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Abstract

The paper tries to provide answers to questions on the status of farm/family forestry in Africa in terms of opportunities and challenges, their contribution to economic development and sustainable landscape management. In the paper, highlights are made on issues related to land tenure, institutional settings and other supporting policies. In addition, market access and factors that may influence the development of forest products value chains are discussed alongside the possibilities for promoting and strengthening cohesive actions amongst FFPOs in different countries and regions. Answers are provided on questions related to easiness to group formation and registration and their product base. Examples of such groups in terms of associations or federations at local, national and regional levels alongside some examples are briefly described. Information on how FFPOs are currently helping forestry farmers are provided with some examples clearly started including their future potentials and/or pitfalls. At the end of the paper, the outlook in the coming 5 to 10 years for the main opportunities and challenges awaiting farm/family forestry and related FFPOs in Africa are pinpointed.
Introduction

In most of Africa, 70% of the population lives in rural areas. This population greatly depends on forests for their livelihoods (Tieguhong & Nkamgnia, 2012, Tieguhong et al., 2009). As natural forests get depleted due to unsustainable logging and agricultural activities, these people have the potential to plant desirable trees on their own farms (Foundjem-Tita et al., 2013, Tieguhong et al., 2012). However, in many African countries, forest farmers are not given the legal and institutional recognition that they deserve to plant, own and sell tree products (Ingram et al., 2014; Unruh, 2008). The implication is that forest policies and laws do not take into account this important segment of forest stakeholders (Macqueen et al., 2015).

In particular, forest communities face the following challenges: insecure land/tree tenure; poor market access; lack of access to financial services, poor quality extension and capacity building support services; and ineffective local and national groups for collective actions (DeMarsh et al., 2014; FAO, 2014a; Mala et al., 2012).

In response to these impending challenges facing African forest-dependent populations, this paper was commissioned by the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA) and the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) under a joint collaboration between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Union for World Conservation of NatureUnion (IUCN) and the International Institute for Economic Development (IIED) for presentation at an international conference to be held in Nairobi, Kenya from the 9-11 June 2015. The conference is designed to discuss and share experiences on farm forestry/family tree growing and community forestry groups and their national federations in Africa.

Attending this conference will include high level government forest managers, forest technical agencies, donor agencies, academic institutions, and general forestry groups who are committed to encourage the development of family farm forestry producer organizations and federations in Africa. To this end, the paper documents some important facets of farm/family forestry in selected countries in Africa (Eastern, Southern, Western and Central Africa) especially on efforts already being made in the direction of promoting private forestry, farm/family forestry, community forestry, landowner forestry or Forest and Farm Producer Organizations (FFPOs) to ensure poverty alleviation and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) at the local level.

The paper tries to provide answers to questions on the status of farm/family forestry in Africa in terms of opportunities and challenges, their contribution to economic development and sustainable landscape management. In the paper, highlights are made on issues related to land tenure, institutional settings and other supporting policies. In addition, market access and factors that may influence the development of forest products value chains are discussed alongside the possibilities for promoting strengthening cohesive actions amongst FFPOs in different countries and regions. Answers are provided on questions related to easiness to group formation and registration and their product base. Efforts are made to define the size of such groups in terms of associations or federations at local, national and regional levels with some examples briefly described. Information on how FFPOs are currently helping forestry farmers are described with some examples clearly started alongside their future potentials and pitfalls. At the end of the paper, outlook in the coming 5 to 10 years for the main opportunities and challenges awaiting farm/family forestry and related FFPOs in Africa are pinpointed.
Methodology

The scope of this study is farm/family forestry and producer organizations in Africa with the intention to outline regional differences for East, Southern, West and Central Africa. Based upon the existing network of the organizing partners, the following twelve countries have been selected for analysis on the status of farm forestry and FFPOs in-country: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Liberia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia.

The methodology for data collection included structured (email) interviews with key informants and representatives of FFPOs in the selected countries (Annex 4), websites searches, and desk reviews on available literature and country forest policies to assess forest tenure, status, challenges and the outlook for the promotion of family forests in Africa. The literature search was conducted in the scientific databases of ISI Web of Sciences (papers) and Google Scholar (books, reports). The collected literature and interviews have been content-wise analyzed on the research themes. Time and resources were limited and did not allow conducting in-depth field studies. In this light, this study serves as a scoping study to give a snapshot of existing information on the status of farm/family forestry and producer organizations in Sub-Saharan Africa. This background paper will be presented and discussed on the “African Farm/Family Forestry Producer Organizations Conference” that will take place in Nairobi from 9 to 11 June 2015. This exchange with representatives from organizations, which represent farm/family forestry in Africa, as well as government forest managers, forest technical agencies, NGOs, donor agencies and academic institutes, will serve to validate the draft review and to identify possible gaps.
1. Setting the scene for Farm/ Family Forestry in Africa

In developing countries, it is primarily farmers who interact with and manage forest ecosystems, which underlines the strong link between forestry and agriculture. Interactions between farmers and tree-based systems vary, from protecting valuable tree species in natural forests to domestication of trees in home gardens and cultivating forest plantations (Michon et al., 2007). This chapter discusses the current status of farm/family forestry (See Box 1 for definitions and concepts) in Sub-Saharan Africa. Subsequently it presents the contribution of farm/family forestry to economic development and sustainable landscape management in African countries. It concludes by presenting new opportunities for promoting farm/family forestry.

Box 1 Farm/ Family Forestry, what’s in the name?

‘Farm forestry’, a concept mainly used in South and Southeast Asia (Long & Nair, 1999), has no universally agreed upon definition, but it has been used interchangeably with ‘agroforestry’ that refers to land-use involving trees and other woody perennials on farmlands or pastures (Harrison et al., 2002). Present day agroforestry focuses on land use that “diversifies and sustains production for increased social, economic and environmental benefits for land users at all levels” (www.icraf.cgiar.org). ‘Family forestry’ is a common way of forest management in Nordic countries, also related to the American concept of ‘Nonindustrial private Forestry’ (NIPF). It links to the concept of ‘Community forestry’ that has been widely used throughout the developing world, in which community members manage a communal forest area. These styles of forest management all imply types of ‘small-scale forestry’ that hold different meanings in different regions of the world, but generally contrasts with ‘large-scale or industrial forestry’ in ways of management, motivation and production (Harrison et al., 2002). Small-scale forestry generally serves a greater range of social, economic and environmental services, compared to profit-oriented industrial forestry (Herbohn, 2006). Understanding the range of local types of (community) forest management should take into account the range of people’s livelihood activities within the forest–farm interface (Cronkleton et al., 2013). The Forest and Farm Facility defines ‘Forest-and-farm producers’ as “women and men, smallholder families, indigenous peoples and local communities who have strong relationships with forests and farms in forested landscapes. Such producers grow, manage, harvest and process a wide range of natural-resource-based goods and services for subsistence use and for sale in local, national and international markets.” ‘Forest and Farm Producer Organizations’ (FFPOs) are “formal or informal associations of producers – women and men, smallholder families, indigenous peoples and local communities – who have strong relationships with forests and (often) farms in forested landscapes” (DeMarsh et al., 2014). This paper refers mostly to the term ‘farm/family forestry’ that is being used by FFF and IFFF globally, while recognizing that in the African context there is much overlap with other concepts that describe forest management involving farmers, such as: small-scale forestry, smallholder plantations, community forestry, agroforestry and trees on farms.
1.1 Status of Farm/ Family Forestry in Africa

Locally controlled forestry in Africa is mainly established through individual tree owners and community forestry. Family forestry and forest associations are common forms of local management in some countries (such as Cameroon and Liberia). Review of national forestry policies confirms a trend towards devolving forest management to local communities, with community forestry being developed in most countries. Countries explicitly refer to agroforestry, trees on agriculture land, or farm-forestry, as practices that should be promoted for sustainable forest management (See Table 1). The government of Ethiopia aims to promote farm-forestry practices among rural communities by providing seeds, seedlings, technical support on planting and conserving tree species and training on marketing of forest products (The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2007). The Gambian forest policy encourages tree farming on agriculture lands and aims to facilitate rural communities and regional Farmer Platform in natural resource management (Government of Gambia, n.d.). In Kenya, commercial and sustainable tree-growing is promoted throughout a number of policies and laws, including the Forest Act, the Forest Policy, the Energy Policy, the Energy Act, the Land Policy, the Land Act, the Agriculture Policy and the Agriculture Act. Kenya’s 2010 Constitution provides important basic elements in support of farm/ family forestry. It grants all citizens the rights to land, property and an equitable sharing of natural resources. Moreover it introduces land reforms that hold principles to equitable, efficient and productive land holding and the state commits to achieving and maintaining tree cover of at least 10 percent of total land area (Makhanu, n.d.). The new forest policy of 2014 explicitly supports the development of community and farm forestry and the marketing of forest-based products (Republic of Kenya, 2014).

Despite the objectives set to promote farm-forestry in national forest policies, national institutional frameworks for farm-forestry still appear to be in early development with little official rights granted to rural communities. Country experts describe the overall status of farm/family forestry mostly as “weak” or “not developed”. The institutional measures and legal basis to tree and land tenure and locally controlled forestry are largely absent or still in early stages of development. Despite the efforts of numerous public and private organizations listed (such as: Ministry of Forestry; NGOs; FAO; IUCN; ICRAF; Farmers’ Union. See Chapter 4), there is still an overall lack of awareness on legal rights, techniques and skills regarding farm/family forestry (Interviews, May 2015). This shows the importance of putting the intentions formulated in current policies into actions, or, as formulated in Ghana’s Forest Policy, to: “Enact the legislations that will enable communities to benefit from trees on their farms and fallow lands, provide off-reserve tree tenure security, authority to legally dispose of resources and allocate greater proportion of benefits accruing from resource management to community members individually or collectively” (Republic of Ghana, 2011). In Zambia, the government aims at integration of agriculture and forestry sectors, which could offer a strong institutional basis for Sustainable Forest Management (Mulenga, 2014).
Table 1: Status of Farm/family forestry and FFPOs in national forest policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Farm/family forestry in national forest policy</th>
<th>FFPOs in national forest policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>TO BE IDENTIFIED</td>
<td>TO BE IDENTIFIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Promotion of community forestry; Improved use of forest products; Agroforestry (promote techniques, seeds, seedlings,); Afforestation and reforestation to produce woodfuel; Simple management plans for artisanal timber and NTFPs; Agroforestry under Carbon finance (CDM) (Gouvernement de la Republique Democratique du Congo, n.d.).</td>
<td>Promote creation of small and medium enterprises to formalize and valorize certain NTFPs (Gouvernement de la Republique Democratique du Congo, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Objectives on Farm forestry are: promote partnerships with land owners to increase on-farm tree cover; promote investment in farm forestry; promote on-farm species diversification; promote development of forest based enterprises; promote processing and marketing of farm forestry products; promote forestry extension and technical services (Republic of Kenya, 2014).</td>
<td>Community forest associations, forest-based enterprises, non-wood forest product enterprises (Republic of Kenya, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Provides right to obtain rural land in areas designated for forest development; participatory management plans with communities for conservation and production purposes; Introduce farm-forestry practices among the farming and semi-pastoral communities and provide them with sufficient amount of plant seeds and seedlings; Provide technical support to farmers and semi-pastoralists In the selection and planting of tree and forage plant species and conservation of the existing ones; give technical advice to farmers, semi-pastoralists, individual forest owners and organizations on technical advice on marketing of forest products to be given to farmers, semi-pastoralists, individual forest owners and organizations (The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This overview focused on to the status of farm/family forestry in national forest policies. A broader assessment, including national policies related to land, agriculture, environment, climate change and energy, could provide a more in-depth and cross-sectoral analysis of the formal status of farm/family forestry. See for example Makhanu n.d. for such an overview for Kenya.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Promote development of small- and medium-scale industries in the rural areas and provide an enabling framework for participation of local communities and the private sector in forest conservation and management, eliminating restrictions on sustainable of essential forest products by local communities, and promoting planned harvesting and regeneration of the forest resources by Village Natural Resources Committees (VNRC’s) (Government of Malawi, 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enact a law that removes restrictions to access to the use of forests and forest products, and promote equity and participation by local communities; Promote proven methods for utilizing forest products and introduce value-adding processes; Enhance sustainable and profitable networks of rural marketing services and the transportation of forest products; Promote increased forestry production, controlled utilization of over-mature trees and access for the collection of non-timber forest products; Encourage agroforestry and establishment of nurseries; Promote on-farm planting; Establish incentives to promote community-based conservation and a sustainable utilization of the forest resources, including on-farm trees, and fostering the growing of trees by all sections of the communities; Strengthen and maintain regular reward system for tree planting and promote growing of trees by individual companies, estates, local communities and authorities, including the integration of forests and trees into farming systems, soil conservation activities and land-use systems; Ensure that the Forest Act makes adequate provision for the conservation and management of forests and trees on private land (Government of Malawi, 1996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Creation of work and revenues for the benefit of the population. Participation and responsibilities of the population in forestry activities and decentralized natural resources management. A cutting permit is required for all tree cutting inside of forests, except for trees from permanent agriculture. Forest exploitation of decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghana</strong></td>
<td>Enhance active participation of communities and land owners in resource management; address issues on tree tenure and benefit sharing; promote the development of viable forest and wildlife based industries and livelihoods; Enact the legislations that will enable communities and individuals to benefit from trees on their farms and fallow lands, Support specialized training and craftsmanship schemes for wood processing, bamboo, rubber wood, cane and rattan and lesser-known tree and NTFP species (Republic of Ghana, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liberia</strong></td>
<td>Develop and implement a national reforestation program, including realistic annual targets for new planting, enrichment planting and agroforestry; Develop appropriate mechanisms and incentives to encourage involvement of the private sector and local communities in reforestation; Encourage tree planting for environmental improvement and income generation by the private sector, individuals, local communities and community-based organizations; Establish a framework for community forest management that allows communities to maximize benefits from all potential uses of forests and to grant user and management rights and responsibilities to them (Republic of Liberia, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gambia</strong></td>
<td>Promote community forestry management; encourages tree farming on agricultural lands, grazing lands, and along roadsides to improve their productivity and contribute to soil and water conservation; promotes private sector involvement in non-wood forest products, processing and marketing (Government of Gambia, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Communities have started to formalize their management’s legal rights from 2002 (FAO, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Support community forestry; Facilitate the entry of small farmers and entrepreneurs by introducing incentives and by minimizing barriers; Establish the districts within which new afforestation would be most beneficial, as well as the land-use and farming systems best suited to the needs of the local people, and ways of assuring the supply of wood to capital intensive processing plants; Provide training and advice to small farmers, contractors and entrepreneurs in skills such as those needed to negotiate and manage contracts develop district level or catchment level plans for areas where there are many small farmers in forestry developments in order to regulate small-scale afforestation so that social and environmental costs are mitigated and impacts on water resources minimized (Government of South Africa, 1997).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Promotion of private investments in forestry such as in non-wood forests products, carbon forests, farm forests, plantation forestry and homestead forestry should be encouraged; Promotion of Community-based participation in the management of protected forest areas and forests on customary lands; Provide training in managing certified forests, carbon trade, harvesting and preservation skills for entrepreneurs wishing to deal in NWFPs; Encourage and facilitate private sector investment in the production, value adding and marketing of NWFPs; Encourage harvesting techniques that ensure optimal regeneration of non-wood forest products; Promote involvement of women in small scale enterprises dealing in NWFPs; Providing incentives for the creation of enterprises and forest-based livelihood systems; Support public private partnerships in the establishment of forest industries, especially small scale and cottage industries in potentially high value and marketable products such as honey, beeswax, carbon trading, rattan and timber; Encourage small scale enterprises dealing in NWFPs such as carbon credits and, mushrooms, honey and bees wax processing. Local communities including community-based organizations (CBOs), shall be the key actors in planning and management of forests and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establish a comprehensive understanding of the resource base by carrying out periodic inventories of NWFPs; Facilitate the development of appropriate technologies for the propagation and productivity, harvesting, processing and commercialization of economically important NWFPs such as orchids, rattan, bamboo, honey and beeswax to enhance livelihoods (Zambia, 2009).

1.2 Farm/ Family Forestry’s contribution to livelihoods and economic development

Forest and tree resources provide poor people with means for subsistence and cash income. By this it contributes to poverty reduction and provides livelihood diversification to supplement often-low agriculture production (Sunderlin et al., 2005). Contributions of farm/family forestry to economies may range from local trade of food products, medicines, oils, fodder, eco-tourism, providing wood for construction and energy, to trade in valuable tree crops for international markets (Hajjar & Timko, 2014; Makhanu, n.d.; Mulenga, 2014; Nganje, 2013). Indeed, empirical data shows that family forestry is good business because forests can bring appreciable income and keep producers on their land. For instance, according to Azevedo-Ramos (2013), gross annual income per hectare in Brazil for cattle ranching, agriculture and forest management are estimated at US$ 17, US$ 20 and US$ 55 respectively. The production of timber and non-timber products can be sustained from the same forest concessions, for different stakeholders, with appropriate practices and institutional arrangements (Snook et al. 2015). Also due to this variety of products, sources, and destinations, data on forest and tree products’ contribution to livelihoods and economic development are often fragmented or non-existent. Nonetheless, it is believed that trade of tree/forest products offer important contributions to household budgets and livelihood diversification (Dawson et al., 2014). This impact of farm/family forestry on economic development is likely to be underestimated due to largely informal and domestic markets. For example, the largely informal chainsaw milling and trade of wood for domestic markets in Cameroon, largely sourced from shifting cultivation, is estimated to create 44,000 jobs (Cerutti & Lescuyer, 2011). Woodfuel provides important sources of income to producers in areas of high demand, with an estimated 300,000 people involved for supply of DRC’s capital Kinshasa alone (Schure et al., 2014). Some of world’s major tree crops are being produced in smallholder systems, such as coffee and cocoa. Whereas crop productivity in small integrated management systems may be lower compared to mono-crop plantations, tree productivity can be higher due to the relatively intensive management provided in agroforestry systems. In addition, income from these trees can be supplemented by income from harvesting of forest and tree products from diverse landscapes (Idol et al., 2011). Below sections illustrate the importance of farm/family forestry to livelihoods and economic development, according to two production categories: Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) harvesting from forestlands and Smallholder tree-growing practices producing Agroforestry Tree Products (AFTPs) on farmlands.
Non-timber forest product harvesting and economic development

Non-timber forest product harvesting by rural populations involves a large variety of products for trade, consumption or other uses and thus contributes in a large variety of ways to people’s livelihoods. Estimating national market values of NTFPs remains difficult due to lack of official data and fragmented case studies using different methods to calculate real or estimated market values. Overall, environmental income has been estimated to contribute 28 percent of household income to rural populations in developing countries, of which 77 percent is accounted for by income from natural forests (Angelsen et al., 2014). An overview of case studies from Africa shows that the proportion of household income from NTFPs can vary widely, from 15 percent to 80 percent for the groups studied, with generally a higher proportion of NTFP income among poorer groups (Jammadass et al., 2015). A review of case studies on annual market values of NTFPs in Cameroon revealed highest values for woodfuel (379 million USD), Gnetum africanum, G. Buchholzianum (12 million USD), Irvingia gabonensis/Irvingia wmbula (8 million USD) and Prunus africana (almost 3 million USD) (Ingram et al., 2012). Surveys of NTFP trade of bush mango, eru leaves, honey, bamboo, gum Arabic, pygeum bark, raffia, bamboo and cola nuts, estimated a total annual market value of 32 million USD, with 34,000 people involved (Ingram, 2014). In the Miombo, NTFPs offer often under-estimated economic importance to rural poor by provision of woodfuel, food and medicinal plants (Syampungani et al., 2009). In Kenya’s arid and semi-arid lands, tree-planting is rare and wood products are generally collected from naturally occurring woodlots. These products, including woodfuel, frankincense, myrrh, gum Arabic, aloe, resin, sandalwood and herbal medicines have limited contribution to household income due to underdeveloped markets for these products (Makhanu, n.d.).

Smallholder tree-growing practices and economic development

Agroforestry trees provide services and products (AFTPs) that improve cash income, food security and environmental resilience and ultimately contribute to the Millennium Development Goals of improved human welfare, poverty alleviation and reduced environmental degradation (Leakey et al., 2005). Agroforestry can be one of the strategies towards sustainable intensification of agriculture production. This is of special importance for the African continent where poverty and hunger remain widespread and per capita food production has only increased for North and West Africa (34 and 10 percent respectively, since 1960) with per capita decreases of 21 percent in East Africa, 22 per cent in Southern Africa and 40 percent in Middle Africa (Pretty et al., 2011). Agroforestry can be part of poverty reduction strategies by increase of on-farm food production and provision of cash income, when accompanied by marketing strategies and enterprise development (Garrity, 2004). Farmers use tree resources as an important additional source of income, especially when crop prices decrease (Idol et al., 2011). In Africa, hundreds of tree species (of which around half indigenous species) have been identified that perform multiple services to people’s livelihoods, providing apiculture, fibre, fodder, food, fuel, medicine, soil improvement and timber (Dawson et al., 2014). Farmers generally grow single trees of species by planting, transplanting or allowing for natural regeneration of valuable species. Trees are grown in production forests, agroforestry systems or home gardens. Assessment of major globally traded tree-products, palm oil, coffee, rubber, cocoa and tea from African regions show high export values, especially for cocoa and rubber from the Western African region (See Figure 1). These tree-crops are often found on smallholders farmlands, but the
The exact portion of export value accrued by smallholders is unknown (Dawson et al., 2014). Examples of valuable African tree-products that are harvested by smallholders and traded on regional and international markets are safou fruit (*Dacryodes edulis*), Njansang *Ricinodendron heudelotii* and Kola nut (*Cola nitida*) and the bark of *Prunus Africana* for the pharmaceutical industry (Ingram et al., 2009; Jannadass et al., 2011).

**Figure 1: Export value of major tree-crops in African regions**

![Export value of major tree-crops in African regions](chart1.png)

Source: FAOSTAT, 2014. Most recent export values are provided for 2011. Cocoa includes beans, paste, butter and powder & cake, coffee includes extracts, greens, husks and skins, and roasted, oil palm includes oil and kernel, rubber includes natural dry and natural.

Tree domestication for tree products in demand, such as mango kernels (*Irvignia spp*) and Eru/Okok leaves (*Gnetum africanum*) in Central Africa, can help to reduce pressure on overharvested wild tree species and improve product quality that responds to market demand. Not only the tree products provide for cash income, but also the improved trees and nurseries...
can offer substantial income generation (Asaah et al., 2014). Domestication of fruits and nuts from Cameroon show a good example of how farmers manage to cultivate commercially attractive trees within diverse agriculture systems, mainly in cocoa agro-forestry (Leakey et al., 2005). Commercialization of ATFPs in Southern Africa confirms the potential of domestication trees for improving livelihoods of poor farmers (Leakey et al., 2005).

Other economic benefits of tree-growing may be provided indirectly, such as the increased crop production and uptake of apiculture as consequences of dissemination of fertilizer trees in Cameroon (Asaah et al., 2014). Growing trees and bushes for fodder by smallholder farmers in Southern Africa contributes to livestock production and related household income (Chakeredza et al., 2007). Tree plantations can be profitable to smallholders when demand is relatively stable and provide additional sources of income to supplement income of agriculture crops (Idol et al., 2011; Pokorny, Hoch, & Maturana, 2010).

Inter and intra-household differences in obtaining benefits from tree products need to be considered. NTFPs play an important role in coping strategies of poor households and vulnerable groups of women and children by either subsistence use or trade (Shackleton & Gumbo, 2010). Poor households tend to have a greater proportion of household income from sales of NTFPs, but absolute revenues are higher for wealthier households (Angelsen et al., 2014). Women have generally less involvement in agroforestry practices in terms of surfaces and quantities of tree planting and when fruits are being commercialized they are more likely to be involved in retailing with little control over the production process (Kiptot & Fanzel, 2012). Although in the Congo Basin it are both men and women who benefit from NTFPs for cash income and domestic use, trade of high-value NTFPs is generally controlled by men (Ingram et al., 2014).

1.3 Farm/ Family Forestry and sustainable landscape management

Farm/family forestry is believed to contribute to a variety of ecosystem services including: improved soil and water conservation, conserving biodiversity, weed and pest control and carbon sequestration in plant biomass and soil organic matter (Idol et al., 2011). Whereas natural stands of forest products are likely to become overexploited under increasing demand and weak resource governance regimes, farmers’ efforts in protecting and growing tree resources hold great potential for sustainable landscape management. The West African Sahel and Burkina Faso and Niger in particular have seen massive tree planting by farmers, which has improved soil quality, water catchment, biomass levels and livelihood benefits (Mortimore & Turner, 2005; Pretty et al., 2011). Integrated landscape management approaches that provide incentives to farmers and agroforestry can contribute to diminishing pressure from agriculture on protected areas (Ashley et al., 2006).

Tree planting on farm-lands can serve as windbreaks or living fences, while protecting crops from wildlife, providing for shade and improved soil fertility. Erosion control and aesthetic reasons may be other benefits from the planted trees and shrubs. Local agroforestry in South Africa comprises a number of different practices (in order of importance): ‘living fences’, ‘roadside plantings’, ‘micro catchments’, ‘improved fallows’, ‘open spaces/public areas’, ‘contour’, ‘windbreaks’, ‘borderlines’, ‘waterways’, ‘home gardens’, ‘earthwork structures’, and ‘alley cropping’ (Kelso & Jacobson, 2011). Small-holder land management generally provides for higher biodiversity compared to intensive large scale land systems and they can
provide corridors for forest-dependent species to increase connectivity in forest landscapes. Smallholders can be part of reforestation programs “as long as there is flexibility to accommodate tree harvesting, understory planting or manipulation, and the inclusion of non-native species that are of particular value to smallholders” (Idol et al., 2011).

Improved soil fertility by agroforestry can assist farmers in regions with degraded lands and lack of means to buy fertilizers, such as in large parts of Central Africa (Asaah et al., 2014). Tree planting can have different effects on soil fertility and avoiding of degradation. An example from Ethiopia shows how specific trees on farms (C. macrostachyus and C. Africana) contributed to soil fertility of farmlands besides providing for other products and services (Gindaba et al., 2005). In Malawi, dissemination of agroforestry with fertilizer, fruit and fodder tree systems improved soil quality and food production (Beedy et al., 2013). In the savannah regions of DRC’s plateau Bateke, planting of Acacia auriculiformus in a rotating agroforestry system did improve soil fertility, but only to a limited extent that still required slash-and-burn practices to release sufficient nutrients for new cultivation cycle (Kasongo et al., 2009).

Smallholder agroforestry practices can contribute to conservation of tree species on-farm, which helps to avoid further encroachment into forests and acts as corridors of wild stands in the wider landscape (Dawson et al., 2013). Options to manage for diversity of tree-species from more natural induced systems (such as protection or assisted natural regeneration) to more human led systems (such as tree domestication) depend on the stage of landscape change (tree cover transition curve) (Ordonez et al., 2014). Agroforestry or tree-planting by farmers do not automatically protect diversity of tree species, as illustrated for example by a case study on Burkina Faso where, from a choice of over hundred locally found tree species, farmers plant primarily cashew nut trees for cash income and only five different fruit trees (Augusseau et al., 2006). Cameroon’s southwestern lowlands found that agroforestry lands contained far less endemic species (18% decrease of bird species to 90% decrease of understory plants) compared to near primary forests in the region (Waltert et al., 2011). A study on agroforestry systems in Kenya found that most indigenous species were located in the living fences, with little diversity and conservation potential to be found at the smallholder coffee farms (Pinard, et al., 2014).

Smallholders’ diversification of agroforestry management systems is likely to create more resilience of these land systems to future climate change (Lasco et al., 2014). Whereas agriculture is a main contribute to greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), agroforestry can contribute reducing emissions by storing CO₂ in its tree biomass and soil organic matter. Agroforestry is an important sustainable alternative to Slash and Burn agriculture and it is estimated that agroforestry sequesters three times as much carbon compared to croplands or grasslands (an additional 57 Mg C/ ha)(Sanchez, 2000). Carbon finance projects that are inclusive to non-carbon benefits can assist farmers to transition to more sustainable land management (Foster & Neufeldt, 2014). Agroforestry and farm managed natural regeneration can be a low-cost solution for land scape restoration, supported by finances from Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), as illustrated by a project in Ethiopia (Brown et al., 2011).

The fallows and agroforestry systems that follow conversion of forest lands are valued for their variety of goods and ecosystem services. However, based on case studies from developing countries, Pfund et al. (2011) argue that this may just be a temporary phase, eventually to be turned into more profitable, but less diverse, monoculture farmlands.
Moreover, it should be noted that tree planting can also have adverse effects on ecosystems. Smallholder plantations that may be effective in providing ecosystem services on degraded land areas have low or even negative outcomes when they replace existing landscapes on fertile (more profitable) soils (Pokorny et al., 2010). Some tree planting that provides cash income and diversification to households, such as Eucalyptus by farmers in Ethiopia, has been adopted despite farmers’ perception of adverse environmental impacts and possible negative effects on farm lands and crop production (Jenbere et al., 2012). Uptake of producing commercial trees and bushes, such as jatropha for biofuel in outgrower schemes in Zambia, actually leads to more clearing of forests. This is the direct result of need of more land for planting of the tree crop and indirectly to replace the land previously used for food crops (German et al., 2011).

**Opportunities for Farm/Family Forestry in Africa**

Farm/family forestry holds great potential for expansion throughout Africa while providing for people’s livelihoods and sustainable land management. Domestication of new tree crops enhances multi-functionality of agroforestry systems while providing food security and income to poor smallholder farmers (Asaah et al., 2014). Smallholders tree-planting and agroforestry systems are increasingly recognized as way to increase farmers’ resilience to future risks under climate change (Lasco et al., 2014). Current policy reforms in many African countries to devolve responsibilities to local communities offer new opportunities to secure access and tenure over land and trees. Improved farm/family forestry needs to build upon existing best practices and new opportunities, such as benefits from ecosystem services, carbon sequestration and biofuel market. It should answer to present challenges related to climate change, food security and inclusion of vulnerable groups and involve policy frameworks that bring together forestry and agriculture sectors (Mbow et al., 2014).

Compensation mechanisms such as, Carbon finances and biocarbon projects, REDD+ payments, Payments for Environmental Services (PES), sustainability certification, eco-tourism enterprises can offer financial incentives and investments to support long-term sustainability of smallholders’ land use. Such mechanisms need to be accompanied by measures to secure tenure and organize smallholders in ways for them to participate, e.g. direct linking them up with global carbon markets, while avoiding high transaction costs (Child & Barnes, 2010; Idol et al., 2011; Jindal et al., 2008; Karsenty, 2010). Due to climatological circumstances, Africa’s semi-arid lands in the Sahel region and Southern Africa offer least perspective for sequestering carbon and CDM by afforestation and reforestation projects (Zomer et al., 2006). East Africa is expected to attract most of carbon investors, mainly representing voluntary markets for emission reductions (Jindal et al., 2008). Mechanisms aimed at compensating efforts intended for the Reduction Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) are being prepared and implemented throughout Africa (in Cameroon, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Republic of Congo, Tanzania and Zambia). REDD+ initiatives would benefit from a broad scope on “forests” to include the high potential of agroforestry and wider tree containing landscapes (“Reducing Emissions from All Land Uses” (REALU)) for carbon sequestration and generation of co-benefits (Thangata & Hildebrand, 2012; Vanderhaegen et al., 2015).
2. Main issues facing Farm/Family Forestry in Africa

2.1 Land tenure and other supporting policies

Land tenure

Main issues for farm/family forestry related to land tenure in African countries are:

- Disconnect between official land law and customary rights (official land title may be granted without taking local community rights into account, national law defines that forests belong to Government);
- Local specific and species-specific rules related to tree and land ownership may exclude rights to access by vulnerable groups;
- Land registration is cumbersome and expensive process;
- Pressure on land because of large concessions bought by foreign investors or local elite and demographic pressure (Interviews, May 2015).

There often is a large gap between existing policies and regulations on land and tree tenure and local practices under customary laws. Farmers in Cameroon for example did not know of official laws on access and trade in indigenous fruit species and most of them did not plan on changing their tree planting behaviour (Divine Foundjem-Tita et al., 2014). Often unclear provisions on land tenure and accessing trees complicate long term prospects needed for tree planting. Adoption of tree planting of fruit trees or *Prunus Africana* by farmers in Cameroon depended much on their ownership of land (Degrande et al., 2006; Gyau et al., 2012). On-farm tree planting in Ethiopia has been limited due to lack of secure land tenure, abrupt changes in rural policies and heavy burden of acquiring permits to trade on-farm produced wood products vs. *de facto* open and free access to forest resources (Kassa et al., 2011). Rules on tree felling and rights to naturally occurring timber trees on farmlands in Ghana do not allow for farmers to use timber trees for commercial or domestic use. Without the provision of some type of timber cutting permit for individual farmers, they are forced to burn trees on their lands or, as is often the case, do not comply to these rules and operate their timber harvesting and trade illegally (Ramcilovic-Suominen & Hansen, 2012). In some cases, traditional authorities have actively attempted to fill the void of secure land tenure for tree-planting at local levels, such as via the enactment of bylaws in Zambia (Ajayi & Kwasiga, 2003).

Throughout Africa, it is often customary rules that govern access to land and tree tenure through “combinations of individual/family/lineage/clan rights that interact and vary depending on the conditions” (Karsenty, 2010). Access depends for example on local resource abundance, marriage and inheritance customs, whether the producer is a local or an outsider, gender, traditional customs, social relations, gifts and payments, and respect of local rules (Augusseau et al., 2006; Hansen et al., 2005). A study on tree planting under customary tenure in Malawi showed how the tradition of men moving to women’s villages after marriage forms a disincentive to tree planting (Hansen et al., 2005). Temporary access makes reforestation or domestication unattractive and aggravates pressure on tree resources. Also under traditional rights for local inhabitants, access to land may be temporary as reported for Bateke Plateau in DRC (Vermeulen et al. 2011). This is more common for migrant producers.
who are often granted short-term access for agriculture production. For example in Burkina Faso migrants in agroforestry landscapes were only provided with land for short production cycles of 3-5 years and could not access certain wild tree products that have traditionally been reserved for local women to collect. Planting of cashew trees has however been widely adopted as a popular way to guarantee access to trees and cash income, also among migrant farmers (Augusseau et al., 2006).

The pro-poor qualities of NTFPs for rural populations also depend on governance arrangements including secure tenure (Ros-Tonen & Kusters, 2011). Collection of tree products on communal lands is largely governed under customary laws. These may be more or less effective, depending on the commercial value of the product and social cohesion in a region (Laird et al., 2010). Official government policies on most tree products are rather rare, with exception of some protected or valuable species, such as honey (Shackleton & Gumbo, 2010). Government’s initiative dealing with forest products have been criticized for its poorly coordinated laws, little consultation with chain actors, and ineffective implementation. Regulating forest products can also have adverse consequences when new legislation criminalizes extraction practices, marginalizes harvesters, enables or promote corruption, and obstructs effective customary laws (Laird et al., 2010).

**Enabling policies**

Tenure reforms by which smallholders and local communities have secure access to land and trees are the first prerequisite for sustainable farm/family forestry. Community forestry is being developed throughout African countries. In the Congo Basin region, most countries are active developing community forestry in their legal framework, with Cameroon in most advance stage with 470 designated community forests of which 142 were in possession of forest exploitation permits in 2012. In DRC, Congo and CAR the legal provisions are not yet finalized. There are continuous conflicts between economic operators and local populations due to unclear rights basis and conflicting interests over land use. For community forestry to be effective in controlling forest resources by local population present challenges to overcome are: lack of management skills and structures; heavy and expensive procedures; vulnerable for overtaking by elite or large economic operators; resistance by local administration to effective transfer of rights, and; difficulties to compete with and to integrate informal small scale loggers (Angu et al., 2014; van de Rijt, 2015). The Southern African region has experience with institutionalizing Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), mainly applied for wildlife management on private lands. Although these projects have known some successes, for rural poor to benefit of CBNRM it needs to extent to a variety of wild products and be accompanied by secure defendable communal land titles (Child & Barnes, 2010). Present reforms for territorial plans and national zoning are basis for improved integrated land management (Oyono et al., 2014).

Besides policies that improve rights and access to trees and products, other policies that would support farm/family forestry address freedom of association and registration of producer organizations (See Chapter 3), facilitating market access, business support and partnerships with private sector, promote tree-planting and sustainable agriculture, and dealing with governance and rural development more broadly (deMarsh et al., 2014; IIED, 2014). Policies that create market opportunities and improve economic perspectives of AFTPs, such as export tree crop promotion, appear to be important for the uptake of farm
forestry practices. Policies in other sectors, like expansion of fertilizer use in southern Africa, can also influence uptake of agroforestry. In some cases the rather withdrawn role of government policy turns out to be favorable as appeared for fruit tree planting in Kenya where the private sector took a lead (Ajayi & Place, 2012).

**Policy related challenges**

Although governments generally state that they support farm/family forestry, actual national regulations may be contradictory, as was found for the context of agroforestry and tree planting in Cameroon. Legislation tends to focus more on conservation objectives than on development objectives and there are no mechanisms to distinguish between NTFPs and ATFPs (Foundjem-Tita et al., 2013). Another study reported that throughout Africa, contradicting development and conservation measures complicate agroforestry near protected areas (Ashley et al., 2006). At national levels, some of the policy related challenges identified are presented in Box 2.

Competing land claims and development of new infrastructure projects, extractive industries and land acquisition for agro-industries put pressure on land and weakens long-term perspective for forest-farmers needed for sustainable land management. The legal framework in countries such as DRC and Cameroon shows lack of coherence among sectoral policies (Oyono et al., 2014). Large Scale Land Acquisition throughout Africa often ignores local customary land rights and puts additional pressure on land rights for smallholders and communities. A study on land acquisition of a total 2 million ha in Ethiopia, Ghana, Madagascar and Mali identified agrifood and biofuel as two equally large drivers for investor (Vermeulen & Cotula, 2010). Over the past few years, Cameroon has granted around twenty large-scale concessions for production of palm oil, rubber, rice and maize (Oyono et al., 2014). Throughout the Congo Basin investors acquire forestlands for bioenergy (oil palm and sugar cane), although large-scale investments are still hampered by lack of infrastructure and government control in remote areas (Karsenty, 2010).
Box 2: Cases of policy related challenges to supporting farm/family forestry

In **Kenya**, policy related challenges related to farm/family forestry are: Lack of incentives to private forestry and out-grower schemes; Insufficient mechanism for benefit-sharing of Participatory Forest Management; No adequate multi-stakeholder platforms; Limited provision of services linked to improved trees and marketing of tree products and insufficient capacity at country levels; Lack of initiatives and capacity of cooperatives and FFPOs; Lack of knowledge on improved nursery management, tree species, pest management, forest enterprises and certification schemes (Makhanu, n.d.).

In **Gambia**, farm/family forestry suffers from conflicts between land holders, weak law enforcement and monitoring of forest and agriculture sector and lack of transfer of ownership to communities. The policy framework in Gambia needs for improved long-term tenure arrangements for farm/family forestry. Present reforms of land tenure and land use plans can improve this situation (Natural Resources Consulting (NACO), 2013).

In **Liberia** there are important reforms that support farm/family forestry, but policies to stimulate marketing and trade of this same forest and tree products lack behind. Forest producer groups lack organizational capacity to access finances (Nanjie, 2013).

In **Cameroon**, the country with longest experience of implementing community forestry in the Congo Basin, difficulties remain regarding: Integration and competition of small-scale informal logging; transaction costs, limited concessions and prohibition of use of industrial equipment that reduce international competitiveness, and mismanagement and corruption of government officials (Eba’a Atyi et al., 2013; Ezzine de Blas et al., 2011 In. van de Rijt, 2015).

International mechanisms aimed at improving sustainable forest management interact with Africa’s national policies and impose new challenges. The FLEGT/VPA that aims to ban illegal timber from European market is likely to benefit trade of industrial concession holder, with very little or adverse benefits for community forest, small or medium forestry enterprises, small-scale loggers who cannot afford its implementation and may be driven out of the market (Atyi et al., 2013; Carodenuto & Cerutti, 2014). Analysis of FLEGT-related reforms in Ghana showed that FLEGT in its present form is unlikely to be inclusive to small-scale foresters and their illegal status, as it is not tackling the underlying issues of tree and land tenure (Hajjar, 2014).

Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (REDD+) stands for national and global actions and policies that aim to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon forest stocks. REDD+ seeks to create a financial value for the carbon stored in forests, offering incentives for developing countries to reduce emissions from forested lands and invest in low-carbon paths to sustainable development. Agroforestry can fit into REDD+ targets directly when it meet the forest canopy cover threshold chosen by a country, or indirectly by its contributions to avoiding deforestation (land sparing) and degradation (by growing alternative tree products) (Minang et al., 2014). REDD+ may help to establish mechanisms for local control over benefits over forests and reinforces
commercialization of NTFPs and conservation outcomes of agroforestry systems. Up to now, REDD+ has not given much attention to small and medium-scale enterprises and agroforestry may not be integrated in national REDD+ plans. Smallholder farmers may not have adequate capacity and organizations to implement REDD+ initiatives (clarify land ownership, data collection and monitoring, financial management) and remain excluded from any benefits (Cerbu et al., 2013; Hajjar, 2014).

Positive examples of policies addressing farm/family forestry

At national levels, policies that are found to be effective in supporting farm/family forestry or FFPOs are: providing secure land titles, subsidizing agriculture production, promote sales and transformation of products, support marketing events for agro-forestry products, provide access to credits, allow for producers to organize themselves, promote tree-planting and guarantee community rights. It is however noted that much of the facilitation to farm/family forestry remains written with hitherto little implementation (Interviews, May 2015). Box 3 shows examples of policies that address challenges of forest/family farming and related organizations.
Box 3: Policies addressing challenges of FFPOs

Gambia’s Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) policy that was launched in 2012, addresses strengthening of forest and farm producer groups and an enabling environment for these groups. This builds upon other efforts of the Government of the Gambia regarding decentralization, participatory forest management and community forestry. The Forest and Farm Facility works together with the government to facilitates ANR policy, with emphasis on: decentralization of tenure rights and forest ownership to communities; stakeholder involvement and awareness in ANR implementation and; strengthening the capacities of producer groups (IIED, 2013).

The large number of policies and laws from different sectors that hold contradictory regulations complicates Zambia’s Natural Resources Management regime. The 1973 Forest Act and 1998 Forest Policy does not provide for meaningful participation of people in forest management or clarity on land and tree tenure for farmers. Land tenure for farm/family forestry is insecure with the Present officially owning forest and land. Zambia’s new constitution proposes reforms and support of a new Land Act and new Forest Act. The Drafts Lands Development Policy of 2006 is likely to improve the tenure rights of farm/family forestry as it recognizes co-management of land by local communities and refers to woodland conservation and improved pasture management. The 2014 Forestry Policy supports farm/family forestry and holds principles on integrated forest and agriculture management that could improve farm/family forestry when supported by a legal framework (currently under reform) (Mulenga, 2014).

Kenya has been at the forefront of tree planting campaigns, with dissemination of materials and information by government and NGOs. The Government of Kenya has also adopted initiatives and policies that can help addressing challenges of FFPOs, such as the adoption of a devolved governance system and development and action plans in different sector, including targets to plant at least 7 billion trees for improved food, water and energy security in its Vision 2030 (Makhanu, n.d.). The institutional support for Community Forest Associations in Kenya was found to have positive impacts on expanding farm forestry (Ogada, 2012).

In Liberia, 2006 reforms of the Forest Law provided for a more participatory approach to forest management and development of community forest management. This was basis to development of the Community Rights Law with respect to forest lands and the Regulation on the Commercial and Sustainable Extraction of Non-timber Forest Products in 2009 and the Community Rights regulation in 2011. Producer groups have been granted improved rights to sustainably harvest NTFPs from their forest lands for use or commercial purposes with tax exemptions until certain quantities or volumes of NTFPs traded. Small and medium forest enterprises or producer groups can exploit timber resources on community lands under the Community Rights Law (Nganje, 2013).
2.2 Market access

Markets for forest products exist throughout Africa in forms of local and urban markets, of which some markets specialize in timber or specific NTFPs (such as for *irvingia gabonensis* or *gnetum Africana* in Cameroon), and wider regional and international markets. Experts report that most of these markets are not properly structured or organized (Interviews, May 2015).

With increasing market exposure, forest and tree products increasingly provide for income generating activities (Ros-Tonen & Wiersum, 2005). Market access determines whether people can use forest/tree products as additional or even main source of income besides possible subsistence use (Ruiz-Perez et al., 2004). Farmers market access for ATFPs have insufficiently been taken into account when introducing agroforestry programs in the past (Russell & Franzel, 2004). Market conditions influence the choices of where and how much forest resources are being extracted and thus the impact on the natural resource base and economic development (Belcher, 2005). Growing urban markets for forest products provide cash-income-earning opportunities to peri-urban smallholders, especially for scarce products in demand (Robinson et al., 2002). Although high demand is generally related to the risk of overharvesting, markets can also stimulate more sustainable methods, or have a specific resource management role, such as the Rural Wood Markets in Mali that involve a delimited forest with specific harvesting quotas and selling points (Hautdidier & Gautier, 2005).

However, there are also limitations related to the potential of NTFP markets for developmental and environmental objectives. First of all, most products are sold in large quantities for low prices within a limited geographical scope (Belcher et al., 2005). These markets for low-value, free-access NTFPs allow a lot of people to engage, but suffer from heavy competition and low profit margins (Sunderlin et al., 2005). Other problems related to NTFP trade are: lack of market information; fragmented markets; low quantities and irregular supplies; perishable nature of the product; lack of storage facilities; poor infrastructure and high transportation costs; lack of organization among producers; lack of credit; and fluctuating prices and demand (Ros-Tonen & Wiersum, 2005).

Markets for specialized, cultivated NTFPs where producers have secure tenure are relatively stable and well developed and concern higher-value products with good returns to investment (Sunderlin et al., 2005). Some farmers have their sales of tree products secured via outgrower schemes as have been implemented especially throughout Southern Africa from the 1960s onwards. In this case, individual tree owners enter contracts with industries to provide them with resources, such as pulpwood and fruits. Conditions for well-functioning and fair schemes are the existence of good infrastructure and secure land rights (Pokorny et al., 2010).

International markets of timber and tree products affect wider trade opportunities of forest/family forestry. A number of African countries have entered negotiations and agreements (Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA)) with the EU to eliminate the export of illegally logged timber to the European Market. These new mechanisms under VPAs potentially exclude smallholders from timber sales (Ayi et al., 2013; Carodenuto & Cerutti, 2014; Hajjar, 2014). Some African countries, such as Cameroon, Gabon and DRC in Central Africa, have put temporary bans on timber exports while reforming national sustainable forest management. In some cases, this has actually led to expansion of local informal timber trade, such as the case in DRC (Oyono et al., 2014). Global demand for renewable energies has
driven investors’ interest in expansion of growing biofuel feedstock, such as in the jatropha outgrower schemes with small-scale farmers in Zambia. These financial flows may offer benefits to rural livelihoods but also imply a risk when farmers depend on single cash crops with still uncertain markets and possibly unfavorable long-term contracts with a company (Germán et al., 2011).

Besides the importance of secure market access, farm forestry producers may face the following challenges in selling their products:

- Low prices due to low bargaining skills/power, lack of market information
- Limited value adding and waste of product due to absence of processing facilities and technologies
- Lack of organization and knowledge of the market chain to respond better to demand (by group marketing, certification etc.).
- Lack of access to finances
- Maintaining quality product standards (freshness, storing, packing)
- Lack of transport and bad roads
- Bribery during transport
- Competing with ‘illegally’ harvested products (Interviews, May 2015).

Access to finance is one of the main challenges for development of Small and Medium Forest Enterprises (SMFEs). An overview of present barriers for African SMFEs to accessing financial services is presented in Box 4. In Cameroon, the government provides credits for agriculture development and farmers, who are organized in groups and possess a guarantee for payment, can access microfinance institutions throughout the country (Interviews, May, 2015). Nonetheless, most SMFEs in Cameroon depend on informal finances from collective saving programs or loans from third parties (Awono et al., 2013). In Liberia, forest producer groups can in theory benefit from microfinance loans provided for by the Central Bank of Liberia, but mostly lack organizational capacity to access these funds (Nganje, 2013). In Zambia, attempts to apply for national Carbon funds to finance planting projects have been unsuccessful due to lack of appropriate institutional framework. New initiatives around preparation of REDD+ policy and FLEGT are driving new strategies for monitoring carbon stocks and combating illegal timber trade. These developments may improve the position and participation of forest and farm producers in private and communal forest management (Mulenga, 2014).
Improved economic viability and sustainability of SMFEs

Collective marketing efforts via producer groups or SMFEs can enable access to markets for smallholders and increase their profits. These groups can offer benefits by reducing transaction costs and increase bargaining power and market chain connections. A study in Cameroon found that continuation of partnerships on trade of NTFPs was especially driven by the mutual benefit of reducing transaction costs, despite low levels of trust and satisfaction on the relationship (Foundjem-Tita et al., 2012). Negative consequences need to be taken into account to assess the total development outcomes of collective marketing for rural poor. Examples of negative consequences are the high costs (sometimes temporarily carried by a project) of organizing groups, costs of free-riders’ behaviour by non-group members, and exclusion of certain vulnerable groups who may then receive less for their individually sold products (Markelova & Mwangi, 2010).

The main conditions for SMFEs that contribute to sustainable forest management and socio-economic benefits are: “clear commercial forest rights, strong social organization and competitive business skills” (Macqueen & Team, 2010). Viability of commercialization of NTFPs by SMFEs depends on market/economic, social, environmental and technological considerations. Outside support by Market Analysis and Development methodology, facilitation of producer groups and enabling business and financial capacity, group sales and market information can assist to expand the markets for NTFPs and opportunities for NTFPs based enterprises (Tieguhong et al., 2012).

SMFEs can spread their risks by diversifying their business to include several NTFPs and by providing to both local and international markets (Shackleton et al., 2007). This helps to deal with seasonal fluctuations and years of bad harvests. Financial stability can also be improved by including processing of NTFPs and adding value as part of the business operation. SMFE’s improve their markets opportunities by knowing the institutional framework for trade and gaining market information. Use of inventories, improved harvesting techniques and post-harvest techniques to stimulate regeneration or cultivating and domestication all contribute to more sustainable extraction of NTFPs (Awono et al., 2013). Investing in locally controlled forestry offers opportunities to support local right-holders’ management of natural resources. Prerequisites for these investments are: secure rights to commercialization of forest products; business skills; strong SMFEs, and; appropriate technologies, finances, and services.

Box 4: Main barriers to access financial services by forestry farmers

- Lack of knowledge, network, and organization or legal status of farmer groups to enter mainstream financial services
- Financial institutions perceive investments in smallholder forestry as high-risk (forest fires, lack of land tenure)
- Lack of collateral security and/or land tenure
- Micro-finance is limited to small investments and durations may be too short for long-term forestry activities
- Conditions for loans can be unattractive or complicated by heavy procedures, high interest loans (Interviews, 2015).
available (Elson, 2012). A study on potential of investments in locally controlled forestry in Mozambique prioritized investments in: community owned forest concessions, community simple licenses for timber and biomass energy, smallholder owned plantation timber supply companies and community plantation based biomass energy (woodfuel) enterprises. Ideally such investments would need to be supported by a programme that focuses on secure local commercial resource rights, business skills, organizational strengthening of producer organizations and facilitation of investments and market access (Nhantumbo et al., 2013). SMFEs have better chances of accessing finances when they are formally registered and have a well-developed business plan. Finances could be provided by government institutions, financial institutions, in the form of microfinance, grants or project finance and new instruments such as PES and REDD+ (Awono et al., 2013). Certification of products can provide incentives to sustainable management and assist SMFEs in entering new market for their products. It is suggested that small farm holders along the Kenyan coast could benefit from certification mechanisms, such as FSC, to help increase transparency and quality of carving wood and establish stronger linkages with carving groups for supplying more markets (Obara et al., 2004). Often certification fees and lack of knowledge on how to obtain certification complicates farmers’ participation in such schemes, as has been the case for forest coffee in Ethiopia (Stellmacher & Grote, 2011).
Box 5: Positive examples addressing challenges of FFPOs

In **Kenya**, the Kenya Forest Service facilitates market access by providing investors with information on suitable commercial species and farmers with technical information on production and management of these species and on how to register a Community Forest Association (Makhanu, n.d.).

In **Zambia**, the Citizen Economics Empowerment Commission (CEEC) provides loans for tree planting to individuals, cooperatives, and small, medium and large enterprises (before 2007 this was the Forest Development Credit Facility (FDCF)). Small grants, of around 2,000 USD, have been provided to individuals and groups such as beekeeping groups, forest nursery groups, fuel wood collection groups etc. Grants did not depend on official land titles, as is a frequent problem for access to credit for those without land, but also went to people based in joint forest management areas, on customary lands and in local forests.

In **Gambia**, the new Forest Act has improved commercial forest rights to forest products for communities by its provision to develop a community forestry and co-manage national park areas under Joint Forest Park Management. Social organization has been enhanced by the Forest Acts obligation to establish a participatory forest management unit and community management committees and product interest groups with representation at national levels. Product based groups and communities have received training through support by FAO on improved business skills, marketing and finances (Macqueen & Team, 2010). The Government’s efforts in transferring land tenure to local communities, capacity building, such as by providing training in Market Analysis and Development methodology and reforestation techniques and providing of support activities, such as start up capital and micro credit, materials, have improved conditions for SMFEs (Tomaselli et al., 2012).

In **South Africa**, commercial forest rights have been addressed in the 2007 Forest Sector Transformation Charter towards Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) that aims to provide better opportunities to black people to own and manage forest through communities or enterprises. Social organization that enables transition to local community forestry has been improved by MOUs between different sectors involved, such as land, forest, SME, water, trade and industry and economic development. Forestry South Africa, a national forest enterprise umbrella organization, provides capacity training in land management and fire control, business planning and access to markets information (Macqueen & Team, 2010).
2.3 Capacity/ technical assistance

Forest farmers’ needs for capacity and extension services involve a number of issues, mainly related to their capabilities for marketing and natural resources management. Main needs listed by experts are:

- Organization in groups or cooperatives;
- Secure access to land and trees and awareness on legal rights;
- Training on sustainable harvesting, conservation, production and post-harvest management;
- Materials for tree-planting and nurseries;
- Training and technologies on processing, packaging;
- Business skills (e.g. conduct cost/benefit analysis before starting new operation), bookkeeping;
- Knowledge on market chain and negotiation skills/bargaining power;
- Market information systems (Interviews, May, 2015).

Present approaches to enhancing capacities for farm/family forestry in African countries mainly deal with building new types of partnerships, introducing new tools and techniques and improving the policy arena.

New partnerships aim to bridge gaps between groups of actors. These may involve forming cooperatives and exchange travels among countries or with enterprises and collaboration with research institutes (Interviews, May 2015). For example the Rural Resource Centers (RCC) in Cameroon function as demonstration centers in bringing together research centers and farmers to test and disseminate new techniques. This has contributed to widely adopted planting of fertilizer trees and resulting benefits from higher crop production and apiculture (Asaah et al., 2014). Also in Cameroon, efforts are being made to link producer groups to potential buyers. In Liberia, there are plans to engage palm oil plantation investors into financing of smallholder plantations and attract other international investors into agroforestry. In Ghana, the Modified Taungya System of plantation development allows for landless persons to enter into partnerships for access to land for tree growing and farming in return for share of the revenues. The existing arrangement between government, land owners and forest fringe communities in forest reserves offer share proceeds of 40% to both the government and the farmers, 15% to the land owners and 5% to the community (Interviews, May 2015). As smallholders often lack the financial means and knowledge to apply for certification schemes, such as FSC individually, they could attempt to apply as a group (such as successful examples of community based forest management enterprise in Mexico have shown). When smallholders are organized in community-based organizations they could also benefit from carbon finance, such as through the Clean Development Program of the United Nations for community-based projects (Idol et al., 2011).

Technical advice on product market chains or on how to grow certain varieties can improve farm/family forestry’s prospects. This involves information transfer from research and providing necessary technologies, skills and materials. Information booklets in the form of illustrated manuals can assist illiterate farmers to identify desired products to develop. The ‘Model Forest Approach’ works in collaboration with farmers (mainly women) to transform and add value to forest products (such as by making oil, pens, charcoal) (Interviews, May 2015). Introduction of fast-growing and N-fixing shrubs in Malawi, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zambia and Cameroon has improved maize cultivation developed by on-farm testing and
continuous farmer involvement. Farmers’ involvement in participatory trials has brought many locally adapted innovations in pruning, planting and nurseries from farmers themselves (Pretty et al., 2011). In DRC, NGOs are actively disseminating tree-planting techniques among rural populations (Interviews, May 2015).

Present reforms of forest policies across African countries are expected to provide a more enabling environment to farm/family forestry. In DRC, new regulation on exploitation of NTFPs is presently being negotiated (Interviews, May 2015). Awareness raising among Forest Farmers on their rights and obligations is an important prerequisite for any meaningful implementation.
3. Forest and Farm Producers’ Organizations

3.1 Status of Farm/Family Producer Organizations (FFPOs) in different regions of Africa

In the past, producer organizations often failed to provide desired services due to dependence on government support, which led to heavy political interference as well as internal leadership and managerial problems (France-Leonard 2014, Owusu 2013, Paumgarten et al. 2012).

Nowadays, things are fast changing with an increasing role of FFPOs being recognised in unleashing the economic power and entrepreneurial potential of indigenous peoples, local communities and private smallholders at scales that transform landscapes (FFF 2015, deMarsh et al. 2014, FAO 2014a).

They do this by:

- Increasing the political “voice” of small-scale forest and farm producers to secure tenure and other rights to the natural resources on which their enterprises are based.
- Increasing the negotiating power of forest and farm producers to obtain fair value for their products and environmental services.
- Delivering business advice and services to forest and farm producers through partnerships with non-governmental organizations, consultants, private companies and governmental and development agencies.
- Forest and farm producer organizations build the capacity of otherwise isolated and marginalized producers to achieve financial, food and energy security, increase their resilience and adaptability to climate change, sustainably manage their forestlands and farms, and boost their participation in policy processes (FAO 2014a&b).

Farm/Family Forest producer organizations are of various kinds and sizes with varying objectives and responsibilities to their members (Owusu, 2013; Paumgarten et al., 2012). Their scale of operation ranges from community, national and regional levels depending on the enabling legal, institutional and policy environments. Aside the foregoing, the scale of FFPOs can also be influenced by the spatial distributions of the products that drive the formation of the groups. This section of the paper tries to capture the status of FFPOs and how they are formed in Africa, their coverage, their product base and their overall institutional and policy environments. The outlook of FFPOs in selected African countries is also pinpointed with special emphasis on information gaps, opportunities and challenges in the next 5-10 years.

From the responses of resources persons in all the countries studied in Africa, FFPOs find their presence in various forms and are easy to organise at community or regional levels. The policy environment is generally favourable for their registration and the formation of associations or federations. The product or service base for the formation of FFPOs include timber, non-timber forest products (NTFPs), and ecotourism in countries such as Cameroon, DRC, Ethiopia, Liberia, Zambia and Burkina Faso. In countries such as Ghana, Kenya and Mozambique, FFPOs are formed around producer groups along the chain of custody such as tree growers association, artisanal milling groups, or domestic lumber traders associations. A combination of these arrangements (individual product based and producer groups) can be found in Gambia and South Africa (Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Easiness to organize FFPOs</th>
<th>Easiness to register FFPOs</th>
<th>Existence of associations / federations</th>
<th>Product base of FFPOs</th>
<th>Missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Timber NTFPs</td>
<td>Baseline on the performance of FFPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NTFPs</td>
<td>Baseline on performance of FFPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tree growers</td>
<td>Extent of farm/family forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Gum olibanum (NTFPs)</td>
<td>-Forestry dependent on Ministry of Agriculture -Baseline on performance of FFPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline on the performance of FFPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, well-structured shea butter association</td>
<td>Around fuelwood, charcoal or value chain of single product such as shea or several NTFPs</td>
<td>Baseline on the performance of FFPOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Producer groups along the chain of custody e.g. Artisanal Milling groups, Domestic Lumber Traders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little legal connectivity between SMFE proprietors and forest tenure policy environment and links to other sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kommentert [PB10]:** I am not sure the way it is presented adds a lot of value. Is it possible to maybe transform into text and perhaps bullet points? Maybe you could say that all the answers from interviews said it was easy to organize (and why if information available).

And then develop a bit more on product base and missing information (it is not totally clear what is meant by that either, maybe find another term that “Missing” information?)

And then, if possible find linkages or more analysis based on the two last columns? For example, do we know why shea butter producers are better organized in Burkina than the other producers?

**Kommentert [JC11]:** I agree – this could be an annexe – text could summarize.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Associations and cooperatives are organised around products such as charcoal, timber and NTFPs.</th>
<th>Policy recognition but poorly implemented in practice with few commercial activities. Community forestry not clear in legal text. Need to organise SME into legal cooperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Associations, Tree growers association &amp; programmes</td>
<td>No information on individual/family forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, three phases</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tree crop growers (Cashew), ecotourism, fuelwood, honey/honey by-products Timber/NTFPs</td>
<td>No information on individual/family forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indigenous trees growers</td>
<td>No information on individual/family forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Timber and NTFPs, small tree growers, black empowerment in the forestry sector</td>
<td>No information on individual/family forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Loosely organized</td>
<td>No information on individual/family forests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kommentert [PB12]: Please expand acronym and put it in the list of acronyms.
A few examples of FFPOs are taken from Cameroon, Kenya and Burkina Faso to illustrate their key characteristics. In Cameroon we find common initiative groups, associations and federations formed around NTFPs or timber. Community forestry forms the entry point for associations formed by village communities to harvest and sell timber. Examples of NTFPs-based FFPOs in Cameroon include Mount Cameroon Prunus Management Company (MOCAP) and the Forest and Agroforestry Promoters (FAP). In Kenya, An example of an FFPO that works on forest and environmental issues is the Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG) that works in collaboration with the Kijabe Environment Volunteers (KFWG/KENVO). An example of a more gender sensitive FFPO is the Songtaaba Women’s group, also known as the Songtaaba-Yarglé Association (ASY), that produces and commercializes shea butter or Karité in Burkina Faso. More on these FFPOs is provided below.

Box 6: Examples of FFPOs in Cameroon

NTFP-based FFPO

MOCAP was created in 2000 as a common initiative group involved in the harvesting and trade of Prunus africana (a major NTFP in Cameroon used in the treatment of prostate cancer in Europe and America) for the benefit of 14 village communities adjoining Mount Cameroon, the highest Mountain in Cameroon. As of 2015, the activities of MOCAP cover 41 villages and support the livelihoods of over 12000 farmers. MOCAP has a Prunus regeneration programme that has produced and distributed over 40000 seedlings in the past five years to farmers and other development agencies such as ICRAF (400 ported seedlings) and WWF (16000 seedlings).

MOCAP started with one product (Prunus africana) but today it is fully registered as a limited liability company and has the authorization to harvest and export three other NTFPs (Yohimbe, Gnetum africana and gum Arabic with 100 tons, 50 tons and 250 tons respectfully attributed in 2015). Yohimbe, gum Arabic and Gnetum spp. are exported to Belgium, France and Nigeria respectively. MOCAP has four permanent management staff and 130 field workers. The success of MOCAP lies in the clarity of objectives, good management and accounting and well-defined benefit sharing mechanism for annual proceeds to all stakeholders, thanks to the support of several regional and international NGOs. For instance, the benefit sharing mechanism applied by MOCAP for the Prunus harvested and sold from the Mount Cameroon National Park is as follows:

- 43% to prunus harvesters
- 20% to park management
16% to village development projects  
7% to regeneration programme  
7% to MOCAP management and coordination  
4% to transportation of Prunus barks from forest to villages  
3% to warehousing of products (Interview, May 2015)

Capacity building FFPO

FAP was created in May 2001 by indigenes of the Northwest Region of Cameroon that have interest in the sustainable management of natural and wetland resources and is registered with the government of Cameroon with reference number: 137/F31/067/SCAB. FAP’s mission is to promote the sustainable management of the natural and wetland resources in the Western highlands of Cameroon. Major problems that FAP has been trying to resolve over the past 15 years include: low farm income, poor farming practices, uncontrolled and over-exploitation of forest and wetland resources, inadequate technical and management capacities of local communities, poor leadership within groups and communities and conflicts over the use of available land and forest resources. In order to solve the above-mentioned problems, FAP and partners have resorted to the implementation of the following activities:

- Capacity-building (especially for communities) in the domains of establishing tree nurseries, tree enrichment planting, afforestation, reforestation, beekeeping, market gardening, sustainable agriculture and livestock production;
- Identification and conservation of ecotourism sites and the sustainable management of wetlands resources;
- Facilitation of dialogue processes between the multiple users of wetland and other natural resources;
- Advocacy for women’s rights and participation in natural resources management processes;
- Communicate market channel to target communities.

FAP uses gender-sensitive participatory approaches to technically build capacities and empower poor community members for a more equitable access to and control over natural resources within the community and to reduce poverty and unemployment. FAP focuses on the rural population of the Northwest region of Cameroon that constitutes about 80% of the total population. This huge segment of the population greatly depends on natural resources for most of their income generating activities (crop production, livestock rearing, beekeeping, exploitation of timber, and non-timber forest products). Since the creation of FAP in 2001, FAP have been supported by partners such as UNDP, GEF-Small grants, SNV, and ICRAF to establish tree nurseries that have produced over 80000 seedlings of Prunus africana, jatropha, voacanga and Eucalyptus for distribution to 1200 farmers for planting in farms and water catchment areas. The burgeoning success of FAP lies with the support and training given to its staff by FAO and partners under the project that identified and prioritize eight NTFPs in Ngoketunjia Division for enterprise development from 2007 to 2011 (Interviews, May 2015).

Community based radio FFPO

Still in Cameroon, a vivid example of a community network on local community groupings, is ONEPCAM that has facilitated the setting-up of network of community radios, so that information can reach many communities at the same time (Mbile et al, 2009). ONEPCAM is
a confederation operating as network of NTFPs exploiters with membership opened to small
and large producer cooperatives, federations and farmer organizations. In 2010-2011, ONEPCAM
received support from FAO, ICRAF and CIFOR to organise group sales and train over 80
farmers on collective action, the development of enterprise development plans, record
keeping/financial accounting and savings (Interview, May 2015).

Box 7: An FFPO in Kenya

The Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG) is a gathering of individuals and organizations
(government and non-government, local, national and international) concerned with forests,
their conservation and management. KFWG was formed in 1995 to provide a forum for exchanging
and sharing information and experiences among members. It exists as a sub-committee of the
East African Wild Life Society. The goal of the KFWG is to improve the status of Kenya's forests
and increase the benefits from them through sound management and conservation practices.
The group if managed by an 11 member board comprising at least one community-based organization KENVO.
KENVO’s membership is drawn from the local residents bordering the Keirita Forest.
KENVO works to conserve the biologically rich Kikuyu Escarpment Forests (Mbile et al. 2009)

Box 8: A women focused FFPO in Burkina Faso

Songtaaba is a national organization of women created in 1997 in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
The group was legalized in October 1998. Songtaaba strives to (i) help its women members
improve their living conditions, (ii) assure their autonomy and self-promotion, (iii) enhance
the value of local products (iv) fight women’s poverty, particularly in rural areas. Songtaaba
focuses on two types of activities: (i) socio-cultural and self-improvement activities (literacy,
training, health), (ii) economic activities aiming at providing income to women, primarily through the manufacturing and marketing of shea butter or Karité. From selling wild nuts,
the Songtaaba women have integrated vertically, controlling their value chain by creating
a subsidiary to process shea nuts to butter and soap. They have increased and stabilized
benefits accruing to their more than 3100 members. Sontaaba also provides technical training
in shea butter processing and literacy education to its members. According to Mbile et al. (2009),
the success of Songtaaba as a model FFPO could be linked to four interrelated functional and organisational attributes:

- **A well-functioning group, association/cooperative based on trust, purpose and passion.** The group started small with possibility of regular exchange visits in which all the members participated in turns. Regular internal meetings are key to strengthen the cooperative spirit, share information and purpose and reduce internal competition.

- **Fullness in access, control, ownership of the natural resource base with full trade rights.** It is important for the group to be fully registered with the relevant Ministries so that all transactions are legal. Ownership of the resource should be legal because for the organization to enter into firm agreements with outlets, supply must be fairly well assured as leakages of resources to unauthorized collectors can be prejudicial to expected volumes.

- **Access to technology for communication to reach potential customers, globally and knowledge, training, skills and technology to collect, process products to customer specifications.** The skills of the members in collection and processing products; and in communication with clients, government and investors are very critical. Resources must be committed to acquire the right equipment in processing technology, information and communications technology. Exchange visits by group members to appraise technology should be considered. Third party quality control is always an advantage.
3.2 Assistance given by Forest and Farm Producers Organizations to forestry farmers: their added value potentials

Forest and farm producer organizations unleash the economic power and entrepreneurial potential of indigenous peoples, local communities and private smallholders at scales that transform landscapes (deMarsh 2014; FAO 2014a). They do this by:

- Increasing the political “voice” of small-scale forest and farm producers to secure tenure and other rights to the natural resources on which their enterprises are based.
- Increasing the negotiating power of forest and farm producers to obtain fair value for their products and environmental services.
- Delivering business advice and services to forest and farm producers through partnerships with non-governmental organizations, consultants, private companies and governmental and development agencies.
- Forest and farm producer organizations build the capacity of otherwise isolated and marginalized producers to achieve financial, food and energy security, increase their resilience and adaptability to climate change, sustainably manage their forestlands and farms, and boost their participation in policy processes.

Box 7: Examples of assistance given by Forest and Farm Producers Organizations to forestry farmers

In Cameroon, FFPOs have been noted to assist forestry farmers by bringing them to discussion tables and to meet the challenges linked to rights, access to markets, and capacity development. The added value is that forestry farmers gain access to small equipment and better negotiation skills for better prices of their products (Mala et al. 2012). The potentials for FFPOs in Cameroon lies in the development of NTFP value chains for job creation, green economy, greater profits to producers and higher contribution to the national economy in terms on contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) (Interview, May 2015).

In Kenya, FFPOs provide the platform for the engagement of tree growers, lobby for enabling legal/policy support and provide market access/partnership services. The added value is that there is increased tree planting with little direct government intervention. Greater potentials for efficiency and lie in building capacities on record keeping and taking stock of planted trees (Makhanu, n.d.).

In Ghana, FFPOs usually play advocacy role and link forestry farmers to service providers (Honey project), facilitate sustainable charcoal production in Ghana (Charcoal Project), developing alternatives to illegal chainsaw milling through multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD project) and support the integration of legal timber market into the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) of the European Union with Ghana. The increased visibility of FFPOs could be seen as some sort of added value. The potentials for greater efficiency of FFPOs in Ghana lies in the prioritization and reformation of tree and forest tenure arrangements by
government that promote sustainable forest enterprises. It is suggested that international development partners should provide some portion of annual grants that go solely to governments to support and strengthen FFPOs. Moreover, it is suggested that funding support to FFPOs should be given for reasonable length of time (3-5 years) and should address capacity gaps in product and services diversification through targeted funding (Interviews, May 2015).

In Liberia, FFPOs support forestry farmers mainly in dissemination of policy and information on rights, e.g. National Charcoal Union of Liberia monitors the traders/producers involved in charcoal production; Timber Union is also trying to ensure that its members operate legally; NTFP Union is trying to have control over producers/traders. The added value is that FFPOs are trying to provide enabling business environment to producers and traders as well as provide the hope for the implementation of the Post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) through SMEs (Nganje 2013, Interviews May 2015). Consult Annex 2 for more information on how FFPOs are supporting forestry farmers.

4. Resources and Support

According to Shiferaw et al. (2011), the history of producer organizations in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) is mixed because producer organizations often failed to provide desired services due to dependence on government support, which led to heavy political interference as well as internal leadership and managerial problems. However, good governance, optimal group size, transparency, appropriate product types and market orientation can enhance their role in improving access to markets (FAO 2014a, Paumgarten et al. 2012, Macqueen et al. n.d.). According to deMarsh et al. (2014), encouraging the establishment and successful development of FFPOs should be a priority for governments wishing to promote sustainable forest management and prosperous rural communities. At least four fundamental conditions must be in place to enable sustainable forest management by communities, families and indigenous peoples:

- secure tenure;
- fair access to markets;
- access to support services, especially extension; and
- Effective FFPOs (FFF 2015).

How much technical, financial, institutional or legal supports do FFPOs need to sustain their activities amid the four fundamental pre-conditions? It is pertinent to keep in mind that supports to FFPOs vary and may be influenced by its size, technical capacity of members and administrative procedures of the supporter (Tieguhong et al. 20012b, Macqueen et al., 2009; Donovan et al., 2006). In this paper we try to provide some positive examples on how resources and policy supports have been provided to the development of FFPOs in Africa.

Box 8: Some examples of policy and resources support to FFPOs
In Cameroon, with the advent of the 1994 Forestry Law and its Decree of Application in 1995, the government supports the participation of local communities in sustainable forest and landscape management through community forestry. The creation of the Sub-Directorates of Community forestry and development of NTFP value chains in the ministry of Forestry and wildlife are key policy support tools to the development of FFPOs. The creation of the Ministry in charge of SMEs and clear guidelines for their promotion all reinforces the government support to the development of the sector (Interviews, May 2015). The FAO/EU supported a project on SMFE based on NWFP in Central Africa from 2007 - 2011 that created 63 potentially viable SMFE (Tieguhong et al. 2012a).

In DRC, the government considers FFPOs as important partners to the construction of the national economy. There is still much to do to add to what some donors have been trying to do in the development of NTFP value chains, notably those of *Gnetum africana*, honey, *Dacryodes edulis* (safou) and rattan. Most supports to farmers have been on capacity development, creation of producers platforms or unions of producers, which are still in their infancy. The country has received other supports from USAID, FIDA. Some donors planted trees on Plateau de Batéké but without much collaboration between farmers and foresters. (Interviews, 2015). The FAO/EU supported a project on SMFE based on NWFP in Central Africa from 2007-2011 that led to the creation of 88 SMFEs based on NWFPs.

In Kenya, the government instituted the Kenya Forestry Master Plan 1995-2020 and a new Forests Act 2005 that established the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and mandated it to come up with innovative means of forest management including a strong emphasis on partnerships and engagement of local communities and promotion of private investments (Government of Kenya 2007). The KFS is currently employing the Farm Forestry Filled School (FFFS) methodology as one of the ways of increasing Kenya's forest cover to the prerequisite 10% (Andika et al. 2014). This has led to several farm forestry enterprises in Kenya including tree nurseries, fruit orchards, and woodlots with the main products being honey, mango, seedlings, timber and charcoal (Andika et al. 2014). These are as a result of the strong support from institutions such as the African Forest Forum, the Farm Forestry Small Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK), the Kenya National Farmers Federation (KENAFF), the Forest Action Network (FAN), the Kenya Forests Working Group (KFWG), the National Alliance of Community Forests Association (NACOFA) and the Kenya Forest Growers Association (KFGA). These plethora of institutions provide great opportunities for partnerships and synergies to meet Kenya Vision 2030, Kenya Master Plan and 17.8 million m³ of wood from farm forestry (Makhanu n.d.)

In Burkina Faso, there is a strong donor support to the government Forest investment programme by the Danish, Swedish and Luxemburg Corporations. The World Bank and AfDB are also putting in some financial supports. Thanks to these supports that there are annual tree planting campaigns with seedlings produced and distributed freely to farmers to plant (Interviews, May 2015).

In Ghana, the National Plantation Programmes have been launched to support tree growing and these have been highly successful resulting in thousands of farmers establishing small to medium level plantations. The current enabling environment (policy, legal, institution) is in favour of the development of SMFE with provisions for their legal registration. Outside support from the European Union - Community Sustainable forest Management Project with members of the Association coming from local communities which retain landowning and
resource rights over forest and off reserves. Most members have experience in the timber business because they were formerly illegal chainsaw operators, machine owners and lumber carriers who have collectively abandoned their illegal activities after the initiation of the project (Interview, May 2015).

In **Liberia**, there are strong government and donor supports including: The Children Youth organization supported by World Bank; Forest Connect, Growing Forests Partnerships, and the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF). FFF is supporting FFPOs by working with the Liberian Farmers Union Network (FUN). The aim is to establish at district, county and national level integrated structures of Forest and Farm producer organizations, including the CFF and CFDC. The USAID/PROSPER is trying to build the capacity of communities that have gained Community Forest Management Permit so that they can be able to extract their own resources instead of giving it to outside investors. Government has a National Tree Planting Day that allows the Government to demonstrate the tree planting in the community every year. However, individual tree planting concept is yet far from reality (Interview, May 2015).

In **Malawi**, the goal of the National Forest Policy is to sustain the contribution of the national forest resources to the quality of life in the country by conserving the resources for the benefit of the nation. The general objectives of the policy are to satisfy the people’s many diverse and changing needs, particularly those of the rural people who are the most disadvantaged (Government of Malawi 1996). In this direction, strategies and enabling institutional arrangements are put in place to ensure the participation of local communities through communal individual ownership of forests and forest resources. Other strategies and policy orientations in Malawi has been through:

- the introduction of value addition,
- the provision of investment incentives for the development of small-and medium-scale industries in the rural areas,
- the enhancement and support of sustainable and profitable networks of rural marketing services and the transportation of forest products,
- the encouragement of agroforestry including on-farm trees, and fostering the growing of trees by all sections of the communities in order to achieve sustainable self-sufficiency of wood and forest-derived products,
- the promotion of the establishment of nurseries by communities and individuals and increase the diversity of species;
- the encouragement and enhancement of community and individual marketing of seeds, seedlings and other forest products and
- the strengthening and maintenance of regular reward system for tree planting and improve the public information system (Government of Malawi 1996).

Preliminary synthesis shows that there are no great variations in policy and resources supports FFPOs in the different regions in Africa. Rather we find country level variations as provided in Annex 3.

5. **Outlook**

Scientific literature provides great evidence that the development of FFPOs has a high possibility to create more jobs, ensure food security, reduce poverty, reduce the effect of climate change and conserve biodiversity (Andika et al. 2014, DeMarsh et al., 2014, France-Lanord 2014, Foundjem-Tita 2011). Key challenges and lessons learnt from developed countries.
countries show that land tenure and ownership rights have to be secured, producers need free market access in order to get economic benefits, organizational strengthening is needed, advisory services and forest management plans are key components when striving towards SFM, study visits are important for new thinking, methods or technologies for development (Macqueen et al. 2015, FAO 2014a). The forest sector needs the involvement of SMEs to bring about sustainable community livelihoods and sustainable use of forest and forest resources (Mulenga 2014, Nganje 2013, Owusu 2013, Republic of Liberia, 2006). The studies conducted in 12 selected countries in the Central, southern, western and Eastern parts of the African continent provide opportunities for collective actions, collaboration, networking and partnerships among farmers in forested communities for sustainable livelihoods and landscape management. In this light, the main opportunities and challenges awaiting farm forestry in the coming 5 to 10 years in Africa are summarized as below:

**Opportunities:**
- Farm/family forestry and related FFPOs can contribute to job creation, food security, climate change mitigation and conservation, timber supply and environmental services. There are many forest products that hold potential for commercialization and which can contribute to economic development and sustainable livelihoods.
- Present reforms regarding land and tree tenure and community forestry and creation of multi-stakeholder platform offer enabling policy environments for farm/family forestry to benefit forest management and benefits to local populations.
- Global markets for forest products are expanding.
- International attention, REDD+ projects, Carbon finances, Payments for Environmental Services (Interviews, May 2015).
- Present attention to synergies between climate mitigation and sustainable land management may provide financial incentives to smallholders (Bryan et al., 2010; Insaidoo et al., 2013).
- Reinterpretation of the role of (subsistence) farmers in deforestation towards perceiving opportunities of their contribution to sustainable landscape management (Mbow et al., 2014).

**Challenges:**
- Timber exploitation permits and community forestry in Cameroon are found to be too expensive to compete with the overall presence of informal artisanal timber harvesting (Cerutti et al., 2013).
- Large scale land acquisitions for biofuel and food production puts pressure on remaining lands and tenure for farm/family forestry.
- Integrating customary land rights with official tenure remains a great challenge.
- Overlapping land allocations of different sectors, such as forestry and mining.
- Lack of capacity in forestry services and sometimes contradicting messages of forestry and agriculture extension.
- Project-based funding is (too) short-term to build long-term forestry initiatives.
- Policies regarding farm/family forestry are not being enforced.
- Overall weak capacity, lack of knowledge and organization of FFPOs (Interviews, May 2015).
- Prospects for carbon sequestration and carbon finance are obstructed by complicated tenure situations in most African countries (Unruh, 2008).
- Agroforestry is not always recognized in REDD+ programs and there are knowledge gaps regarding potential carbon benefits of agroforestry and related tradeoffs, costs of monitoring mechanisms and who could access benefits (Ajayi & Place, 2012).
Box 9: Examples of opportunities and challenges in African countries, next 5-10 years

In Cameroon, in terms of opportunities, there are many activities and reforms in the pipeline (revision of 1994 Forestry Law, finalisation of the multi-stakeholder rural development plan, reflections and orientations on the national land management plan, revision of land tenure laws and the presence of many international organisations and active civil society. The challenges lie on how to integrate customary property rights into the management of rural lands, how to deal with land grabbing phenomenon in rural areas and how to promoting family farming against individual farm holdings (Interviews, May 2015).

In the Democratic Republic of Congo, the main opportunity is that policy makers in the country are fully aware of the importance of farm forestry and the different producer organizations. On the challenge side, major problem lies with the political will to prioritize farm/family forestry and the promotion of FFPOs. Developing new ways to persuade them to take the expected actions remains a challenge and may take time (Interviews, May 2015).

In Kenya, many opportunities for farm forestry depend on the 16000 trees growers in Kenya that have added over 17000 ha to tree cover and created 30000 jobs (Makhanu n.d.). There are numerous international donor-funded activities are underway (EU, USAID, FFF etc) and a supportive policy environment for increased wood production (Makhanu n.d.). The main challenges for FFPOs in Kenya include: inadequate incentives for private forestry and out-grower schemes, inadequate legal mechanisms for ensuring equity in benefit sharing, limited mentorship and marketing of forest-products-based entrepreneurs, inadequate knowledge and technologies (clonal forestry, nursery operations, SME development), poor operational efficiencies in terms of credit opportunities, risks posed by pests and diseases etc, inadequate extension services for tree growers and poorly developed markets for environmental services (Makhanu n.d.).

In Burkina Faso, there are many opportunities including support from international development agencies but the greatest challenges to improve individual and collective performance indicators dwell on how to improve technical and financial capacities.

In Ghana, the biggest opportunity is that farmers will own planted trees on their farms and have a share of benefit on trees planted in forest reserves. With a large rural farming population putting in place conducive incentive schemes can result in several thousands of farmers engaging in farm forestry to increase the stock of trees across Ghana’s landscape for carbon sequestration, income generation, timber availability, jobs creation and environmental benefits. The challenges lie in very short time span of supportive projects, over-reliance of FFPOs on NGOs and inability to raise funds own finances, insecure land tenure for “migrant communities” vis-à-vis “land grab” phenomenon and political polarization - factions in FFPOs lead to break up of groups (Interview, May 2015).

In Liberia, the opportunities for the development of FFPOs include: availability of donor funding like FFF to build the capacity; government support to the implementation of community forestry; a move to solve the land tenure rights issue in Liberia and large forest resource and forest lands available for communities to use for improving livelihoods. The challenges in Liberia include: limited access to funding to run their own activities i.e. lack of capital to invest, most donor funding is limited and activities are dictated by them, high cost of loan/interest rates, lack bargaining skills and power or limited capacities, poorly organized FFPOs, weak enforcement of policies, ownership to land is problematic, unwillingness of
some communities to join cooperatives; and difficulties to sustain initiatives after donor supported project timeframe (Interviews, May 2015).

In Zambia, donor support is the biggest opportunity and new measures instituted to reform land management laws to increase the proportion of customary over statutory lands is another great opportunity. The Forest and Farm Facility works with Zambia National Farmers Union and government to develop FFPOS. FFF has just started the organization of FFPOS in two pilot districts in Zambia. However, the involvement of the private sector, micro finance and insurance are both opportunities and challenges for the future (Interviews, May 2015).

Overall, to capture the benefits from the contemporary opportunities requires convincing national governments through appropriate advocacy mechanisms to demonstrate community preparedness and capacity and lobbying for appropriate laws to be in place (Macqueen et al. 2014, Foundje-Tita et al., 2013).

**Conclusion and recommendations**

Farm/family forest producer organizations (FFPOs) can play important roles in sustainable small-scale forest enterprises development and forest landscape management in Africa. However, to sustain the interest of FFPOs in social, economic and environmental sustainability and to have a positive climate footprint, national governments, donors and development partners could build on the opportunities highlighted and tackle the challenges through consistent and longer project timeframes.

**Recommendations:**

- Research and policy on how and under what conditions farmers adopt systems as response to threats of climate change need to be taken up. These efforts need to thrive for linking farm to landscape level, integrate agroforestry in a multi-sectoral climate change policy options and be facilitated by Non-governmental organizations’ support of smallholders and increase of demand driven by private sector (Lasco et al., 2014).
- Policies would need to acknowledge the strong link between clearing land for agriculture and timber exploitation by farmer population, while reinforcing the environmental benefits of trees on farm-lands (Robiglio et al., 2013).
- Programs on carbon benefits of tree-planting/ reforestation should take a landscape approach that recognizes the value of agroforestry land uses (Ajayi & Place, 2012).
- Carbon markets and related domestic policies would need to specifically address AFOLU projects and benefits directed at smallholder farmers (Bryan et al., 2010; Insaidoo et al., 2013).
- Need to draw lessons by research and development organizations on often-fragmented initiatives dealing with farm/family forestry (Ajayi & Place, 2012).
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Annex 1: Status of Farm/family forestry/FFPOs in national forest policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Farm/family forestry in national forest policy</th>
<th>FFPOs in national forest policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Public forests comprise the territory of the rural commune (‘territoire de la commune rurale’) with space to live, produce and protect. Private forests can belong to individuals, private commercial entities, local communities and indigenous communities. Official figures do not include any private forests because there are no official titles given. It is noted that many individual or family plantations exist throughout the country, but most of these have no official land title. (Département des forêts Organisation des Nations Unies pour l’alimentation l’agriculture, 2010). The forest domain excludes tree and bush cover that results from agriculture activities. Main principles of the forest policy regarding FFF are: Creation of work and revenues for the benefit of the population Participation and responsibilities of the population in forestry activities and decentralised natural resources management. A cutting permit is required for all tree cutting inside of forests, except for trees from permanent agriculture. Forest exploitation of decentralised collective territories should integrate forestry with rural development and should contribute to optimal development of agriculture, livestock and forestry (Le président du FASO, 1997).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>FFF can officially take place in forests categorized as ‘production forests’ and ‘protected forests’. Permanent production forests (forêts de production permanentes) include forestry concessions and forest tenure, which can be allocated as industrial/semi-industrial concessions or community forestry concessions. Protected forests (forêts protégées) are dedicated to local development and can serve future agriculture lands. They can also be appointed as timber concessions or allocated to communities. Classified forests (forêts classées) have ecological purposes with restricted rights for usage by local population. Objectives and strategies proposed that support FFF are: Promote creation of small and medium enterprises to formalize and valorize certain NTFPs. (Gouvernement de la République Démocratique du Congo, n.d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Public forests and private forests. In official figures forest ownership is 100% public, while community ownership has not been properly assessed (Forestry Department FAO, 2010). The national Forest Policy holds the following objectives regarding FFF: Private individuals, associations, governmental and non-governmental organizations and business organizations shall have the right to obtain rural land in areas designated for forest development. Management plan shall be developed, with participation of the local community for conservation and production purposes. “In order to introduce farm-forestry practices among the farming farmers, semi-pastoralists, individual forest owners and organizations shall be given technical advice on marketing their forest products.” (The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis was restricted to the status of Farm/Family Forestry in national forest policies. A broader assessment, including national policies related to land, agriculture, environment, climate change and energy, could provide a more in-depth and cross-sectoral assessment of the formal status of FFF. See for example Mkhathu n.d. for such overview for Kenya.
and semi-pastoral communities, effort shall be made to provide them with sufficient amount of plant seeds and seedlings of tree species that could have different economic benefits; Technical support will be provided to farmers and semi-pastoralists in the selection and planting of tree and forage plant species and conservation of the existing ones that help to prevent soil erosion and serve as landholding boundary marks. Farmers, semi-pastoralists, individual forest owners and organizations shall be given technical advice on marketing their forest products."

(The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Key Actions/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Community forest management</td>
<td>Encourage and facilitate (regional) Farmers Platform to advance strategies in land and agricultural resource management at local level. Mobilize the rural communities to assume increasing responsibilities for sustainable preservation, conservation, exploitation and utilization of natural resources. (Government of Gambia, n.d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Community forestry</td>
<td>Promote small and medium forest and wildlife enterprises as a means of job creation for the rural and urban poor (Republic of Ghana - Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>The Constitution of Kenya classifies forests into three categories namely public, community and private forests. Community forests include forestland that is lawfully held, managed or used by specific communities, forestland lawfully held as trust land by the county governments and ancestral forestland traditionally occupied by hunter-gatherer communities. Private forests on the other hand include forestland held by any person under any freehold or leasehold tenure and any forest owned privately by an individual, institution or body corporate for commercial or non-commercial purposes. Objectives on Farm forestry (4.5): (a) promote partnerships with land owners to increase on-farm tree cover and to reduce pressure on reserved forests. (b) promote investment in farm forestry through provision of economic and non economic incentives. (c) promote on-farm species diversification. (d) promote development of forest based enterprises. (e) promote processing and marketing of farm forestry products. (f) promote forestry development through irrigation. (g) promote forestry extension and technical services. (Republic of Kenya, 2014).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lberia</td>
<td>Regulation on Commercial and Sustainable Extraction of Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) states that, resident producer</td>
<td>Community based organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54
groups may sustainably harvest NTFPs from their forest lands for use or for commercial purposes within the community.
Community Rights Law Regulation of 2011 states that small scale commercial activities shall cover forest land of not more than 5000 hectares. These shall be commercial activities undertaken by community members either collectively or singly in support of livelihoods. These shall involve timber and non-timber forest products extracted for sale in the domestic Liberian market. (Njange, 2013)

Strategies regarding FFF in forest policy are:
- Develop and implement a national reforestation program, based on sound scientific and technical principles (best practices) and including realistic annual targets for new planting, enrichment planting and agroforestry.
- Develop appropriate mechanisms and incentives to encourage involvement of the private sector and local communities in reforestation.
- Encourage tree planting for environmental improvement and income generation in green belts within and around urban areas.
- (The private sector, individuals, local communities and community-based organizations will be responsible for reforestation in the future. The role of government will be to create an enabling environment for forest plantation development and to facilitate tree planting for social and environmental benefits, by providing technical advice and other incentives for tree planting.)
- Establish a framework for community forest management that allows communities to maximize benefits from all potential uses of forests and to grant user and management rights and responsibilities to them (Republic of Liberia, 2006)

Malawi

Private, public and customary land

Strategies related to FFF are:
- Enact a law that removes restrictions to access to the use of forests and forest products, and promote equity and participation by local communities.
- Promote proven methods for utilizing forest products and introduce value-adding processes to popularise their commercial values.
- Enhance and support sustainable and profitable networks of rural marketing services and the transportation of forest products.
- Promote increased forestry production per unit area of land, and controlled utilization of over-mature trees, licensed grazing and access for the collection of non-timber forest products.
- Encourage agroforestry to improve land fertility with respect to nitrogen without the need to increase the use of expensive imported nitrogenous fertilizers, and to meet some of the farmers needs for fuelwood and fodder.
- Establish appropriate incentives that will promote community-based conservation and a sustainable utilization of the forest resources as a means of alleviating poverty, including on-farm trees, and fostering the growing of trees by all sections of the communities in order to achieve sustainable self-sufficiency of wood and forest-derived products;
- Promote communal individual ownership of forests and forest resources;
- Promote the establishment of nurseries by communities and individuals and increase the diversity of species;
- Encourage and enhance community and individual marketing of seeds, seedlings and other forest products; and
- Strengthen and maintain regular reward system for tree planting and improve the public information system.
- Expand the activities of the forestry extension service to promote on-farm planting and management of natural woodlands, and maintain full co-operation with the extension activities of the Department of Agriculture and other relevant departments and agencies to minimize overlap and duplications of effort;
- Initiate and promote environmental education, extension and

Encourage investment incentives to promote the development of small and medium-scale industries in the rural areas and offer employment opportunities to the rural communities;
- Provide an enabling framework for promoting the participation of local communities and the private sector in forest conservation and management, eliminating restrictions on sustainable use of essential forest products by local communities, and promoting planned harvesting and regeneration of the forest resources by Village Natural Resources Committees (VNRC’s). (Government of Malawi, 1996)
Awareness programmes, in partnership with other relevant bodies to promote and support the conservation and protection of forest ecosystems and the growing of trees by individual companies, estates, local communities and authorities, including the integration of forests and trees into farming systems, soil conservation activities and land-use systems;

Update the Forest Act in order to define more adequately the legal framework for the sustained utilization of customary land forest resources with particular emphasis on the formation and operation of Village Natural Resources Committees, and to allow usufruct of trees by rightful customary land, and ensuring that the Act makes adequate provision for the conservation and management of forests and trees on private land;

(Mozambique)  Public ownership & some unspecified private ownership reported in FRA. “All land and natural resources therein (natural forest included) are owned by the state. In the case of forest plantations trees belong to individuals who planted it.”

“The state owns all the land and natural resources therein. No distinction is made between individuals and private business entities and institutions regarding forest management rights of public forests. 4 National Categories relate the holder of management rights of public forest resources, namely, Public administration, Communities, Simple licensing and Forest concession. National definition of forest concession holders was considered at Private corporations and institutions. “ […] Communities have started to formalize their management’s legal rights from 2002. However, not all communities have their areas gazetted and those areas cannot be reflected in the table.”

(South Africa) Support community forestry

Facilitate the entry of small farmers and entrepreneurs by introducing incentives and by minimising barriers

Establish the districts within which new afforestation would be most beneficial, as well as the land-use and farming systems best suited to the needs of the local people, and ways of assuring the supply of wood to capital intensive processing plants

Provide training and advice to small farmers, contractors and entrepreneurs in skills such as those needed to negotiate and manage contracts develop district level or catchment level plans for areas where there are many small farmers in forestry developments in order to regulate smallscale afforestation so that social and environmental costs are mitigated and impacts on water resources minimised.

(Zambia)  The involvement of the private sector, civil society and local communities in forestry is critical to improved management, conservation and sustainable utilization.

Promotion of private investments in forestry such as in non-wood forests products, carbon forests, farm forests, plantation forestry and homestead forestry should be encouraged.

Community-based participation in the management of protected forest areas and forests on customary lands shall be promoted.

Providing incentives for the creation of enterprises and protection of forest-based livelihood systems which directly contribute to forest conservation and protection and respond to the national sustainable development criteria.

Facilitating incentives and supporting public private partnerships in the establishment of forest industries, especially small scale and cottage industries in potentially high value and marketable products such as honey, beeswax, carbon trading, rattan and timber

Promoting and encouraging small scale enterprises dealing in NWFPs such as carbon credits and, mushrooms, honey and bees wax processing.
Establishing a comprehensive understanding of the resource base by carrying out periodic inventories of NWFPs.

Facilitating the development of appropriate technologies for the propagation and productivity, harvesting, processing and commercialization of economically important NWFPs such as orchids, rattan, bamboo, honey and beeswax to enhance livelihoods.

(Zambia, 2009)

The local communities including community based organizations (CBOs), shall advice Government on policy formulation and implementation. They shall be the key actors in planning and management of forests and investment in forestry at local levels. They shall also be the implementers and the determinants of tree species and technologies to be used in community based forestry plantation establishment and management, and play a key role in Joint Forest Management.

(Zambia, 2009)

Annex 2. Roles and potentials of FFPOs in helping members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Assistance of FFPOs to forestry farmers</th>
<th>Value added to forestry farmers</th>
<th>Potentials of FFPOs in terms of efficiency and strengthening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Bringing them to the table for discussion. FFPOs help members to meet the challenges linked to rights, access to markets, and capacity development (Interviews, May 2015).</td>
<td>Small equipments are also made available to members as well as capacity development on price negotiation skills through study-visit exchanges.</td>
<td>Development of NTFP value chains for job creation, green economy, profits to producers and contribution to GDP -Moving from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Organisation and Roles</td>
<td>Donor Support</td>
<td>Government Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Democratic Republic of Congo | -organisation of NTFP value chains (honey, okok, safou, rattan)  
- Capacity building still embryonic (Interviews, May 2015) | Donor supports being galvanised | Government recognizes the role of FFPOs as a partner in restructuring development in the country |
| East Kenya              | - Platform for engagement of tree growers  
- Lobby for enabling legal/policy support  
- Provide market access/partnership services | Increased tree planting with little direct government intervention | Capacity development on record keeping and stock taking of trees planted (Makhanu, n.d.) |
| Ethiopia                | Well-organised regional organisation gives support services to members |                |                    |
| West Burkina Faso       | Well-structured shea butter value chain at the national level |                | Associations with well defined roles but the challenge rest with effectively dispatching services to members |
| Ghana                   | - Usually playing advocacy role and linking them to service providers if any (Honey project).  
- Facilitating sustainable charcoal production in Ghana (Charcoal Project).  
- Developing alternatives to illegal chainsaw milling through multi-stakeholder dialogue (MSD)  
- Supporting the integration of legal timber market into the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) of the European Union with Ghana. | Increased visibility of FFPOs | - Tree and forest tenure reforms that promote sustainable forest enterprises must be prioritized by government  
- International development partners should provide some portion of annual grants that go solely to governments to support FFPOs  
- Funding support to FFPOs should be given for reasonable length of time (3-5 years)  
- Address capacity gaps in product and services diversification through targeted funding |
<p>| Liberia                 | Mainly in dissemination of policy and information on rights, e.g. National Charcoal Union of Liberia monitors the traders/producers involved in charcoal production, Timber Union is also trying to ensure that its members operate legally, NTFP Union is trying to have control over producers/traders. | FFPOs are trying to provide enabling business environment to producers and traders | The National Forests and Landscape Forum is trying to work with the producer organizations to educate and encourage the individual forest and farm producers to form associations/cooperatives for better advocacy position to demand tenure rights and gain bargaining power for their commodities |
| Gambia                  | Regular advice and support services to members |                |                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mozambique</td>
<td>Assistance is provided by local forestry and NGO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>FFPOs in Zambia are still in their infancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Member-based agriculture cooperatives evolving in the absence of government supported ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High with consistent government and donor supports to the existing 47 FFPOs made up of over 300,000 farmers transfer of forest tenure from state ownership to management by local communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3. State of government and donor supports to FFPOs across regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Government support to FFPOs (strong, fair, weak)</th>
<th>Donor support to FFPOs (strong, fair, weak)</th>
<th>Remarks and examples of supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Sub-Directories created for Community forestry and development of NTFP value chains. Existences of Ministry in charge of SMEs. FAO/EU supported a project on SMFE based on NWFP in Central Africa from 2007 - 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>USAID, FIDA, FAO/EU supported a project on SMFE based on NWFP in Central Africa from 2007-2011. Some donors planted trees on planté Plateau de Batéké but without much collaboration between farmers and foresters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| East                 | Kenya                                  | Strong                                           | Strong                                      | -African Forest Forum  
- Farm Forestry Small Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK),  
- Kenya National Farmers Federation (KENAFF)  
- Forest Action Network (FAN)  
- Kenya Forests Working Group (KFWG)  
- National Alliance of Community Forests Association (NACOFIA)  
- Kenya Forest Growers Association (KFGA)  
These provide great opportunities for partnerships and synergies to meet Kenya Vision 2030, Kenya Master Plan and 17.8 million m³ of wood from farm forestry. |
| West                 | Burkina Faso                           | Fair                                             | Strong                                      | Forest investment programme, Danish, Swedish and Luxemburg Corporations, World Bank and AfDB supports. Thanks to these supports that there are annual tree planting campaigns with seedlings produced and distributed freely to farmers to plant. |
|                      | Ghana                                  | Weak, None at moment                             | Weak, None at moment                        | This initiative seeks to organize tree growers to have a strong front. Building Capacity. Providing seedlings and education, providing technical advice. National Plantation Programmes have been launched to support tree growing and these have been highly successful resulting in thousands of farmers establishing small to medium level plantations. |
|                      | Liberia                                | Fair                                             | Strong                                      | The Children Youth organization supported by World Bank; Forest Connect, Growing Forests Partnerships, the activity of NLBI (Forest Instrument) and now, the Forest and Farm Facility. The USAID/PROSPER is trying to build the capacity of communities that have gained Community Forest Management Permit so that they can be able to extract their own resources instead of giving it to outside investors. |
|                      |                                       |                                                  |                                             | Government has a National Tree Planting Day that allows the Government to demonstrate the tree planting in the community every year. However, |
individual tree planting concept is yet far from reality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>The Forestry Vision of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>The Forest and Farm Facility works with ZNFU and government to develop FFPOS. FFF has just started the organization of FFPOS in two pilot districts in Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4: Experts and Resource Persons interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Country</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makweti Sishekanu</td>
<td>Zambia National Farmers’ Union (ZNFU), Manager – Environment and Gender, Zambia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maksishe@znfu.org.zm">maksishe@znfu.org.zm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Asare</td>
<td>Manager, Collaborative Resource Management Department, Forestry Commission, Ghana</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abasare99@yahoo.com">abasare99@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward S. Kamara</td>
<td>National Forests and Landscape Forum, National Coordinator, Liberia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kamara.ed14@gmail.com">kamara.ed14@gmail.com</a>/ <a href="mailto:nff_LIBERIA13@yahoo.com">nff_LIBERIA13@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF-FUN Liberia and National Forests and Landscape Forum</td>
<td>Team Liberia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:farmersliberia@yahoo.com">farmersliberia@yahoo.com</a>/ <a href="mailto:kamara.ed14@gmail.com">kamara.ed14@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barthelemy Kaboret</td>
<td>TREF AID, Projects Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barthelemy.kaboret@treaul.org.uk">barthelemy.kaboret@treaul.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaff Francis Agiamntebom</td>
<td>Coordinator, Forest and Agroforestry Promoters, Cameroon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fapngocameroon@yahoo.com">fapngocameroon@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:forestagrofor@yahoo.com">forestagrofor@yahoo.com</a></td>
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