UN-REDD
PROGRAMME

# Training Workshop Report

## Developing Indicators and Data Collection Tools for the Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ in Viet Nam
13-15 June 2013, Da Lat – Viet Nam

*Prepared by:*

**Ngo Tri Dung, Tran Nam Thang (CORENARM)**

**Truong Quang Hoang (CRD)**

**Nguyen Xuan Lam (Pan Nature)**

# Contents

## Abbreviation

CORENARM:      Consultative & Research Center on Natural Resources Management

CPC:           Commune People's Committee

CRD:           Center for Rural Development in Central Vietnam

DARD:          Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

DHR:           District Human Resource

DIA:           District Internal Affairs

DPC:           District People's Committee

FAO:           Food and Agriculture Organization

FPD:           Forest Protection Department (Provincial, District, Commune levels)

FPDF:          Forest Protection and Development Fund

ICA:           Institutional Context Analysis

NGO:           Non-Governmental Organization

ONRE:          (District) Office of Natural Resources & Environment

Pan Nature:    People and Nature Reconciliation

PGA:           Participatory Governance Assessment

PPC:           Provincial People's Committee

REDD:          Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation

UNDP:          United Nations Development Programme

UNEP:          United Nations Environment Programme

VNFOREST:      Vietnam Administration of Forestry

VRO:           Vietnam REDD Office

# 1. Background for PGA indicator development workshop

The collaborative program among FAO, UNDP, and UNEP on Reduced Emission from Deforestation and forest Degradation (UN-REDD) is a global program aiming at developing approaches and tools for data collection, data analysis, and providing guidelines on implementation of REDD+ in other countries. Participatory Governance Assessment (PGA) is a tool developed by UN-REDD and piloted in 4 countries namely Nigeria, Ecuador, Indonesia, and Viet Nam. In Viet Nam, pilot and testing activities for PGA was carried out since March 2012. In April 2013, the first workshop on PGA was organized in Da Lat, Lam Dong province to introduce steps on developing a set of indicators and data collection tools for the PGA. This second workshop in June 2013 aimed at completion of data collection tools for field testing. Main facilitators of this workshop were Consultative and Research Center on Natural Resources Management (CORENARM), Center for Rural Development (CRD), and People and Nature Reconciliation (PanNature) – all 3 Viet Namese NGOs - who have extensive experience in developing tools for forest governance issues.

This report was compiled by 4 facilitating members after 3 days of the workshop from 13-15 June 2013. Mr. Dung (CORENARM) wrote Section 4.1 and other parts of the report which included overall report compilation, editing and responding all comments. Mr. Lam (PanNature) prepared Sections 4.2 and 4.3. Mr. Thang (CORENARM) wrote Section 4.4. Mr. Hoang (CRD) was responsible for sections 4.5 and 4.6. The report includes 6 main parts: Parts 1 and 2 introduced the background, objectives, and expected outcomes of the workshop. Part 3 provided details on characteristics of the participants and process of selecting these participants. Part 4 focused on key issues addressed and discussed in the workshop. Part 5 analyzed some main points and their implications on the implementation of PGA in Lam Dong province. Part 6 proposed follow-up activities. The annexes included all details of workshop agenda, list of participants, list of indicators, and tools for data collection presented in forms of tables and questionnaire.

# 2. Objectives, methodology, and outcomes

This 2nd workshop of PGA aimed at finalizing a set of indicators and data collection tools for field testing in Lam Dong province. Accordingly, the expected outcomes of the workshop were:

- A set of indicators and data collection tools for priority issues of forest governance;
- Reporting format and expected outputs from PGA implementation; and
- Identifying immediate next steps for implementation

In order to meet the above-mentioned objectives and outcomes, the workshop was divided into 8 main sections during 3 days (Annex 1). These sections are (1) Opening and introduction the objectives and expected outcomes of the workshop; (2) Identifying priority issues of forest governance in Lam Dong province, (3) suggesting key components for the priority issues, (4) developing indicators of identified key components, (5) analyzing sources of data and data collection techniques, (6) developing data collection tools, (7) providing outlines of PGA reporting format and expected outputs, and (8) setting follow-up action plan of PGA process.

A variety of facilitating approach was applied in each section of the workshop in order to encourage maximum level of participation. Some of methods were group discussion which utilized local knowledge and experience in identifying key components and conforming indicators. Slide presentation and speech by facilitators were limited as much as possible in this workshop so as to

encourage local participants to present, discuss, and provide feedbacks. During group work, participants always received guidance and feedbacks properly from the facilitating team to make sure that all group discussions were on track and active in sharing ideas among members as well groups. The processes and facilitating methods were presented in details in each section below.

## 3. The participants

### 3.1 Composition of the participants

A total of 21 participants attended the 2nd PGA workshop of which 7 females and 14 males. Participants came from different levels of authority and type of organizations which listed in the Table 1 and details were presented in Annex 2.

Table 1: Composition of participants in the 2nd PGA workshop

| Organization/levels | Female | Male | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Local participants* | *3* | *10* | *13* |
| - Commune level | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| - District level | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| - Provincial level | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| *Organizing/facilitating team* | *4* | *4* | *8* |
| - FAO | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| - Viet Nam REDD office (VRO) | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| - UNDP | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| - VN-NGOs | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| *Total* | *7* | *14* | *21* |

Total participants from Lam Dong province (local participants) were 13 people (3 females and 10 males) of which 9 members were from commune and district levels.

The facilitating team has 4 members who are from 3 VN-NGOS. These organizations used to participate in the previous workshops, and committed to follow-up field testing of data collection tools in the coming time.

Compared with the April 2013 workshop, numbers of participants reduced due significantly. In April, there were 28 participants of which 21 males and 7 females. The difference in numbers of participants of the two workshops was due to difference in purposes: While the Apri. Workshop focused on introduction and practice of indicator development, this workshop aimed at developing full set of indicators for all priority issues.

### 3.2 Group work

During the workshop, participants were grouped in various sizes depending on the contents of each section. In Sections 3 and 4 which discussed on identification of priority issues and key components of forest governance in Lam Dong province, participants were divided in 3 groups (Annex 3a, 3b) to discuss 5 priority issues raised in the Institutional Context Analysis (ICA) report held in March 2013. After discussion, all groups agreed to select 02 priority issues to work out in following sections. These issues are (i) allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement, and (ii) participation and collaboration of local authorities and functional departments in forest management and decision-making process. These two issues were also selected for practice of indicator development during the April Training workshop. However, participants emphasized these

issues again given their urgency and importance, and add 'collaboration' among agencies as they perceived a lack of collaboration would lead to stagnancy of policy implementation.

After identifying 02 priority issues, participants were reclassified into 02 groups to propose key components for each priority issue. All participants actively worked out to propose 3 key components for each priority issue. From that time on, 02 groups remained until the last day of discussion. In total, there were 02 priority issues, 6 key components, and a set of indicators as a result of group works and discussions.

### 3.3 Local participation

People from Lam Dong provinces have participated in most meetings/workshop events related to PGA such as quick survey of stakeholders (December 2012), stakeholder consultation workshop (March 2013), the first training workshop on developing indicators and tools for PGA (April 2013), and this second workshop on completion of previous one (June 2013).

From our records, there were 10 local participants who participated continuously 4 recent workshops and 3 people participated 2 workshops. This number showed that there was a high level of interest from local people, and they should be actively involved in the follow-up activities of PGA.

The choice of the delegates responded to the principles and criteria 4 and 8 of the UN-REDD Programme on Environment and Society. Criterion 4 requires "the full participation of all stakeholders, especially indigenous peoples, forest-dependent communities, and especially the group of vulnerable people." The criterion 8 emphasizes on "to encourage and increase gender equality and empower women". In this workshop, participants were presented by indigenous and ethnic people (6/13) who might be direct impacted by forest related decisions. In terms of gender equality, there were 2 female participants who came from Women Union at commune level and 1 from forest protection department at provincial level.

The way of selecting participants emphasized much on maximum level of participation from local levels in all meetings/workshops on PGA. Among 139 people attended in the quick survey in December 2012, there were 25 people came from provincial levels, 45 from districts (Lac Duong and Di Linh) and 65 from commune level. After that, the PGA project worked with DARD Lam Dong and piloting districts to select participants for the follow-up activities. One of the important criteria for selecting participants in the follow-up workshops was the attendance in the previous workshop/meetings. Among 13 local participants of this workshop, there were up to 10 people who had participated in all 4 meetings/workshops previously. This number showed that local participants in Lam Dong were very much interested in process of developing indicators and data collection tools for the PGA.

### 3.4 Expectation of the participants

Most of participants expressed their interests in actively participating in developing indicators and data collection tools for PGA in Lam Dong province. In particular, one participant expected that data collected by this set of tools would contribute effectively to the second phase of REDD+ implementation in Lam Dong, especially focus on payment for forest protection. Other delegates showed their willingness in continuing to participate follow-up steps of testing field data collection tool, data processing and analysis in order to find out issues relevant to participatory forest governance. Besides, there were also other interests on receiving updated information related to

application of PGA in implementing process of REDD+ in other countries which share similar contexts as Viet Nam's.

## 4. Key issues addressed and discussed in the workshop

### 4.1. Section 1: Opening

In opening workshop, Mr. Nguyen Ba Luong – Deputy Director of provincial Forest Protection Department (FPD) – on behalf of DARD LamDong welcomed workshop delegates and gave speech for the workshop. Following part is the introduction of participants and their expectation on the workshop. The focal point facilitator introduced workshop agenda and expected outcomes. In order to help workshop participants understand workshop contents and outcomes, the representative of PGA project summarized results of the previous workshop in April 2013 including 02 priority issues and some preliminary indicators.

### 4.2. Section 2: Key governance priority issues

The goal of this section was to select the priority issues of forest governance in Lam Dong province which were identified in the previous workshops. On that basis, participants will select those forest governance issues that they are interested to develop indicators and data collection tools for PGA integrated in REDD in Lam Dong province.

In this section, participants were recalled by a short presentation on results of stakeholder consultation workshop in March 2013 in which five priority issues was reported in the Institutional Context Analysis (ICA). In addition, two priority issues identified in the first workshop in April 2013 were also included in the presentation. After that, participants were divided into 3 groups to propose priority issues as their concerns. Finally, scoring method was utilized to select 2-3 priority issues for next steps. Results of 3 group discussions were presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Priority issues in forest governance presented by groups

|  | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Issue 1* | Participation of local authorities in decision making process | Participation of local authorities in forest and forestland management | Participation of local authorities and functional departments in forest management |
| *Issue 2* | Forest allocation to local people | Forest protection contract to local people | Forest allocation to local people |
| *Issue 3* | Law enforcement of forest protection | Collaboration among agencies in forest/land management | |

After scoring, revising, and compiling similar contents, all participants agreed to select two priority issues as below:

    a.    *Participation and collaboration of local authorities and functional departments in forest management and decision-making process (9 points)*

    b.    *Allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement (14 points)*

## 4.3. Section 3: Key components

In order to focus on 02 priority issues, participants were clustered in 02 groups with 7 members per group (Annex 3a, 3b). Both groups discussed and proposed key components for 02 priority issues which were identified in the previous section.

Group 1 worked on the issue "*Participation and collaboration of local authorities and functional departments in forest management and decision-making process*"

Group 2 discussed and proposed key components for the issue "*Allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement*".

Initially, Group 1 proposed 7 key components of the issue 'participation, coordination of local government'. But after the presentation, group discussion, content review, and writing edition, the group consolidated only 4 key components. Group 2 proposed 5 key components of the issue "allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement". Results of group discussion were presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Priority issues and their associated key components

| Priority issues | Key components |
|---|---|
| *1. Participation and collaboration of local authorities and functional departments in forest management and decision-making process (Group 1)* | 1.1. Management and implementation capacity of communal authority |
| | 1.2. Mechanism for receiving and sharing information |
| | 1.3. Policy on timely and suitable allowances |
| | 1.4. Powers and responsibilities of stakeholders |
| *2. Allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement (Group 2)* | 2.1. Forest status before allocation |
| | 2.2. Rights and responsibilities in forest management after allocation (Transparency in payment amount and time) |
| | 2.3. The effectiveness of forest management after allocation (Forest protection and livelihood) |
| | 2.4. Forest management after allocation |
| | 2.5. Actual conditions and local demand |

Given limited time for discussion, both groups decided to select the first three components to develop indicators and data collection tools for the next steps.

## 4.4. Section 4: Developing indicators for key components

After completing list of key components, each group was provided the following handouts as reference for indicator development:

- Results of discussion on indicator development in April 2013 workshop (reference, inheritance, and further development);

- Developing indicators for monitoring and evaluation;

- Sources of data collection.

Facilitators were assigned to support group in explanation, put questions for discussion, and share experience to encourage participants to provide information on indicators for each key component.

After discussion, representative of each group presented results on indicators of the first key component. Participants then provided comments on the first set of indicators. Both groups continued to develop indicators for the remaining components until all finished. List of indicators were presented by each key component in the Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 4: Indicators for the issue "*Participation and collaboration of local authorities and functional departments in forest management and decision-making process*"

| No. | Key components | Indicators |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | *Management and implementation capacity of communal authority* | 1. Number of commune officials with formal training;<br>2. Number of commune officials trained in forestry;<br>3. Number of commune officials appointed with appropriate profession<br>4. Number of years working with forest protection and management<br>5. Number of projects for forest protection participated in<br>6. Number of complain letters successfully solved<br>7. Number of formal letters issued/year<br>8. Number of recommendations submitted to higher levels be accepted<br>9. Number of cases of violation discovered and handled<br>10. Value of capitals mobilized for the commune/year<br>11. Number of capitals mobilized for the commune/year |
| 2 | *Mechanism for receiving and sharing information* | 1. Quantity of legal documents received by the commune per year<br>2. Number of workshops for disseminating forest protection law/year<br>3. Number of participants in propaganda on forest protection law<br>4. Radio program on forest protection law per quarter<br>5. Time for sharing information between communes and local people and higher level authorities;<br>6. Time for sharing information between communes and local people and higher level authorities;<br>7. Number of cross-sector meetings to share the work done on forest protection/quarter |
| 3 | *Policy on timely and suitable allowances* | 1. Amount of allowance for forestry staff/month<br>2. Propaganda cost/year<br>3. Number of people getting reward/year<br>4. Training cost/year |

Table 5: Indicators for the issue "*Allocation/contract of forest for local livelihood improvement*"

| No. | Key components | Indicators |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | *Forest status before allocation* | 1. Number of main timber/non-timber species<br>2. Area, function, type of forest, condition<br>3. Standing volume of timber and non-timber forest products<br>4. Distance from the residential area to forest;<br>5. The slope of allocated forest |

| | | 6. Forest cover |
|---|---|---|
| | | 7. Area of forestry land designed for non-forestry uses; |
| 2 | *Rights and responsibilities in forest management after allocation (Transparency in payment amount and time)* | 1. Amount of payment for forest protection/household<br>2. Area of allocated forest land allowed to cultivate<br>3. Number of households involved in forest patrol/month<br>4. Number of households violate the contract<br>5. Number of forest patrol (month, quarter, year)<br>6. Volume and area of damaged forest (month, year, quarter)<br>7. Number of violated case (month, year, quarter)<br>8. Number of households that use forest for exploitation and service (service: eco-tourism, husbandry, farming)<br>9. Volume of timber and NTFPs harvested/household/year<br>10. Number of people receiving payment for protecting forest<br>11. Number of households allowed to utilize and cultivate forest land in the allocated forest<br>12. Forest areas used for planting, nurturing, regeneration<br>13. Number of forest fire case reported/stopped per year |
| 3 | *The effectiveness of forest management after allocation (Forest protection and livelihood).* | 1. Area of forest before and after allocation<br>2. Change in timber volume/year<br>3. Change in numbers of violated case, level of seriousness of the cases<br>4. Forest cover after allocation<br>5. Percentage of income from allocated/contracted forest per year<br>6. Change of incomes from allocated/contracted forest in poor households per year<br>7. Number of people getting job thanks to allocated/contracted forests |

## 4.5.  Section 5: Potential sources of data and data collection techniques

This section aims to identify sources and techniques to collect data for all indicators of forest governance defined in Section 4. The expected outcomes include the source of data and collection techniques which were listed for each specific indicator.

To start Section 5, a member of facilitating team presented a 15-minute presentation (using a projector) to introduce the dynamics of developing tools for forest governance, the basic concepts, and the examples for further group discussion. The presentation was to help participants understand the process and foresee all the work they need to do to have a good set of indicators for PGA.

After presentation, there were group discussions to identify source of data and data collection technique for each indicator proposed in Section 4. Number and composition of groups remained as previous section. This helps to keep participants be familiar with contents they developed before.

After discussion, each group sent a representative to present the results. Participants in group supplemented or explained unclear points, while participants in the other group provided additional comments and adjustment of better sources of data and collection techniques. The criteria used to select the better source of data were (i) level of accuracy and (ii) time/effort spent for collecting those data. Most of the suggestions focused on additional sources of data and indicated whether they could be collected from the secondary or primary sources.

By ending of Section 5, all participants already identified sources of data and collection techniques for all indicators identified in the previous section (Annex 4). In total, participants proposed 4 secondary and 3 primary sources of data for 45 indicators. Some discussions were about which source of data was better than others. For example, information about size of forest, forest type, timber stock, location (Indicators B1.2, B1.3) should be collected via secondary data (i.e. forest protection department/units) for better level of accuracy. Particularly, participants could listed many sources of data for each indicator, especially from the secondary source. Based on this diversity, participants selected the best source of data to develop tools for data collection later. Common techniques for data collection include: secondary data collection, household interview, key informant interview, and in-depth discussion local staff. Details on indicators, source of data, and data collection techniques were presented in the Annex 4.

### 4.6. Section 6: Developing data collection tools

The purpose of this section was to develop the data collection tools for all identified indicators, corresponding to each of the various data sources such as forest owners, local authority staff et cetera. This was the core part of the workshop included many contents such as developing a questions for each indicator; compiling all questions in survey/questionnaire form; and writing the guidelines for these survey/questionnaire forms. The expected outputs were (i) Decided what was the main source of data for each identified indicator; (ii) completed tools for data collection such as questionnaire, checklist, or survey form; and (iii) guidelines on using these tools. Specifically, we developed tools for data collection depending on the data sources. For example, for those indicators that need information from primary data source we constructed household questionnaire or group discussion topics/questions. For indicators of which information can be verified by secondary data source, we designed tabular forms for quick collection.

The contents of the Section 6 was done through 5 consecutive sessions of group discussions. The participants were divided into two discussion groups and maintained throughout 5 sessions of discussions as described below:

The first session: Each group selected one key component for discussion and development of table/questionnaires for each indicator of that key component; Group 1 worked on "Management and implementation capacity of local authority" while Group 2 selected "Forest conditions before allocation". Each group then sent one representative to present results of group work after completion. Comments and feedbacks then came from other participants. Finally, each group worked by themselves on correction and revision following comments and feedbacks.

The second session: This session was carried out as the first one. Howver, each group selected the next key component for developing tools of data collection. Group 1 worked on "Receiving and sharing information mechanism" and Group 2 worked on "Rights and responsibilities after forest allocation".

The third session: Continue with the previous session, group 1 worked on key component "Policy on timely and suitable allowances" and Group 2 continued with "Effectiveness of forest management after allocation". In this session, group did not present their results because they accumulate more experience after the first two sessions. However, facilitating member still put questions for their discussion, and made clear points on the feasibility and rationality of each indicator.

The forth session: Each group classified tables/questions from results of previous discussions into two categories: tables/questions for secondary data and those for primary data. Each group was then divided into 3 sub-groups to discuss on each key component. After that all participants in the group revised, agreed on result of each sub-group work and synthesized as group's result.

The fifth session: all tables/questions for secondary data were given to Group 1, and those for primary data were assigned to Group 2. Group 1 classified and reviewed these tables and questions into different information providers such as commune authority, forest management board, forest protection unit (district level). Group 2 developed tools for the primary source of data such as questionnaire for household interview, group discussion checklist or in-depth interview of local staff. After discussion, representative from each group presented their results in front of all participants and received comments for finalizing results.

The component of each group was similar in the Section 5. Due to the limited time, facilitating team discussed and decided to divide into 3 sub-groups to make use time of discussion given numbers of key components and indicators. Therefore, we could complete developing questions and tables for all indicators.

Before the workshop, all members of facilitating team agreed that the first priority was to collect as many ideas as possible on questions/tables for indicator as well as data collection tools. Therefore, time allocated for comments and feedback was longer as scheduled. All participants were very active in discussion on contents, wording presented in each question and table; and thus everyone has fully understood all questions and tables and they have constructed good data collection tools for the local context.

As the end of the Section 6, following results were achieved:

 (1) Various tablular forms for secondary data collected from 4 agencies (information providers)

- Tabular forms for secondary data collected from forest owners, including 10 tables (Annex 5)

- Tabular forms for secondary data collected from Forest Protection Unit at district level, including 6 tables (Annex 6)

- Tabular forms for secondary data collected from district Office of Internal Affairs, 1 table (Annex 7)

- Tabular forms for secondary data collected from Commune People's Committee (including administrative office, forestry sub-division), including 12 tables (Annex 8)

(2) Topics and questions for group discussion (Annex 9)

(3) In-depth interview questions for commune staff (Annex 10)

(4) Questionnaire for household interview including 3 main parts (i) Benefits from allocated/contracted forests, (ii) Information propaganda, and (iii) Complaints (Annex 11)


## 4.7. Section 7: Expected outputs of and report outline of PGA

Expected results of the PGA included two main components (i) report on the PGA implementation and (ii) the database on forest governance. In the context of implementing the PGA in Viet Nam, the results of PGA report can be used for:

- Tools for forecasting forest status and forest governance issues at the grassroots level. Figures of initial assessment of the PGA can be used as 'baseline' data to compare the status of forest governance issues in different timeline, based on data collected periodically (quarterly and annual) .
- Data inputs for the policy making process by different topics of interest (eg, forest land allocation, livelihood improvement, forestry management) or by geographic areas of survey (commune, district, province);
- Information to help process of monitoring and periodical evaluation of forest management, monitoring changes in forest and forest land status, and management capacity of local staff. PGA results may also help to compare the effectiveness of forest governance in different local area or management units.
- In addition, civil society organizations can use the results of the PGA in the advocacy to improve the level of rational policy when issued, or increasing the efficiency of the implementation process.

### 4.8. Section 8: Roles and plans for the next steps

In this section, the coordinator of PGA scheduled the roadmap of PGA in Viet Nam. Accordingly, immediately after completion of indicators and data collection tools, a test of the data collection will be conducted to determine the level of compatibility /rationality of indicators and the designed tables/questionnaires.

The coordinator of PGA also share two options in the following process of data collection including (i) participants in Lam Dong province will be directly involved in data collection, and (ii) an indipendant consultants will be contracted to deploy this assignment. All participants expressed their willingness on option (i) which they will directly collect information by themselves because they are the one who have built up this toolkit at the same time they also expect to be involved in REDD + process in Lam Dong province afterwards.

According to the schedule, it was expected that a 2-day pre-field training would be held by the end of July, and field testing of data collection would be in the first week of August 2013. A multi-stakeholder consultation will follow in September. By the end of December 2013, data collection will be finished at commune level, then data analysis and report would be sent to Lam Dong province. All stakeholders (provincial, district, communal staff and NGO members) agreed to continue field data collection in the next time.

## 5. Analysis results and implications

### 5.1. Selection of priority issues and key components

The selection of priority issues and key components of forest governance in Lam Dong province in this workshop received high level of consensus. It was because a series of workshops/meetings has discussed about this topic (see Section 1 for details of the previous workshops/meetings). Among five top priority issues, participants decided to select two issues for their practical concerns and feasibility for developing indicators and data collection tools afterwards. However, some discussions were needed for compiling and wording the ideas so that the following steps can run smoothly.

### 5.2. Developing indicators for key components

In total there were 45 indicators (see Annex 4) for 6 key components of 2 priority issues. This can be a longer list (49 indicators, see Table 4), but participants selected only those indicators that met the requirement of feasibility (collection technique and quick reflection), practicability (cost-effectiveness, understood by local people), and rationality (relevant to context specific, compatible with existing system of governance). Some indicators were grouped together due to their interrelation in common tables by state offices; for example area of forest, forest types, altitude, timber volume, etc. It would be very helpful that many forestry experts were included in the group discussion. Their advice and comments were great for table and questionnaire development as well as grouping indicators for a particular source of data.

Indicators proposed in this workshop were not only about measurement for the baseline status, but also for the changes/tendency by the time. For example, indicator B3.3 indicated "Change in numbers of violated case and level of seriousness of the cases", or indicator A2.5 described "Time for sharing information between communes and local people and higher level authorities". These indicators will help to explain how different aspects of forest governance change by the time and in what way.

### 5.3. Sources of data and collection technique

For most of indicators, participants identified at least two possible sources of data but selected only the best ones for developing data collection tools. The preliminary criteria for selection of data source were level of data accuracy and amount of time spending on collecting those data. Doing so allows the data sources have been identified correctly and ensure the reliability of the data collected later. More notably, participants specified the type of documents or material containing the information collected for each indicator in the secondary source of data. This is not only helpful for the design of the secondary data collection form but also make it convenient for data collection later on.

The participants also gave inputs on data collection techniques to gather information for each indicator. Some data collection techniques were quite good and ensuring high accuracy such as setting forest sampling plots to determine the forest reserves but entails high costs. However, participants then considered many different factors such as cost, source and agencies of data provision, level of accepted accuracy to decide to decide the most appropriate collection technique. In this way, the proposed data collection techniques were reasonable with the local conditions but still met the requirement of high feasibility.

### 5.4. Tabular forms for secondary data collection

Based on various sources of secondary data identified for each indicator, participants discussed to select the best data source when designing forms. The participants also knew clearly all kinds of documents available in each data source that contains the data to be collected. For example, details on size, location, forest type, timber volume of forest contracted to protection were often available in the forest contract files managed by forest owners or head of forest protection groups. They paid special attention to the selection of the terminology and units calculated to match the terms of the measurement units in local documents. Thus, the designed forms were consistent with the data source and the data in these forms can be fully collected. These forms for secondary data collection can be put into use for the upcoming test survey.

## 5.5.    Topics and questions for group discussion

Although the participants suggested six topics/questions for focus group discussions, however, techniques and tools for discussion were too simple and need to adjust more. The discussion topics/questions were not arranged in a logical sequence. Most of the questions were for information need to be collected, but lack of guiding questions to help group discuss and answer these questions. In addition, the group discussion should be accompanied with visual tools such as resource map or appropriate tables to encourage collective discussion. Thus, these topics/questions were not ready yet for the upcoming test survey, but need to be revised and upgraded before putting into use.

## 5.6.    Household survey questionnaire

It can be said that the construction of a household interview was a great effort of the participants. It was also a session that participants discussed seriously before coming to an agreement. The questionnaire included all questions, which were divided reasonably in 3 different themes. The questions in each theme have yet to be arranged in a logical sequence. Most of the questions contained sufficiently information on required data collection for the evaluation indicators. However, words and phrases in each question remained unclear and difficult for information providers to understand and understand properly. Some questions were still general and need to be split into smaller questions for data collection conveniently. In addition, participants also realized that apart from secondary data sources, information for some indicators need to be collected from primary source such as household interview but participants still could not complete.

Generally, this questionnaire was not ready for use and need to be developed. Contents need to improved include construct questions on primary data for some indicators such as household questionnaires (Annex #11) or topics/questions for group discussion (Annex #9), simplify some general questions, clarify unclear questions, and rearrange the logical sequence of questions in a reasonable order.

## 5.7.    In-depth interview

Although there are some indicators that need to collect information by in-depth interview, participants seemed not pay enough attention on this tool but spend too much time on developing tools for secondary data collection, household interview, or group discussion. Therefore numbers of questions for in-depth interview were still limited (6 questions). At the same time, sources of data for this technique was also limited and mainly from the commune staffs. Interview questions were not arranged in logical sequence while contents of some questions were unclear. In general, questions for this in-depth interview were not ready for use but need much improvement.

In addition, guideline for using these data collection tools – one of the expected outputs – was not achieved due to time limitation. Actually, all facilitating members were aware that there would not be enough time to develop guideline during this workshop. Instead, we put first priority for developing data collection tools and will continue develop this guideline if there is still enough time. After the workshop, members of facilitating team can continue develop the guideline if required.

## 6. Follow-up activities

In the last session of the workshop, participants agreed on the action plan in the coming time. The delegates representing the various levels and the different agencies have expressed the desire to continue participating in the next activities such as field data collection and finalizing data collection tools.

As analyzed above, most of tools developed in this workshop were not fine enough for field testing. Thus there need to improve these data collection tools. This task can be done by the facilitating team and take about 3-5 days. Together with fine-tuning these tools, guideline for using these tools is another necessary task which can be done by the facilitators but need to consult workshop participants. This task is estimated to be complete within 3 days more.

Before field testing, it is necessary to train people who will participate in data collection. Also, key persons for PGA (i.e. who come from functional departments) also need to be updated results of this workshop for preliminary comments before the field testing. This training workshop will help to share experience among local staff, facilitators, and field assistants who can be the main actors for future data updates.

## Annexes

### Anex 1: Workshop agenda

| Time | Content | Facilitator |
|---|---|---|
| **Day 1: June 13, 2013** | | |
| 08:00 – 08:15 | Welcome & Opening remarks | Lam Dong FPD |
| 08:15 – 08:45 | Participant Introductions and Expectations | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 8:45 – 9:00 | Objectives, expected outputs and program of workshop | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 09:00 – 09:30 | Overview of PGA workshop in April and its outputs | Hoang Vu Lan Phuong, UNDP |
| 09:30 – 10:00 | Key governance priority issues for PGA | Nguyen Xuan Lam (PanNature) |
| 10:00 - 11:30 | Identification of components for selected priority issues | Nguyen Xuan Lam (PanNature) |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Lunch | |
| 13:00 – 16:45 | Developing indicators for the key components | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 16:45 – 17:00 | Summary of day 1 | |
| **Day 2: June 14, 2013** | | |
| 08:00 – 08:30 | Feedback on day 1 | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 08:30 – 10:00 | Identifying potential sources of data and relating techniques for data collection | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
| 10:00 - 11:30 | Developing tools for data collection:<br><br>• Developing forms for data collection (secondary data)<br>• Identification of question(s) needed for each indicator (primary sources)<br>• Compilation survey forms/ questionnaires for different group of stakeholders | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Lunch | |

| 13:00 – 16:45 | Developing tools for data collection:<br><br>• Developing forms for data collection (secondary data)<br>• Identification of question(s) needed for each indicator (primary sources)   Compilation survey forms/ questionnaires for different group of stakeholders | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
|---|---|---|
| 16:45 – 17:00 | Summary of day 2 | |
| **Day 3: June 15, 2013** | | |
| 08:00 – 08:30 | Feedback on day 2 | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
| 08:30 – 11:30 | Developing tools for data collection (cont):<br><br>• Identification of steps needed in using each tool (e.g. what steps required for focus group discussion)<br>• Preparation of guide/ explanation to each question | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Lunch | |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | Developing tools for data collection (cont) | Truong Quang Hoang (CRD) |
| 14:30 - 15:30 | Expected outputs of the PGA/ Reporting format<br><br>• What are the potential outputs of the PGA process?<br>• Key items of the report | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 15:30 – 16:45 | Roles and plan   What is the plan for next steps?   What roles each actor plays in the next steps? | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |
| 16:45 – 17:00 | Close of the workshop | Ngo Tri Dung (CORENARM) |

## Annex 2: Workshop participants

| # | Name | Position | Organizations |
|---|------|----------|---------------|
| 1. | Mr. Nguyễn Bá Lương | Deputy Director | Provincial Forest Protection Department (FPD), Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) of Lam Dong province |
| 2. | Mrs. Hoàng Công Hoài Nam | Head of Nature Conservation Office (FPD) | FPD, DARD Lam Dong |
| 3. | Mr. Võ Minh Thâm | Deputy Director | Forest Protection and Development Fund (FPDF), Lam Dong province |
| 4. | Mr. Phạm Trung Thông | Specialist | FPD, DARD Lam Dong |
| 5. | Mr. Thân Trọng Toản | Head of Office of Ethnic Affairs | Lac Duong district |
| 6. | Mr. K'Boi | Officer | Forestry section, Bao Thuan commune, Di Linh district |
| 7. | Mr. Mo Lom Sứ | Officer | Forestry section, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district |
| 8. | Mr. K' Brợt | Officer | Farmer Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district |
| 9. | Mrs. Liên Trang K'Đom | Chairperson | Women Union, Da Sar commune, Lac Duong district |
| 10. | Mr. Cao Đức Anh Trung | Deputy Director | Dran Forest Management Board, Don Duong district |
| 11. | Mr. Hồ Huỳnh Dũng | Deputy Director | Da Nhim Forest Management Board, Lac Duong district |
| 12. | Mrs. Trần Thị Lệ | Chair person | Women Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district |
| 13. | Mr. K'Brêl | Vice Chairman | Bao Thuan Commune People's Committee, Di Linh district |
| 14. | Mr. Ngô Trí Dũng | Director | Consultative and Research Center on Natural Resources Management (CORENARM) |
| 15. | Mr. Trần Nam Thắng | Officer | Consultative and Research Center on Natural Resources Management (CORENARM) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 16. | Mr. Trương Quang Hoàng | Deputy Director | Center for Rural Development in Central Viet Nam (CRD) |
| 17. | Mr. Nguyễn Xuân Lãm | Officer | People Nature Reconciliation (Pan Nature) |
| 18. | Ms. Kim Soojin | Officer | FAO Việt Nam |
| 19. | Ms. Lê Hà Phương | Safeguards officer | VRO, VNFOREST |
| 20. | Ms. Nguyễn Thị Hảo | Officer | VRO, VNFOREST |
| 21. | Ms. Hoàng Vũ Lan Phương | PGA coordinator | PGA, UNDP Việt Nam |

## Annex 3a: Participant group work for priority issues of governance

| # | Name | Position | Organizations | Group |
|---|------|----------|---------------|-------|
| 1 | Mr. Võ Minh Thâm | Deputy Director | Forest Protection and Development Fund (FPDF), Lam Dong province | 1 |
| 2 | Mr. Thân Trọng Toản | Head of Office of Ethnic Affairs | Lac Duong district | 1 |
| 3 | Mr. Hồ Huỳnh Dũng | Deputy Director | Da Nhim Forest Management Board, Lac Duong district | 1 |
| 4 | Ms. Lê Hà Phương | Safeguards officer | VRO, VNForest | 1 |
| 5 | Mrs. Hoàng Công Hoài Nam | Head of Nature Conservation Office (FPsD) | FPsD, DARD Lam Dong | 2 |
| 6 | Mr. Nguyễn Bá Lương | Deputy Director | Forest Protection Sub-Department (FPsD), Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) of Lam Dong province | 2 |
| 7 | Mr. Phạm Trung Thông | Specialist | FPsD, DARD Lam Dong | 2 |
| 8 | Mrs. Liên Trang K'Đom | Chairperson | Women Union, Da Sar commune, Lac Duong district | 2 |
| 9 | Mr. Cao Đức Anh Trung | Deputy Director | Dran Forest Management Board, Don Duong district | 2 |
| 10 | Mr. K'Boi | Officer | Forestry section, Bao Thuan commune, Di Linh district | 3 |
| 11 | Mr. K' Brợt | Officer | Farmer Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 3 |
| 12 | Mr. Mo Lom Sứ | Officer | Forestry section, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 3 |
| 13 | Mrs. Trần Thị Lệ | Chair person | Women Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 3 |
| 14 | Mr. K'Brêl | Vice Chairman | Bao Thuan Commune People's Committee, Di Linh district | 3 |

## Annex 3b: Participant groupwork for key components

| STT | Họ và tên | Chức vụ | Cơ quan/tổ chức | Nhóm |
|-----|-----------|---------|-----------------|------|
| 1 | Mr. Võ Minh Thâm | Deputy Director | Forest Protection and Development Fund (FPDF), Lam Dong province | 1 |
| 2 | Mr. Thân Trọng Toản | Head of Office of Ethnic Affairs | Lac Duong district | 1 |
| 3 | Mr. K' Bợt | Officer | Farmer Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 1 |
| 4 | Mr. Hồ Huỳnh Dũng | Deputy Director | Da Nhim Forest Management Board, Lac Duong district | 1 |
| 5 | Mrs. Trần Thị Lệ | Chair person | Women Union, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 1 |
| 6 | Mr. K'Brêl | Vice Chairman | Bao Thuan Commune People's Committee, Di Linh district | 1 |
| 7 | Ms. Lê Hà Phương | Safeguards officer | VRO, VNForest | 1 |
| 8 | Mr. Nguyễn Bá Lương | Deputy Director | FPsD, DARD Lam Dong | 2 |
| 9 | Mrs. Hoàng Công Hoài Nam | Head of Nature Conservation Office (FPsD) | FPsD, DARD Lam Dong | 2 |
| 10 | Mr. Cao Đức Anh Trung | Deputy Director | Dran Forest Management Board, Don Duong district | 2 |
| 11 | Mr. Mo Lom Sứ | Officer | Forestry section, Gung Re commune, Di Linh district | 2 |
| 12 | Mrs. Liên Trang K'Đom | Chairperson | Women Union, Da Sar commune, Lac Duong district | 2 |
| 13 | Mr. Phạm Trung Thông | Specialist | FPsD, DARD Lam Dong | 2 |
| 14 | Mr. K'Boi | Officer | Forestry section, Bao Thuan commune, Di Linh district | 2 |

## Annex 4: Source of data and data collection tools

| | Indicators | Source of data | Collection techniques | Reference tools |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | **Participation of local (commune) authority in decision making process related to forest management** | | | |
| *A.1* | *Management and implementation capacity of communal authority* | | | |
| A.1.1 | Number of commune officials with formal training | DHR, DIA, CPC | Fill the form based on staff dossiers | Table 7.1 |
| A.1.2 | Number of commune officials trained in forestry | DHR, DIA, CPC | Fill the form based on staff dossiers | Table 7.1 |
| A.1.3 | Number of commune officials appointed with appropriate profession | DHR, DIA, CPC | Fill the form based on staff dossiers | Table 7.1 |
| A.1.4 | Number of years working with forest protection and management | DHR, DIA, CPC | Fill the form based on staff dossiers | Table 7.1 |
| A.1.5 | Number of projects for forest protection participated in | District People's Committee (DPC), District FPD, forest owners | Fill the form based on regular reports | Table 7.1 |
| A.1.6 | Number of complain letters successfully solved | DPC, CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Fill the form based on regular reports | Table 8.12 |
| A.1.7 | Number of legal documents issued per year | CPC | Official letter archive | Table 8.2 |
| A.1.8 | Number of recommendations submitted to higher levels be accepted | DPC, CPC | Official letter archive | Table 8.3 |
| A.1.9 | Number of cases of violation discovered and handled | CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Archive | Tables 6.3, 6.5, 8.12 |
| A.1.10 | Total value of capitals mobilized for the commune/year | CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Archive | Tables 6.1, 8.6 |
| *A.2* | *Mechanism for receiving and sharing information* | | | |
| A.2.1 | Quantity of legal documents received by the commune per year | CPC | Archive | Table 8.1 |
| A.2.2 | Number of workshops per year for disseminating forest protection law | CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Archive | Tables 6.6, 8.8 |
| A.2.3 | Number of participants in | CPC, District FPD, | Archive | Tables 5.9, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | propaganda on forest protection law | forest owners | | 6.6, 8.8 |
| A.2.4 | Radio program on forest protection law per quarter | CPC, Culture unit, commune radio | Archive | Table 8.9 |
| A.2.5 | Point of time for sharing information between communes and local people and higher level authorities; | CPC, District FPD, forest owners, farmers | Archive, interview village leaders, farmers | Tables 8.1, 8.2 |
| A.2.6 | Number of violated cases report to commune authority | CPC, District FPD, forest owners, contracted households | Archive, interview commune officials, farmers | Tables 5.6, 5.7, 6.5, 8.11 |
| A.2.7 | Number of cross-sector meetings to share the work done on forest protection per quarter | CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Archive | Table 8.10 |
| **A.3** | **Policy on timely and suitable allowances** | | | |
| A.3.1 | Amount of allowance for forestry staff/month | CPC, District FPD | Account filing, forest protection reports | Table 8.7 |
| A.3.2 | Propaganda cost/year | CPC, District FPD, forest owners | Regular report | Tables 5.8, 6.1, 8.6 |
| A.3.3 | Number of people getting reward/year | CPC, District FPD, district internal affair unit | Archive | Table 8.7 |
| A.3.4 | Training cost/year | CPC, District FPD, district internal affair unit | Regular reports | Table 8.7 |
| **B** | **Allocation of forests to local people** | | | |
| **B.1** | **Forest status before allocation** | | | |
| B.1.1 | Number of main forest products (timber and non-timber) | Forest owners, Provincial FPD, farmers | Monitoring forest resource dynamics, field observation, staff and local people interview | Table 5.4 |
| B.1.2 | Area, function, type of forest, condition | Forest owners, Provincial FPD | Monitoring forest resource dynamics | Table 5.1 |
| B.1.3 | Standing volume of timber and non-timber forest products (NTFPs) | Forest owners, Provincial FPD | Monitoring forest resource dynamics | Tables 5.1, 5.4 |

| B.1.4 | Distance from the residential area to forest | Forest owners, Commune FPD | Interview local staffs and farmers, map | Table 5.1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B.1.5 | The slope of allocated forest | Forest owners, Provincial FPD | Interview local staffs and farmers, map | Table 5.1 |
| B.1.6 | Forest cover | Provincial FPD | Monitoring forest resource dynamics | Table 5.1 |
| B.1.7 | Area of forestry land designed for non-forestry uses; | Provincial FPD | Decision from Provincial People's Committee | Table 8.4 |
| **B.2.** | **Rights and responsibilities in forest management after allocation (Transparency in payment amount and time)** | | | |
| B.2.1 | Amount of payment for forest protection/household | Forest owners, commune FPD, households | Interview local staffs and farmers | Table 5.3 |
| B.2.2 | Number of households/Area of allocated forest land allowed to cultivate | District Office of Natural Resources & Environment (ONRE), households | Reports, observation and group discussions | Table 5.5 |
| B.2.3 | Number of households involved in forest patrol/month | Forest owners, commune FPD, leader of the contract team | Regular reports, Interview local staffs and farmers | Table 5.3; Annex 9 |
| B.2.4 | Number of households violate the contract | Forest owners, commune FPD | Regular reports from forest owners, dairy of local forest ranger | Tables 5.3, 6.3 |
| B.2.5 | Volume and area of damaged forest (month, year, quarter) | Forest owners, district FPD | Regular reports from forest owners | Tables 5.6, 6.2, 6.4 |
| B.2.6 | Number of violated case (month, year, quarter) | Forest owners, district FPD | Regular reports from forest owners | Tables 5.2, 5.6, 6.2, 6.4 |
| B.2.7 | Number of households that use forest for exploitation and service (service: eco-tourism, husbandry, farming) | Commune FPD | Reports, observation, household interview | Table 8.4 |
| B.2.8 | Volume of timber and NTFPs harvested/household/year | District FPD, forest owners, commune | Regular reports, household interview | Table 5.4 |

| | | FPD, households | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B.2.9 | Numbers/area of forest fire discovered and stopped per year | Forest owners, commune FPD | Reports, interview farmers | Table 5.6 |
| B.2.10 | Forest areas used for planting, nurturing, regeneration | Forest owners, commune FPD, households | Reports from forest owners, interview farmers | Table 5.5 |
| **B.3.** | *Component 3: The effectiveness of forest management after allocation (Forest protection and livelihood).* | | | |
| B.3.1 | Area of forest before and after allocation | District FPD, forest owners, households | Regular reports, interview households | Table 5.2 |
| B.3.2 | Change in timber volume/year | District FPD, forest owners | Monitoring forest resource dynamics | Table 5.2 |
| B.3.3 | Change in numbers of violated case and level of seriousness of the cases | District FPD, commune FPD | Annual report/half-year report/quarter report | Tables 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 |
| B.3.4 | Forest cover after allocation | District FPD | Regular reports | Table 5.1 |
| B.3.5 | Percentage of income from allocated/contracted forest per year | Village leader | Interview village leaders, households with allocated forest | Tables 5.3, 5.4; Annex 9 & 11 |
| B.3.6 | Change of incomes from allocated/contracted forest in poor households per year | Commune People's Committee (CPC) | Regular reports, interview poor households, group discussion | Annexes 9 & 11 |
| B.3.7 | Number of newly created employment from allocated/contracted forests | Commune People's Committee | Regular reports, interview poor households, group discussion | Annexes 9 & 11 |

## Annex 5: Tabular form for secondary data collection of the Forest owners

Organization: …………………….…..

Address: …….. commune, ……………..district,  Lam Dong province

Table 5.1: Characteristics of allocated/contracted forest areas

| No. | Group/ Household | Allocation forms | Location | | | Area (ha) | | | Types | Timber volume (m3) | Function | Slope | Distance (km) | Forest cover (%) | Designated purpose |
| | | | Compartment | Sub-compartment | Block | Total | Forested | Barren | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | NGUYỄN VĂN  A | G | 113 | 6 | a | 114 | 100 | | IIIA2 | 20000 | PH | > 30 | 8 | | LN |
| | | | | | | | | 14 | IA | | | | | | |
| 2 | NGUYỄN VĂN  B | KH | 115 | 2 | b | 115 | 15 | | IIIA2 | 3000 | SX | < 30 | 3 | | LN |
| | | | | | | | | 100 | IA | | | | | | |

Note:

- Allocation forms: Allocation (G) and Contract (KH)

- Forest categories by functions: Protection (PH), Special-use (DD), Production (SX)

- Designated purposes: Forestry (LN), Agriculture (NN), Industry (CN)

Table 5.2: Change of forest conditions before and after allocation/contract

| # | Name of household | Forest types | Area (ha) | | | Volume (m3) | | | Before/after allocation | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Beginning period | Ending period | Change | Beginning period | Ending period | Change | Beginning period | Ending period | Change |
| | Nguyễn Văn A | IIIA1 | 100 | 80 | -20 | | | | | | |
| | | IA | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5.3: Information on benefits and responsibility of households on allocated/contracted forests

| # | Household | Allocation forms | Area (ha) | | Amount (VND) | | Number of patrol/month | Number of hhs/time | Violated cases (case) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total | Cultivated | Contracted | Actual receipt | | | |
| 1 | A | KH | | | | | | | |
| 2 | B | G | | | | | | | |
| 3 | C | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | |

Table 5.4: Amount of timber and NTFPs harvested

| # | Household | Species | Timber/NTFPs | Unit | Amount | Price/value |
|---|-----------|---------|--------------|------|--------|-------------|
| 1 | Nguyễn Văn A | Dipterocarps | Timber | m3 | 5 | |
| | | Rattan | NTFPs | kg | 15 | |
| | | | | | | |

Table 5.5: Area of plantation/nourishment/regeneration

| # | Household | Area (ha) | | | Species |
|---|-----------|-----------|---|---|---------|
| | | Afforestation | Nourishment | Regeneration | |
| 1 | Nguyễn Văn A | | | | |
| 2 | Trần Văn B | | | | |

Table 5.6: Case of forest fire of early discovers or timely stopped

| # | Location (compartment, sub-comp, block) | Date | Area (ha) | Causes | Forest types |
|---|------------------------------------------|------|-----------|--------|--------------|
| 1 | b-5-113 | 14-Jun | 0.2 | Phát rẫy | IC |
| 2 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Table 5.7: Number of violated cases on forest law reported to commune office

| # | Cases | Number | Location | Dates | Result of solution |
|---|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------------------|
|   |       |        |          |       |                    |
|   |       |        |          |       |                    |
|   |       |        |          |       |                    |
|   |       |        |          |       |                    |

Table 5.8: Number of conferences and participants on forest protection issues

| # | Conference | Number of participants | | | | Date of conference | Venue |
|---|-----------|------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|-------|
|   |           | Total | Of which | | |                    |       |
|   |           |       | Commune & village officer | Local people | Household of allocated forests | | |
| 1 |           |       |          |       |       |                    |       |
| 2 |           |       |          |       |       |                    |       |
|   |           |       |          |       |       |                    |       |
|   |           |       |          |       |       |                    |       |

Table 5.9: Cost related to propaganda on forest law at commune per annum

| Number of propaganda | Implementing agencies | Amount (VND) | Number of participants |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 5.10: Information on budget mobilized for forest protection/management per annum

| # | Content | Source of funding | Total (VND) | Period |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Annex 6: Forms for secondary data collection at District Forest Protection Unit

- Name of organization: …………………….…..

- Address: ……………..

Table 6.1: Information on funding sources for forest protection/management

| # | Content | Source of funding | Total (VND) | Period |
|---|---------|-------------------|-------------|--------|
|   |         |                   |             |        |
|   |         |                   |             |        |
|   |         |                   |             |        |

Table 6.2: Periodical statistics on forest law enforcement by quarterly/yearly

| # | Behaviors | Unit | Number of cases | | | Level of damages | | |
|---|-----------|------|-----------------|---|---|------------------|---|---|
|   |           |      | Beginning period | Ending period | Change | Beginning period | Ending period | Change |
|   | Harvest | m3 | 100 | 80 | -20 |  |  |  |
|   | Deforestation | ha |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Hunting | kg |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6.3: Violated cases discovered and enforced

| # | Violated persons | Content | Forms of enforcement | Results |
|---|------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|
| 1 | Nguyễn Văn A |  | Cash fine | Deposited |
|   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Table 6.4: Characteristics of violated cases

| # | Behavior | Cases | Damages | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Area (ha) | Amount |
| 1 | Forest encroachment | 3 | 1.5 | |
| 2 | Illegal harvest | 5 | | 3 kg of rattan |
| Total | | | | |

Table 6.5: Number of violated cases on forest law reported to district FPU

| # | Cases | Number | Location | Dates | Result of solution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Table 6.6: Number of conferences and participants on forest protection issues

| # | Conference | Number of participants | | | | Date of conference | Venue |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Of which | | | | |
| | | | Commune & village officer | Local people | Household of allocated forests | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

## Annex 7: Forms for secondary data collection at District Office of Internal Affairs

- Name of organization: ……………………….…..

- Address: ……………..

Table 7.1: Capacity of commune staff relevant to forest governance

| # | Name | Birth date | Years of work | | Formal education | | | | | | Forestry | Current job | Number of forest-related projects participated in |
|---|------|-----------|---------------|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | In forestry sector | Other sector | Secondary level | Preliminary | Intermediate | College | University | Post-grad | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Annex 8: Forms for secondary data collection at Commune People's Committee

- Name of commune:

Table 8.1: Number of legal documents related to forest management received by Commune People's Committee

| # | Names of document | Brief content | Code | Date of issuance | Issued by | Date of receipt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.2: Number of legal documents issued by Commune People's Committee per annum

| # | Type of document | Content | Date of issuance | Signatory |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8.3: Suggestions/ Recommendations submitted to higher level of authority

| # | Content | Total number of recommendation | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Already accepted/ solved | Pending |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 8.4: Number of households participated in forest-service business

| # | Household | Income from forest-service business | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Eco-tourism | Husbandry | Cropping | Others | Amount (VDN) |
| 1 | | | | | | 150000 |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| | Total hhs | Total amount | | | | |

Table 8.5: Change in annual income

| # | Type of jobs | Original capital | Personnel | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Table 8.6: Annual funding sources mobilized for forest management/protection

| # | Content | Sources | Amount (VND) | Period |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Table 8.7: Budget for training and awards

| # | Category of budget | From commune budget (VND 1,000) | Number of receipients |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Annual allowance for duties | | |
| 2 | Annual training allowance | | |
| 3 | Annual awards | | |

Table 8.8: Number of conferences and participants on forest protection issues

| # | Conference | Number of participants | | | | Date of conference | Venue |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Of which | | | | |
| | | | Commune & village officer | Local people | Household of allocated forests | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |

Table 8.9: Radio program on forest protection law per quarter

| # | Content of radio program | Duration | Number of program/month | Date of broadcasting | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | AM | PM |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Table 8.10: Cross-meetings among stakeholders on forest protection/management

| # | Contents | Coordinating agency | Date | Compositions | No. of participants |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

Table 8.11: Number of violated cases on forest law reported to commune office

| # | Cases | Number | Location | Dates | Result of solution |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |

Table 8.12: Number of complaints on forestry sector

| # | Contents | Date | | | Reasons of delay/ unsolved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Receipt | Solved | Times | |
| | | | | | |

## Annex 9: Topics/Questions for Group discussion

1. Names of timber and non-timber species (A1.1) or: What typical tree/forest products in the commune forest do you know? (list)

    a. Măng, Tre, Dớn, Lan rừng, Rau rừng, Chè dây, Nấm, Lá bép, Lá giang

    b. Thông, Dổi, Dẻ, Sao, Lim, Chò, Xá xị, Bạch tùng,

2. According to you, how possible of forest access given this current topography (i.e. slope, road condition)? Very difficult, Difficult, Easy

3. How member of group was assigned duty of patrol?

4. How frequent does your group patrol the forest monthly?

5. How numbers of violation are changed in your forest? (Increase/Decrease) Reasons for increased/decreased numbers of violation?

6. Change in income of poor households (A3.6)

7. How many households did receive forest protection contract?

8. What is average monthly payment for forest protection contract per household?

9. All sources of income from forest (forest protection, cattle/animals raising, non-timber forest products, crop cultivation, total income, other sources)

10. Your main career classified by agriculture, forest protection and management, animal husbandry, other)

11. Is forest protection contract long enough? Why?

12. Is payment from forest protection contract stable/consistent by time?

13. Have you invested in anything in your forests? (yes/no) if yes, what kinds of investment?

14. Have your received any supports apart from payment for protection contract?

    a. If yes, what it is: ……………

    b. Source of funding: …………(what program?)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## *Annex 10: Questions for in-depth interview of commune/village officers*

Details of respondent/interviewee: name, address, position, etc.

1. Are you a member of commune forestry team? (Y/N)

If yes, when did you join this team? .............(year or number of years/months participated)

2. Did you receive allowance/salary when participating in this team?

If yes, how much did you receive per month? ................. VND

3. Do you think this amount of allowance/salary is suitable with your responsibility? (Y/N)

4. During your work, have you ever been awarded any prizes/awards? (Y/N)

If yes, who confered you the award? (level):…………….

5. According to you, is the selection process of persons for this award appropriate? (Y/N)

If not, please specify the reasons? …………………

6. Do you think the policy of allowance is suitable? (Y/N)

Please justify: ...............

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Annex 11: Household questionnaire

General information of the household (name, address, village, etc.)

**Section 1: Benefits from allocated/contracted forest**

1. Do you often go to the forest? (Y/N)

2. What kinds of forest product do you often harvest?

| No. | Name of products | Measuring unit | Location | | Volume/year | Purposes | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | In forest | Out forest | | Consumption | Sale |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

3. Do you get contract of forest protection? Y/N

If yes, what is size of your forest? ………ha

4. Do you cultivate in your forest? (Y/N)

If yes, how many patches of forest do you have? Size of each patch?

5. Do you opereate any business services in you forest?

If yes what type of business?

| No | Name of household | Income (VND) from business service | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Eco-tourism | Café | Karaoke | | | Total |
| 1 | | | | | | | 150000 |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| | Total numbers of household | Total amount of money | | | | | |

6. How much money do you receive per month for your forest protection contract?

7. What is your main source of income yearly?

- Forest protection & management – Animal husbandry – Non-timber forest products - Cropping - Others

7. Was your contract protection forest fired last year?

If yes, how many times did they fire? ............. times

8. Did you stop fire or prevent fire by yourself? (Y/N)

9. Did you report these fire events to relevant agencies? (Y/N)

10. Does your forest change areas after contract/allocation? If yes, how much? And reasons for these changes?

**Section 2: Forest policy propagation/dissemination**

1. During last time, do you often receive information on forest protection & management?

2. If yes, do you find information useful? Y/N

3. Do you find amount of news broadcasting suitable? Y/N

Note: a table of broadcasting means is needed (radio, leaflets, meetings)

4. Point of time of information sharing is suitable?

5. Methods of sharing information is suitable?

6. Are you aware of any following regulations?

| Regulations | Unknown | Little | Wellknown | Soure of information | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Communal staff | Village staff | Forest protection Unit | Forest owner | Mass media |
| 1. Regulations on forest fire prevention/treatment | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Regulation on shifting cultivation | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Regulation on NTFP harvest | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Regulation on wildlife hunting and sales | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Regulation on fine/sanction on violation in forest management & protection | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Others:……………………….. | | | | | | | | |

**Section 3: Complaints**

1.  Did you have any complaints on forest protection & management last year? (Y/N)

*If yes, what contents did you make complaints?*

Forestland   Forest product sale   Wildlife hunting   Forest product
harvesting   Land management  Other, specified: ............

2.  Was your complaints considered by relevant agencies? Y/N

*If yes, how do you think about result?*

**Time:** On time Delayed

**Solution:**  Agree   Not agree