

**Independent Multi-stakeholder  
Forest Sector Review,  
Cambodia**

**Scoping Mission II  
August 2003**

**Dermot Shields**

**FOR DISCUSSION**

## **Contents**

- I. Introduction**
- II. Background**
- III. Governance arrangements for the review**
- IV. Programme, outputs and approach of the review team**

## Scoping Report II

### I. Introduction

1. The key issues to be addressed during the second scoping visit, undertaken in August 2003, relate to the commissioning arrangements for the review and, in particular, the relationships between the RGC, the Donor Working Group and the independent review team.
2. This second scoping report addresses this issue as well as providing a more detailed programme of work and specific TORs for each fact-finding team. The report has been modified to reflect reaction and feedback from the debriefing meeting with the WGNRM held at the end of the consultants visit. This report follows on from the first scoping report and, therefore, only additions and modifications have been included.

### II. Background

3. The RGC has started a process of preparing a National Forest Program (NFP) under the aegis of the UN ad-hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF). The IPF sets out the principles and elements for a National Forest Program. A key element of the process is a Forest Sector Review, which precedes the development of strategies, action plans and investment programmes. The IPF defines a sector review as:

“... a process to establish an understanding of the forest sector and its relations and linkages to other sectors in the context of national development in order to identify key issues and priorities for further action.” FAO/UNDP Practitioner’s Guide (May 1999).

4. The Donor WGNRM also wishes to undertake a forest sector review in order to be better prepared for the next Consultative Group (CG) meeting which is planned for January 2004. The objective of this exercise is broadly similar to that of the NFP.
5. Following discussions with DFW, we would like to propose that a **joint and independent sector review**. This would serve all stakeholders and contribute to both the NFP and the next CG meeting.

6. The review would be forward looking, wide-ranging and strategic in approach. It would not be an evaluation of existing or previous programmes. The review would analyse, synthesis and work with existing data and information and would identify further sector work which could be continued as part of the NFP and fed into future CG meetings.
7. The proposal is that the review should start work in late September 2003 and produce a final report by January 2004. Further sector work, as allowed for in the NFP, may be required after this date.
8. The findings of the review team would not be binding on any of the stakeholders. The purpose of the review is to assist in developing an understanding between stakeholders of the possible options and the implications of different courses of action.

### III. Governance arrangements for the review

9. In order to ensure the smooth working and independence of the review team, it was proposed to:
  - (a) establish a **Joint RGC/Donor Coordinating Committee** for the independent sector review.

The committee would be formed under the **umbrella** of the Council of Ministers and would exist only for the period of the review.

The **membership** of the Committee should consist of representatives of the following Ministries: Economics and Finance, Environment, Interior, Lands, Agriculture, DFW and Donors: GTZ, JICA, DFID, DANIDA, World Bank

The **purpose** of the Committee would be to commission and coordinate the work of the review team. The team leader of the review team would interact with the committee, brief the committee on progress and discuss any problems as they arise. The committee would also engage in dialogue with the team, solve problems and ensure access to staff and data.

- (b) commission an **Independent Review Team** of external consultants whose team leader (Dermot Shields) would report to the co-ordinating committee.

The review team would be recruited as independent consultants without a previous or future stake in the Cambodia. The team

leader would be responsible for the team's output. The consultants would be contracted with funding from the Bilateral Donors Trust Fund of the WGNRM (managed by FAO) and from funds or contributions directly from donors such as The World Bank, Conservation International and, possibly, USAID.

10. The relationships between the RGC, the donors, civil society and private stakeholders and the review team is set out in Figure 1.
11. This mechanism should enable the review team to remain independent of all stakeholders, whilst engaging in debate and dialogue. The independence of the team is of utmost importance and the output and report of the independent team must be their own professional opinions.

#### IV. Programme, outputs and approach of the review team

12. The exact activities and programme for the team will need to be finalised in due course, but two phases are envisaged:
13. The **first phase** of the review (Sept/Oct) would be largely fact-finding and would focus on:
  - a. the **forest and biological resources** and the dynamics of the pressures and trends on the resource;
  - b. the impact and contribution of forest resources to people's **livelihoods and the national economy**
  - c. the **institutional environment** within which forests are managed, including the policy, legal, regulatory and fiscal context, the relationships between different agencies and between sectors and sub-sectors.
14. The fact-finding teams would consist of two to four independent consultants assigned to each of the three study themes: forest resources, livelihoods and institutions. Each team would develop a separate programme which would include an assessment of existing reports and data, interviews with key informants and stakeholders both within and outside government, field visits and small surveys. The teams will also benefit from the results of the independent review of SFMPs and the interim results of the forest cover change assessment to be conducted by USGS which will be WGNRM will be conducting in parallel.

15. These interactions will need to be conducted in Khmer and, therefore, translation will be required. Furthermore, the team will require assistance from Government, NGOs and other stakeholders in making appropriate appointments and introductions.
16. The teams will need to work closely with the overall team leader and with each other to ensure consistent frameworks and approaches are fed into the analytical phase.
17. Each study team would produce a study report at the end of the first Phase which would (a) serve as a working document for the analysis phase and (b) become an annex to the final report. As well as the study report, the coordinator of each study team would prepare a short written status report of 2-4 pages and also be prepared, where possible with the individual team members, to present team observations and assessments verbally to the Joint Coordinating Committee and to other stakeholders.
18. The **second phase** of the review (Nov/Dec) would be largely analytical, bringing together the understanding gained by the team during the first phase into a number of scenarios. These scenarios would be based on both institutional and managerial assumptions about future trends. The review team would describe each scenario, and then set out the implications of each scenario on (a) the forest, (b) livelihoods and (c) the national economy - in terms of advantages and disadvantages, costs and benefits, gainers and losers.
19. The output of the analytical phase would be an overall report consisting of a series of scenarios (or policy narratives). Each scenario would consist of:
  - a **description** of the scenario and an assessment of the likelihood of the scenario occurring;
  - a **projection of the expected implications** of the scenario in terms of forest cover, livelihoods and the national economy;
  - an **analysis of the advantages/disadvantages**, benefits/costs and winners/losers;
  - an **identification of the policy variables and assumptions** as well as critical factors underlying the scenario; and, therefore,
  - an **outline of the policy, programme and investment requirements** of each scenario.
20. In order to develop these scenarios, the team for the second phase would synthesise the work and understanding of the Phase 1 study teams. The analytical team would consist of the coordinators of each of the studies, together with an economist and GIS specialist. As the

analysis progresses, the analytical team would continue to engage in dialogue and debate with the Joint Coordinating Committee and with other stakeholders. The exact nature of this dialogue will depend on the form in which the scenarios eventually emerge – joint meetings, presentations etc.

21. The overall team leader will keep the Joint Coordinating Committee informed of progress throughout both phases. Verbal interaction and engagement between the team and stakeholders will be as important as the preparation of written reports. Initially, this will be as fact-finding for the review team. Increasingly, over the period of the review, the nature of the interaction should shift as the team present their own assessments and seek reaction from stakeholders.
22. The proposed programme is attached (Appendix 1)
23. Detailed TORs for each study are attached (Appendices 2-)

Figure 1. Governance arrangements for the review

