The smallholders that the MTE mission met were unanimous in their appreciation of the contribution of training to their performance in production, processing and marketing activities. The MTE also observed many cases at grassroots level of positive effect on the quality of life of women who participated in trainings.
4. Social capital. The most significant contribution of FFF to this domain has come from the support to FFPOs organizational capacity. Its interventions are increasing the stock of trust that FFPOs members have in the governance of their organizations, and strengthening solidarity in communities. Smallholders are being empowered through raised awareness on the benefits of working together. The FFPOs and their governing committees are effectively contributing to a sense of local ownership of FFF’s results by their members.
5. Political capital. FFF supported the enhancement of the political capital of its target FFPOs through a diversity of trainings. As a result, FFPO leaders and leaders of their Apex organizations are in regular interaction with state services at national and subnational levels, and with members of parliament on matters relating to forest and farm management. Apex organizations take part in policy-making processes and cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms and raise issues for discussion through these mechanisms.
6. Natural assets. FFF’s main focus at the local level is advocacy role in the Government’s decision on the transfer of forest tenure to local communities, and support to sustainable management and use of these resources. With this transfer, communities’ natural assets have expanded, and as a result, local communities countrywide can clearly improve the use of management of the forest resources, and participate profitably in the forest-based value chains development processes.
7. Physical assets. In general, FFF grants to FFPOs do not cover investment in physical capital. There is therefore likelihood that FFF will have limited impact on FFPOs physical assets.
8. Financial Assets. Due to limited data available, it is not possible to assess the full extent to which FFF is affecting financial assets of households of FFPOs members. From the interviews with FFPOs representatives in Myanmar, the MTE Team believes that production and value addition activities supported by FFF trainings are likely to positively affect household income.

## Evaluation question 7: Has FFF been successful in engaging other partners in FFF-supported processes?

1. The FFF has taken advantage of the MERN network of NGOs, a number of which are implementing partners for the FFF. The FFF Myanmar has made formal agreements with the following partners:

* Myanmar Environmental Rehabilitation and Conservation Network – to support the Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG)
* Ecosystem Conservation and Community Development Initiative (ECCDI) – for support to village-level, township-level and national-level community forestry product producers associations (CFPPAs) in Shan State
* Rakhine Coastal Region Conservation Association with ECCDI and MERN – for support to village-level, township-level and national-level CFPPAs in Rakhine State
* Myanmar Ceramics Society – for the establishment of a township-level association of wood and ceramics producers in Shan State
* Friends of Wildlife – for strengthening the Chin Producer Cooperative Association in Rakhine State
* Ar Yone Oo – for promoting an elephant-foot yam and silk farmer association in Chin State
* Social Vision Services – for facilitating the formation of smallholder producer groups into township-level associations in Ayeyarwady Delta
* RECOTFC – for capacity development to the Forest Department and non-state stakeholders in the assessment and monitoring of extent and effectiveness of community-based forestry in Myanmar
* Myanmar Heart Development Organization - to support the creation of CFPPAs in Ayeyarwady in Phase 1 of the project.

1. The MERN network is valuable for the direct implementation of FFF activities at community level. Meanwhile, MERN and ECCDI in particular are key partners in liaising with the Forestry Department and the CFNWG, given that the Chairman of MERN and ECCDI is the former Director General of the Forestry Department. ECCDI and MERN have recently developed a new partnership with ICRAF to develop agroforestry techniques for alternatives to shifting cultivation to provide technical assistance alongside the business support offered through the FFF.
2. However, apart from RECOFTC, there have been no direct partnerships with other regional or international-level partners. Such partnerships could facilitate scaling up and provide further fund-raising opportunities (such as happened in Kenya with We-Effect). As previously mentioned, the FFF has synergies with other initiatives in Myanmar, specifically the Pyoe Pin project funded by DfID, DANIDA and SIDA. Such synergies may provide future opportunities for the scaling up of FFF activities in Myanmar.

## Evaluation question 8: How sustainable is the FFF concept of investing in the organizational capacity of forest farm producer organizations – and how might this be enhanced?

1. There are increasing signs of interest in community forestry development in Myanmar, particularly with the creation of the CF Unit in the Forestry Department. Meanwhile, there is strong optimism that the situation will improve further under the new government.
2. Ownership by the government is a critical aspect of the sustainability of the FFF concept. While the implementation arrangements with MERN and the NGO network are effective in the short term, there are concerns about the longer term sustainability of this arrangement. There is no clear exit strategy for the eventual handover of coordination to the Forest Department. The FFF theory of change in Myanmar hinges on a big assumption on the capacity and willingness of the government to coordinate and develop community forestry in Myanmar. Similarly, there is a big assumption on the capacity of the yet-to-be-created CF Practitioner Network to adequately represent the needs of CF groups at the national level.
3. At the time of the evaluation mission, civil society support through MERN and ECCDI is still a critical and much-needed component of CF development in Myanmar. The evaluation strongly supports the continuation of FFF support in Myanmar, particularly under Pillar 2.
4. At the field level, groups attest that they will continue to keep the CFs active and that they will do so with or without FFF support. A previous UNDP ‘watershed’ project in 2005 assisted the creation of CF user groups in Southern Shan State; however, the evaluation learned that these groups became inactive following the closure of the UNDP project and these groups did not become active again until FFF activities commenced in 2014. The creation of township level and regional producer associations does provide additional motivation to CF user groups that may have been missing from the UNDP project, and this may prevent the groups from becoming inactive after the project ends, as previously happened. In any case, the guarantee of tenure over CF land for 30 years for CF Producer Associations is a clear indication of sustainability, at least in terms of protection of the CF area.
5. There are mixed sustainability prospects regarding enterprise development. Some groups (e.g. Ywar Ngan, Southern Shan State) have much stronger prospects of developing and maintaining business ventures, while others (e.g. in Kyeintali, Rakhine) have yet to develop business ideas. There are also challenges of market access for nearly all groups.
6. The lack of capacity of field-level forest department offices and staff is a concern for the sustainability of the development of CFs in Myanmar. Presently, Forest Department staff do not have the sufficient skills to assist in market-led development of community forests and this aspect is primarily handled by civil society organizations such as ECCDI. Further linkages could be formed with the Ministry of Cooperatives through the CFNWG.
7. In general, there are high expectations of the newly formed government and government stakeholders are hopeful that there will be increased inter-ministerial collaboration under the new government.

# Crosscutting issues

Evaluation question 9: To what extent have gender and human rights been taken into account in the design of the FFF and during the implementation?

1. Membership of CF groups by women varies between the different groups. In some groups, membership is dominated by men. For example, groups supported by the Rakhine Coastal Region Conservation Association (RCA) reported membership of 80% men to 20% women. Similarly, for the 30 CFPAs supported by ECCDI in Southern Shan State, out of the 3515 members, 3143 are male (89.5%) and 372 are female (10.5%). Meanwhile, out of the 13 groups supported by Social Vision Services in Bogalay Township, the overall proportion of males to females was 45% male, 55% female. In 2014, the FFF annual report states that out of 95 leaders of producer groups supported by the FFF, 25 leaders were women. Meanwhile, out of 47 leaders of producer groups supported by the FFF in Southern Shan State in 2015, 5 leaders are women.
2. Men were seen to occupy decision-making positions in nearly all CF groups visited by the evaluation team, even in groups where the primary activity of the group revolved around women’s livelihood activities (for example, the ceramic groups in Nyaungshwe, where women are mostly responsible for the production of the pots). However, the revised CFI will introduce a set requirement for women’s representation on CF management committees which may increase women’s representation.
3. In Southern Shan State, the market training and product-specific trainings received by CF groups may have overlooked certain potentially lucrative activities that are performed solely by women. For example, in Kyauk Ku Lay village, Ywar Ngan Township, the collection of wild medicinal plants in the CF areas is an unexplored value chain that could receive further focus. The evaluation team learned that there is strong demand for certain medicinal plants, particularly from Chinese markets where such plants are important for traditional Chinese medicine. Currently, the women are selling these plants unprocessed, but they are aware that the plant products fetch a much higher price further down the value chain.
4. In Rakhine, it is not yet clear who will benefit (i.e. men or women) from the FFF training, for example regarding crab production. Similarly, there are no explicit instructions in the market analysis and development training for the identification and development of women’s only value chains. The development of women’s only brands could potentially be a strong selling point, particularly for groups with opportunities to sell to international markets, such as the ceramic groups in Inle Lake.
5. Overall, the FFF Myanmar needs to give more explicit focus to the particular needs of women with respect to CF activities. This needs to be strengthened at all levels, from the CFNWG at the national level down to the CFUGs at village level.
6. The FFF has targeted vulnerable ethnic minority groups. For example, in Rakhine State, through FFF support, Friends of Wildlife is assisting a Chin minority ethnic group in attaining CF certification, while providing training on wildlife conservation practices.

# **Appendices**

## Appendix 1: FFF Project Sites in Myanmar (Map)

## Appendix 2: FFF Project Sites in Myanmar

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sr.** | **Project Name** | **Project Period** | **Implementing Organization** | **Region** | **Township** | **Remark** |
| 1 | Promoting Rural Livelihoods through Community Forestry in Chin State of Myanmar | 1 November 2015 to 31 March 2016 | AYO | Chin State | Tonzang, Tedim & Mindat | On-going project,  but able to sign in January 2016 |
| 2 | Establishment of community forest products producer association and strengthening community forestry enterprises in Southern Shan State | 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2015 | ECCDI | Southern Shan State | Ywangan, Pindaya, Kalaw, Nyaung Shwe and Pinlaung | Just finished project |
| 3 | Ensuring the sustainability of Chin Producer Cooperative Association involving in Sub-regional level CFPPA of Rakhine through forest-farm practices and market-led | 1 Dec 2015 to 31 August 2016 | FOW | Southern Rakhine State | Gwa | On-going project,  but able to sign in January 2016 |
| 4 | Strengthening Community Forestry National Working Group (CFNWG) for promoting innovative approaches to advance Community Forestry, Improving livelihoods of forest and farm producers | 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016 | MERN/CFNWG | (CF Unit, Forest Department) | (CF Unit, Forest Department) | On-going project |
| 5 | Establishment of Regional level Community Forest Products Producer Association in Rakhine, Supporting MERN Membership Process for Forest and Farm Producer Groups and Developing an Effective Communication and Engagement Strategy | 18 February 2015 to 28 February 2016 | RCA-ECCDI-MERN | ( MERN ) and Southern Rakhine | Gwa and Kyeintali sub-township | About to finish in the end of February 2016 |
| 6 | Establishment of Township-level Association of Wood and Ceramics Producers’ Groups | 1st November 2015 to 30 June 2016 | MCS | Southern Shan State | Nyaung Shwe | On-going project,  but able to sign in January 2016 |
| 7 | Capacity development to forest department and non-state stakeholders in assessment and monitoring of extent and effectiveness of community based forestry (CBF) in Myanmar | Nov 2015 to 30 June 2016 | RECOFTC | FD staffs and FFF IPs | FD staffs and FFF IPs | On-going project |
| 8 | Facilitating the formation and strengthening of Smallholder producer groups into Township Level Producers Association in Ayeyarwady Delta forest landscape to contribution livelihood enhancement | 1 December 2015 to 31 May 2016 | SVS | Ayeyarwady Region | Bogalay | On-going project,  but able to sign in January 2016 |
| 9 | Support to Community Forestry (CF) and Community Forest User Groups (CFUG) from 7 villages in Ywangan Township, Southern Shan State to establish a community forest product-based enterprise contributing to socio-economic development | 18 November 2013 to 18 January 2015 | ECCDI | Southern Shan State | Ywangan | Project is finished |
| 10 | Supporting the livelihood sustainability of a Chin tribe community in Southern Rakhine Yoma, through introducing forest-farm practices | 15 November 2013 to 15 January 2015 | FOW | Southern Rakhine State | Gwa | Project is finished |
| 11 | Facilitate the process of self-organization of Wood-fuel User Groups (WUP) and the Planter and Producer Forester Groups (PPFG) for the establishment of Community Managed and Planted Forestry (CMPF) at Kyauktaing and Naungbo pottery villages in Inle Lake, Shan State | 15 November 2013 to 15 January 2015 | MCS | Southern Shan State | Nyaung Shwe | Project is finished` |
| 12 | Support to mangrove forest dependent communities to establish a community enterprise contributing to the improvement to their economic and livelihood conditions in the Udoe and surrounding mangrove forest | 15 November 2013 to 15 January 2015 | MHDO | Ayeyarwady Region | Pathein | Project is finished |
| 13 | Facilitative support to issue a call for proposals for the establishment and strengthening of smallholder producer groups in Myanmar forest landscapes | 29 May 2013 to 28 February 2015 | NAG | Country wide assessment | Country wide assessment | Project is finished |
| 14 | Facilitation the process of formation and strengthening of smallholder producer groups in forest landscapes in Kantbala Chaung, Pyin Bo Lay, Kone Tan Pauk, Kwun Thar Yar villages in Bogalay Township, contributing to enhance their livelihood | 16 November 2013 to 16 January 2015 | SVS | Ayeyarwady Region | Bogalay | Project is finished |
| 15 | Facilitation to the process of self-organization of forest producers from five villages for forming forest user groups in Kadon Kani reserved forest and contributing to sustainable development by balancing the forest protection and livelihood | 18 November 2013 to 18 January 2015 | SDF | Ayeyarwady Region | Bogalay | Project is finished |

## Appendix 3: List of people met during Myanmar mission

| **Name** | **Role/Title** | **Institution** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| U Paing Htet Thu | Intern | MERN |
| Dr. Kyaw Tint | Chairman | ECCDI/MERN |
| U Aung Thant Zin | FFF Facilitator/ CEO MERN / Treasurer, CFNWG | MERN |
| U Phyo Thu | Project staff | ECCDI |
| U Myat Ko Oo | Asst. Planning and Operations Officer | ECCDI |
| Prof. Ohn Lwin | Professor | Forest Products Department, University of Forestry (MoECFAF) |
| U Kyaw Kaw Lin | Deputy Director General | Forest Department, MoECAF |
| U Bo Ni | Director/FFF Focal point | Watershed Management Division, Forest Department, MoECAF |
| U Tint Swe | Director | Training, Research and Development Division, Forest Department, MoECAF |
| U Myo Min | Director | Natural and Plantation Forest Division, Forest Department, MoECAF |
| Dr. Ei Ei Shwe Zin | Staff Officer | Forest Research Institute, Forest Department, MoECAF |
| U Sein Moe | Staff Officer | CF Unit, Forest Department, MoECAF |
| Dr. Maung Maung Than | Country Programme Coordinator | RECOFTC |
| Ms. Bui Thi Lan | FAO Representative | FAO Myanmar |
| U Ye Kaung | Forestry officer | FAO Myanmar |
| U Aung Swe | Assistant FAO Representative (Program) | FAO Myanamar |
| Daw Thin Thin Mya | Project In-charge | Myanmar Ceramic Society |
| U Myint Aung | Chairman | Friends of Wildflife |
| U Naung Zin Latt | Project In-charge | Social Vision Services |
| U Than Htay | Vice Chairman) | RCA |
| U Myint Aung | Field Technician) | RCA |
| Daw Kyu Kyu Than | Admin & Finance Assistant | RCA |
| U Kyi Soe Lwin | Project Officer | Friends of Wildlife |
| U Zaw Lin Than | Township FD officer, Gwa | Forest Department, Gwa |
| U Myint Maung | Secretary | Kyeintali CF Group |
| U Myin Aung | Chairman | Sundar CF Group |
| U Win Pe | Chairman, CFUG | A Le Chaung CF Group, Ywarngan |
| U Khin Maung | CFUG Member | Kyauk Ku Lay Ywar CF Group, Ywar Ngan |
| Daw Mya Yin | CFUG Member | Kyauk Ku Lay Ywar CF Group, Ywar Ngan |
| U Kyaw Mya | CFUG Member | Kyauk Taing Village CF Group, Inle, Nyaung Shwe |
| U Hla Kyaw | CFUG Member | Kyauk Taing Village CF Group, Inle, Nyaung Shwe |
| U Kyaw Soe | CFUG Member | Kyauk Taing Village CF Group, Inle, Nyaung Shwe |
| Thazin Oo | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Khin Moe | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Khin Myo | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Zin Min Thant | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Kyaw Win | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Saw Htun | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| Ba Saung | CFUG Member | Ywar Ngan |
| U Myint Hla | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| U Myint Maung | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| U Tin Han | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| Daw Myint Khaing | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| Daw May Myint | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| Daw Khin Toe Yi | CFUG Member | Kyeintali |
| U Tun Min | Chairman, CFUG | Ywar Thit Kone |
| U Tin Aung Lay | Treasurer, CFUG | Ywar Thit Kone |
| U Min Swe | Secretary, CFUG | Ywar Thit Kone |
| U Myint Win | CFUG Member | Ywar Thit Kone |

## Appendix 4: Itinerary and meetings for FFF mid-term Evaluation Mission in Myanmar, March 2016

Mid-Term Evaluation Mission: Southern Rakhine + Southern Shan State + Nay Pyi Taw

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Time** | **Proposed meeting & trip** | **Mode of travel/ Meeting venue** | **Night stop** | **Remark** |
| 19.3.2016  Saturday | 05:00  09:30-11:30  13:00-19:30 | * Arrival in Yangon * Meeting with FFF Project IPs (ECCDI, FOW, SVS, MCS, MHDO, AYO) * Travel to Gwa, Kyeintali Southern Rakhine | By flight  MERN meeting room  By Car | Kyeintali |  |
| 20.3.2016  Sunday | 08:30-16:00 | * Meeting with village CFUGs, Township CFPPA and District/Sub-Rakhine CFPPA * Visit to project villages | meeting room, Ktl  By Car | Kyeintali |  |
| 21.3.2016  Monday | 06:30-14:00  16:00-16:30 | * Travel back to Yangon * Briefing with FAO-Myanmar | By Car | Yangon |  |
| 22.3.2016  Tuesday | 06:45-08:50  09:30-10:30  11:00-16:00 | * Travel to Heho (Southern Shan State) * Travel from Heho – Aungban – Pwehla village * Visit to Pwehla village, meeting with village, township and Southern-Shan State CFPPA members * Travel to Nyaung Shwe (Southern Shan State) * Meeting with FFF-MCS project in-charge | By flight (UB)  By car  By car  By car | Hotel in  Nyaung Shwe |  |
| 23.3.2016  Wednesday | 07:00-16:30 | * Visit to a FFF-MCS project village and meeting with producer members * Visit to another a FFF-MCS project village and meeting with producer members | By boat | Nyaung Shwe |  |
| 24.3.2016  Thursday | 07:00-08:30  09:25-10:35  17:30-18:05 | * Travel from Nyaung Shwe to Heho Airport * Heho to Yangon * Yangon to Nay Pyi Taw | By car  By flight  By flight | Nay Pyi Taw |  |
| 25.3.2016  Friday | 09:30-11:30  13:30-14:10  16:00-16:30 | * Meeting with DG-FD, CFNWG Chairman and members * Nay Pyi Taw to Yangon * Debriefing at FAO-Myanmar | FD meeting room  By flight | Yangon |  |
| 26.3.2016  Saturday | 09:30-11:30  15:20 | * Meeting with National Consultant and FFF Country Facilitator * Depart Yangon | By flight |  |  |

## Appendix 5: Organogram of FFF Support in Myanmar
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1. In order to avoid repetition in the presentation of the findings, some questions from the Evaluation Terms of Reference have been reclassified as sub-questions here in the final evaluation report where it was appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). Activists beyond borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. Cornell University Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Value chain governance is understood as the power to control, influence, and set the modes and rules of interaction in the value chain. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Value chain upgrading refers to the acquisition of capabilities and market linkages that enable enterprises to improve their competitiveness and move into higher-value activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Macqueen (2016), <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G04020.pdf>? Also, Macqueen 2012, 2013, 2015… <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G04020.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. DFID (2014) Burma Forests: Research and Analysis, DFID, FCO and UKT&I Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/burma-forests/burma-forests> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Tint et al, 2014. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/13571IIED.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Distinct from assumptions, impact drivers are factors that project/programme management can influence to a certain extent. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Funded through the Livelihoods and Food Security Trust Fund (LIFT) - a multi-donor fund established in 2009 to improve the lives and prospects of smallholder farmers and landless people in rural Myanmar. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. LIFT is a multi-donor trust fund that improves the lives and prospects of rural poor people in Myanmar, with generous contributions from the United Kingdom, European Union, Australia, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Switzerland, Sweden, and the United States of America. From the private sector, the Mitsubishi Corporation is a donor. To date, the donors have committed more than USD 400 million to LIFT. <http://www.lift-fund.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The evaluation team visited groups in Kenya, where poultry production has been supported in tandem with tree nursery development as a complementing livelihood activity. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. [http://mernmyanmar.org/mern-governance/#](http://mernmyanmar.org/mern-governance/) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)