

**UN-REDD**  
PROGRAMME



# Training Workshop Report

---

**Developing an Indicator Set and Data  
Collection Tools for the Participatory  
Governance Assessment for REDD+ in  
Vietnam**

16-17 April 2013, Da Lat - Vietnam

---

Prepared by Nguyen Quang Tan, workshop facilitator

With inputs and comments from Akiko Inoguchi, Emelyne Cheney, Tore Langhelle, Tina Hageberg and Soojin Kim

## Contents of the report

<b>1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND TO THE TRAINING WORKSHOP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES, PROGRAM AND APPROACH</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND GROUP WORK DYNAMICS</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	THE PARTICIPANTS	4
3.2	THE GROUP WORK	5
3.3	PARTICIPATION IN THE WORKSHOP OF DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PARTICIPANTS	6
<b>4</b>	<b>THE WORKSHOP PROCESS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1	DESCRIPTION OF THE WORKSHOP SESSIONS	6
4.2	COMPLETENESS OF THE INDICATOR SET AND THE DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	9
4.3	SPECIFICITY OF PRIORITY ISSUES SELECTED FOR THE INDICATOR DEVELOPMENT	9
<b>5</b>	<b>FOLLOW-UP AND NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1	COORDINATION AND ORGANIZATION FOR THE NEXT WORKSHOP	10
5.2	WORKSHOP TO FINALIZE THE DATA COLLECTION TOOLS FOR FIELD TESTING	10
5.3	TESTING AND FINALIZING THE INDICATOR SET AND DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	12
5.4	MULTI-STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION ON THE INDICATOR SET AND DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	12
5.5	DATA COLLECTION, DATA ANALYSIS AND REPORTING	13
	ANNEX 1: TRAINING AGENDA	14
	ANNEX 2: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	16
	ANNEX 3: OUTPUTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS	18

## 1 Background to the training workshop

The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD Programme) is a collaboration between FAO, UNDP and UNEP. Global activities of the Programme aim to develop common approaches, analyses, methodologies, tools, data and guidelines that facilitate REDD+ readiness work.

The Participatory Governance Assessment for REDD+ is an initiative of the UN-REDD Global Programme jointly delivered by FAO and UNDP. Vietnam is among four countries in the world to undertake the PGA piloting<sup>1</sup>. FAO provides technical support and training on indicators and data collection methods to the PGA pilots. PGA process in Vietnam started in March 2012. Currently, Vietnam is at the stage of developing indicators and designing a data collection process. RECOFTC, the Center for People and Forests, has been contracted by FAO to provide technical assistance and to deliver a training workshop on 16-17 April 2013 in Da Lat city, to the stakeholders including those identified for involvement in the Advisory Group of the PGA for Lam Dong province.

This document provides an overview of the training workshop mentioned above, and a reflection of the training process and outputs. After this introduction, the training objectives, approaches and organization will be presented in details in Section 2. Section 3 will follow with an overview of the participants. In Section 4, a reflection on the process and outputs from the training workshop is presented. Finally, Section 5 will discuss suggested follow-up actions.

## 2 Workshop objectives, outcomes, program and approach

This two-day training workshop aimed to develop an understanding among all participants, who came from different background and levels, on key considerations in the development of a an indicator set for further use in the PGA in Vietnam, and the capacity needed to develop the indicator set and data collection tools, considerations and potential relevant data sources. In more specific terms, the training aimed to help participants to:

- come up with an agreement on the necessity in developing an indicator set and data collection tools for PGA
- develop common understanding on the main elements of and the main step for developing indicators (based on identified priority issues)
- become aware of key considerations for data collection
- become aware of general considerations when later on deciding on the data collection methodologies relevant for PGA
- explore possible data sources, and based on the above
- develop a draft indicator set and data collection tools, building on two identified priority issues agreed during the PGA Institutional and Context Analysis (ICA) workshop in Da Lat in March 2013<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> The other three countries are Indonesia, Nigeria and Ecuador.

<sup>2</sup> Available online at <http://vietnam->

[redd.org/Upload/Download/File/Provincial\\_consultation\\_workshop\\_report\\_Mar6\\_final\\_5039.pdf](http://redd.org/Upload/Download/File/Provincial_consultation_workshop_report_Mar6_final_5039.pdf)

The outputs of the training workshop were

- A draft indicator set of forest governance assessment in Lam Dong province, focusing on maximum two priorities as highlighted in the PGA ICA workshop in March 2013, including the related tools for data collection, and
- Tentative plan for next steps

The workshop program was designed in the way to achieve the objectives and outputs (see more details in Annex 1). Each session had its own learning objectives and concrete outputs, which served as the inputs for the following sessions:

Session 1: Opening and welcoming

Session 2: The necessity of monitoring and assessment of forest governance

Session 3: Developing the indicator set and data collection tools: introduction

Session 4: Identifying key components of the identified priority issues

Session 5: Developing indicators for the key components

Session 6: Identifying potential sources of data

Session 7: Developing data collection tools

Session 8: Next steps

Methodologically, the training workshop employed an experiential learning approach, which allowed participants to engage themselves actively in the whole process through small group-work exercises, giving participants ample opportunities to link the theories and actual situation in their working sites in the development of the indicator set and corresponding data collection tools. Minimum lecturing was given during the workshop. Throughout the group-working, participants received guidance and immediate support and feedback on their group-work results from other participants and the workshop facilitator who worked closely with them.

Finally, it is important to note that while PGA process in Vietnam is part of the REDD+ process, it was intended that the workshop did not focus only on REDD+ but on forest governance issues in general for the main reason that forest governance issues of REDD+ are essentially the same as forest governance issues in general.

### 3 Workshop participants and group work dynamics

#### 3.1 The participants

The training workshop was attended by 28 participants, including six members of the organizing team. The participants came from various levels and organizations (see summary in Table 1 and more details in Annex 2).

**Table 1: Overview of participants to the workshop**

Type of organizations	Male	Female
<i>Participants</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>3</i>
- Vietnam Administration of Forestry (VNFOREST)	1	0

- Functional departments at provincial level	5	1
- State forest companies/ management boards	3	0
- Functional unit at district level	1	0
- Communal level	3	1
- Local university	1	0
- Vietnamese non-government organizations	5	1
<b>Organizing team</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
- Vietnam REDD+ Office (VRO)	0	1
- UNDP	1	2
- FAO	0	1
- RECOFTC	1	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>

It is important to note that the participants from Vietnamese NGOs (six participants) were from outside of Lam Dong and were invited to the workshop with the intention to foster cross-fertilization of experiences between the PGA and the Livelihoods Impact Assessment for FLEGT VPA, to enhance the dynamics of discussions, and to foster local capacity for facilitating future PGA indicator development exercises. They therefore did not only play the role of the participants but also of the facilitators in the group work, which will be discussed next.

### 3.2 The group work

Participants were divided into four small groups for group-working. Division of participants into the working groups was done in such a way that facilitated the contribution from all participants. Participants from leading positions of provincial functional departments who deemed to dominate the discussion were asked to sit in a separate group, to avoid them overwhelming the participation of others. Local level (district and commune) representatives were purposefully asked to sit together in two groups in order to encourage their participation. Participants from Vietnamese NGOs were split into all four groups. As a result, members of the working groups were as followed:

- Group 1: Participants from provincial functional departments (3), local university (1) and NGO (1)
- Group 2: Participants from provincial functional departments (2), forest company/ management board (2) and NGO (1)
- Group 3: Participants from district and commune (3), and NGO (2)
- Group 4: Participants from provincial functional department (1) forest company/ management board (1), district level (2) and NGO (2)

For each group working session, a five minute introduction of the groups' task was given at the beginning. Members of the groups worked on their task and the workshop facilitator went around to each group to provide guidance, explanation and support. Group members had the chance to share their work results and received feedback from the workshop facilitator and other participants at the end of each session. The output of each group's work was used as the input for the discussion in the following session.

### **3.3 Participation in the workshop of different groups of participants**

As mentioned above, participants came from a wide range of organizations, administrative levels, backgrounds, and exposure to similar exercises. The group work was employed to make sure each participant felt most comfortable to learn and contribute to the discussion.

The participants from Vietnamese NGO (six participants) made important contribution to the dynamics of the workshop. They contributed actively in the group discussion, as well as the plenary sessions during the whole workshop. Their field experience and technical knowledge expressed through their interventions were undoubtedly of great importance in helping other participants to understand better. In addition, some of them (namely Toan from SRD, Hoang from CRD and Dzung from CORENARM) were helpful in facilitating the small group discussions.

Participation of commune and district officials (five participants) improved substantially during the course of the workshop. They started the workshop rather timid, but became more active during the small group discussions, contributing to the development of the indicators measuring participation of commune authority in the decision making process. Local participants also presented to the plenary, the group discussion results and participated in the plenary discussions. At the final session, they actively requested the workshop organizers to extend the invitation to other communal representatives.

Provincial participants and a representative from a local university (seven participants), as expected, dominated the plenary discussions at the beginning of the workshop. The workshop facilitator had to impose a one-minute rule for questions or sharing comments at the plenary, in order to avoid their dominance over the discussions. It was encouraging that many provincial participants expressed significant learning and potential application of the new knowledge gained from the workshop in their work at the office. Before the end of the workshop, these participants discussed among themselves and a leader of provincial FPD (Mr. Nguyen Ba Luong) proposed that Lam Dong FPD to take the coordinating role in the subsequent steps of PGA in Lam Dong, which was regarded as an indication of their interest in the PGA process.

Representatives from state company/forest management boards showed rather limited interest in the process. Although they also participated in the discussion, they appeared to be responding to questions asked rather than making proactive contribution. For unknown reasons, none of the three participants from this group attended the two-day workshop in full, despite the prior request by the organizers.

## **4 The workshop process and analysis**

### **4.1 Description of the workshop sessions**

Session 1: the workshop was opened by Lam Dong Forest Protection Department leader, who welcomed participants and emphasized on the need for active participation of all participants to the workshop. This was followed by a round of introduction of participants, who worked in pairs to learn about each other and then introduced the partners to the plenary. After that, participants worked together to build up the agenda of the workshop, based on the individual items written on card provided by the facilitator. The WS agenda developed by participants followed exactly the same sequence as prepared by the workshop organizers.

Session 2: the session aimed to reach an agreement on the need for forest governance monitoring and assessment. It started with a role play on the importance of monitoring and assessment in daily life. The discussion that followed the role play then gradually led the participants to the importance of monitoring and assessment in forest (governance). The session was enriched with a presentation on lessons from Provincial Governance and Public Administration Performance Index (PAPI) project by UNDP.

Session 3: the intention of session was to reach a common understanding among participants on the steps needed to undertake to develop the indicator set and data collection tools. Participants worked in small groups to identify steps that they felt needed to be undertaken. The group work results were shared to the plenary using snowball method, in which the first group presented all the results of the work. After that, other group added new items. At the end of the session, participants discussed in plenary and came up with an agreed list of steps.

Session 4: This session aimed to come up with key components for identified governance priorities. Based on the discussions from the previous stage in the PGA process, the March 2013 ICA workshop, two priority issues were selected for use in development of indicator set and corresponding data collection tools. Two groups focused on each of these issues throughout the whole workshop:

- Allocation of forest to local people (groups 1 and 2)
- Participation of local (commune) authority in decision making process related forest management (groups 3 and 4)

Prior to the start of the workshop, the workshop organizers discussed internally and agreed the prioritization of governance issues taken in the March ICA workshop was found not to be particularly reflective of the richness of the discussions that preceded, and therefore, not to use the priority issues concluded in the March PGA workshop. Rather, the two selected priorities, as presented above, are based on, and agreed among the organizers to better reflect the discussion in the previous workshop.<sup>3</sup> It is also noted that only two priority issues were selected for development of indicator set in this workshop as: a) the workshop was meant to familiarize participants with the approach/ steps needed to develop the indicators and related data collection tools, and b) there was a time constraint to cover more issues as the workshop was only for two days.

As the first step to develop the indicator set, the participants developed key components related to the given priority issues. Each group developed a maximum of four key components. The components were then presented to the plenary using the “snowball method” (i.e. the first group presents all components developed, the second group adds only additional components). After the plenary discussion, the key components for ‘Allocation of forest to local people’, as identified by groups 1 and 2, were:

- Conditions of local forests: the main argument made to include this component was that conditions of the forest would affect directly the benefits that local people may derive from the forest and thus their interest in protecting the forest.
- Benefit sharing mechanism: the main argument to include this component was that availability of a clear and fair benefit sharing mechanism would create interest among local people in protecting the forest.

---

<sup>3</sup> Reflecting this point, it has therefore been suggested that for the future, prioritization be made not only of the governance issue as represented by the governance principles, but in the context of the tangible larger issues at hand.

- The effectiveness of forest management after allocation: the argument to include this component was the effectiveness of existing examples of forest management after allocation would provide important lessons for future allocation of forest to local people.

And the key components for 'Participation of local (commune) authority in decision making process related forest management', as identified by groups 3 and 4, were:

- Transparency of concerned policies and their implementation: the main argument to include this component was that if there was transparency in communication/ dissemination of new policies and in the implementation of those policies, local level officials would have the opportunities to be informed and join relevant events or processes.
- Scope of jurisdiction of the communal authority in decision-making: the main argument was that the whether or not local authority can participate in certain event/ process would also depend on what has been regulated by existing legal framework.
- Management and implementation capacity of the communal authority: the main argument to include this component was that the existing capacity of local officials would have significant influence on whether or not and how they participate in decision making process.
- Requests from local people: the main argument was that when local people kept sending different requests (e.g. to represent them in certain event) to its authority, the officials would have to find the way to respond to such requests. This would stimulate the participation of local authority.

Session 5: In the next step, each group focused on development of indicators for one agreed component from the previous session. This step was divided into two sub-steps to make sure that participants got enough time to receive feedback on their work. In the first sub-step, the four groups developed indicators for the components they selected (one component for each group). The results were then presented and discussed. Based on feedback from the plenary and workshop facilitator, the groups refined the indicator set for the selected component as the second sub-step. Some groups also decided to develop a more comprehensive list of indicators than the instructed maximum number of four. The outputs of the group work on this step (the indicators) are presented in Annex 3.1 (first column).

Session 6: After the indicators had been developed, the groups went on to identify the data sources (where information and data for each of the indicators can be found), and the techniques for data collection (how to get these data and information from the identified sources). Data sources included secondary (existing literature, statistics, etc.) as well as primary (to be collected through interviews, surveys). Outputs of the group work of this step (source of data for the corresponding indicators) and corresponding data collection techniques are presented in Annex 3.1 (second and third columns).

Session 7: The small groups then continued to develop some tools for data collection (forms for collecting secondary data and questions for primary data collection). Due to the limited time, the data collection tools (as presented in Annex 3.2) were not complete. In addition, as there was shortage of time at the end of the workshop, comments made during the plenary had not been fully incorporated in the data collection tools.

Session 8: the session was split into two parts. The first part was an introduction about the options for next steps in terms of leading/ facilitating roles (before lunch break on day 2), which were:



Option 1: (and organization in) Lam Dong to take the leading/ coordinating role to undertake PGA in a participatory way, with backstopping from FAO, UNDP, VNFOREST, and participating NGOs.

Option 2: an expert or a group of experts to lead the PGA process, and concerned stakeholders to be consulted when needed

In the second part (end of the workshop), (provincial) participants discussed their choice of option above and made proposal to UNDP/ FAO. It is also noted that before the options were presented at the plenary on Day 2, there was a small group meeting between workshop organizers and Vietnamese NGOs to discuss about the above mentioned options and explore the possibility that VNGOs to play the facilitating role in the subsequent steps of the PGA. Based on the agreement with VNGOs that option 1 would be preferred and they would play facilitating role, the two options were presented to the plenary.

## **4.2 Completeness of the indicator set and the data collection tools**

It is important to note again that the indicator set and the data collection tools, as presented in Annexes 3.1 and 3.2, are not yet ready for field data collection (nor were they intended to be as the design of the workshop). The training workshop was designed to foster understanding among participants of the process to develop the indicator table and the data collection tools; and to generate a rough set of indicators. The primary focus of workshop (and PGA in general) was the process of indicator development and corresponding data collection tools development. The resulting indicator set was given secondary priority in terms of time and attention of the workshop facilitator.

Before proceeding to field data collection, it is recommended that the following further steps are taken; finalization of the indicator set and data collection tools, and field testing of the tools. These steps will be discussed in more details in Section 5.

## **4.3 Specificity of priority issues selected for the indicator development**

As discussed in Section 4.1, the two governance issues selected for the group work of developing indicator set and data collection tools came from the discussions (instead of what was concluded) in the March 2013 ICA workshop. While one issue ('participation of communal authority in decision making process') was specific enough, the other issue ('allocation of forest to local people') appeared to be too broad for the participants to intuitively connect to and to form a coherent understanding of the underlying issues. For the future (particularly for the next workshop – see discussion in the next Section), this should be avoided. In other words, priority issues selected for the assessment should be concrete enough to facilitate the understanding and participation of local stakeholders, and to match with the time and resources available for the assessment.

## **5 Follow-up and next steps**

This section outlines the key next steps needed and the main points of considerations in each step. Table 2 presents an overview of the PGA process in Vietnam till date (the organization of first workshop on indicator development) and suggested time line for the next steps. A few crosscutting/ organizational issues will precede the discussion on key steps:

## **5.1 Coordination and organization for the next workshop**

During the last session of the workshop, the Lam Dong FPD representative expressed the interest in taking the coordination role for the next steps of PGA in Lam Dong province, with continued support from UN-REDD Program. This is in line with the idea of a participatory approach intended to be achieved through the PGA. It is therefore recommended that Lam Dong FPD to take the lead in the PGA in the province (e.g. indicating what they want to get out from PGA, where the PGA should be piloted) to ensure that the outputs of PGA serve the need of stakeholders in Lam Dong. Stakeholders at local level (district and commune, and village) should be strongly encouraged to participate. UN-REDD Program continues to backstop them to ensure it is a participatory process.

It is also recommended that the Vietnamese NGOs (VNGOs) participating in the workshop (i.e. Pan Nature, CORENARM, SRD, CHCC and CRD) form a consortium to collectively assist and guide Lam Dong FPD in the development of the indicator set and data collection tools, as well as subsequent steps of PGA in the province (e.g. data collection, data analysis, reporting). VNGOs consortium members are also expected to help Lam Dong FPD in the coordination with various stakeholder groups to make sure the participatory approach is employed in the whole process of the PGA.

## **5.2 Workshop to finalize the data collection tools for field testing**

The next immediate step is to finalize the development of the indicator set and data collection tools, to be ready for field testing, to be implemented through a workshop of around three days. The following key points are recommended for the next workshop:

- a) Finalizing the developed indicator set and corresponding data collection tools for the selected priority issues: this is the most important item in the workshop agenda. Based on the workshop outputs (as presented in Annex 3), participants of the next workshop will need to review and come up with a more comprehensive and refined set of indicators for the selected priority issues and the corresponding data collection tools. This includes but is not limited a) to reviewing of the workshop results (involving narrowing of the priority issue on 'allocation of forest to local people' to something more specific), b) completing the indicator development process for missing components, and c) developing the complete set of data collection tools to collection needed data.

**Table 2: PGA process till date and suggested timeline for next steps**

	2012										2013												
	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	
Launch of PGA in Vietnam																							
Recruitment of staff and consultant team																							
Institutional and Context Analysis																							
First workshop on indicator development																							
Second workshop on indicator development																							
Field test of data collection tools																							
Multi-stakeholder consultation on indicator set and data collection																							
Data collection																							
Data analysis and reporting																							

- b) Development of the indicator set and corresponding data collection tools for other priority issues: as earlier explained, the selection of the two issues was done partially externally based on the outputs from the ICA workshop. In the next workshop, if time and resources allow, it is suggested that the participants spend some time to review the issues to see if there may be other key issues.
- c) Taking data analysis and report writing into account: before going out to collect data, it is important to discuss how collected data will be analyzed and what should be reported in order to be clear that relevant roles are assigned to different stakeholders and to discuss how the outputs can be made useful for all involved. Key data analytical tools can be identified and reporting format be developed.
- d) Development of plan for data collection: By the end of the next workshop, a plan needs to be collectively developed, indicating the concrete steps/ events to take place for data collection, the timeline, the roles of different actors involved, and the resources needed.

Participants: there should be a smaller group of participants for the next workshop, to facilitate the discussion and process. It is recommended that there should be between 15 and 20 participants. These participants should be the core of PGA team – that is they will be the ones to develop the indicator set and data collection tools, field test and finalize the tools, lead the data collection in the field, conduct the analysis and reporting. Based on the participants in the workshop in April, the following groups are recommended:

- Vietnamese NGOs: 5-7 (one or two from each of the NGOs participated in the workshop in April). VNGOs will guide the process in the workshop, as well as contribute to the development of the indicator set and data collection tools.
- Commune and district level officials: 4-6 (two or three from district and two or three from commune)
- Provincial functional departments: 4 (2 from FPD, 1 from Board of Ethnicity, and 1 from DARD)
- Others: max 3 (from forest companies, management board, etc.)

### **5.3 Testing and finalizing the indicator set and data collection tools**

After the data collection tools have been agreed by the workshop participants, it can be field tested in one site in order to be certain of the overall consistency of the methodology as well as the relevance of the questions to the local contexts/ respondents. It also serves as a reality check to see if data for certain indicators exist. Ideally, the field test is done by the same members of the participants of the next workshop. Time should be spent on reflection among the participants on what have been learned/ observed and what can be done to improve the data collection tools (and the indicator set if needed). After that, the tools and data collection set need to be revised for the next step. In addition, a guide for each of the data collection tools should also be prepared to yield relevant data. This step may take a month or more.

### **5.4 Multi-stakeholder consultation on the indicator set and data collection tools**

Once the indicator set and data collection tools have been revised after the field test, a bigger workshop with participation of a wider stakeholder group to provide last round of comments to the indicators is suggested. The outputs of this workshop will be comments to improve the indicator set

and data collection tools. Based on which, final revision can be made before field data collection takes place.

### **5.5 Data collection, data analysis and reporting**

Once revised, the tools can be used to collect data. Ideally, the data collection, analysis and reporting is done by the participants. However, there may be a need to have human resource from outside to assist, particularly as enumerators in the data collection. If this is the case, the enumerators should be familiarized with the data collection tools (a short training is recommended) before they start collecting the data. PGA team (or key members of the team) should be with the enumerators to provide help and explanation on time, to avoid any bias or collection of unnecessary data.

## Annexes

1. Final agenda
2. Participants list
3. Workshop outputs

### Annex 1: Training agenda

Time	Content	Facilitator
<b>Day 1: 16/04/ 2013</b>		
08:05 – 08:15	Welcome & Opening remarks	Nguyen Ba Luong
08:15 – 08:45	Participant Introductions and Expectations	Nguyen Quang Tan
8:45 – 9:00	Objectives, expected outputs and program of workshop	Nguyen Quang Tan
09:00 – 09:15	Introduction about current status of PGA in Vietnam	Hoang Vu Lan Phuong
9:15 – 10:15	The necessity of monitoring and assessment of forest governance	Nguyen Quang Tan
10:15 – 10:30	Tea break	
10:30 - 11:10	Presentation on UNDP PAPI	Do Thi Thanh Huyen
11:10 - 11:30	Developing assessment framework and data collection tools: introduction	Nguyen Quang Tan
11:30 – 13:00	Lunch	
13:00 – 13:30	Developing assessment framework and data collection tools: introduction (cont)	Nguyen Quang Tan
13:30 – 15:00	Identifying key components of the selected governance issues	Nguyen Quang Tan
15:00 – 15:15	Tea break	
15:15 – 16:45	Developing indicators for the key components	Nguyen Quang Tan
16:55 – 17:00	Summary and feedback on day 1	Nguyen Quang Tan
17:00 – 17:20	Discussion with Vietnamese NGOs on next steps	

**Day 2: 17/04/ 2013**

08:00 – 08:35	Reflection on day 1	
08:35 – 10:15	Developing indicators for the key components (cont)	Nguyen Quang Tan
10:15 – 10:30	Tea break	
10:30 – 11:15	Developing indicators for the key components (cont)	Nguyen Quang Tan
11:15 – 11:35	Information on next steps	Nguyen Quang Tan
11:30 – 13:00	Lunch	
13:00 - 15:00	Developing data collection tools: Identifying potential sources of data and techniques for data collection	Nguyen Quang Tan
15:00 – 15:15	Tea break	
15:15 – 17:15	Developing data collection tools: tools for data collection	Nguyen Quang Tan
17:15 – 17:45	Discussion on next steps	Nguyen Quang Tan
17:45	Close of the workshop	

## Annex 2: List of participants

#	Name	Position/ Organization	Working group	Notes
Participants				
1.	Mr. Nguyen Huu Dzung	Director, Forest Protection Department	n/a	For the opening
2.	Mr. Nguyen Ba Luong	Deputy director, Provincial FDP, DARD Lam Dong	2	
3.	Mr. Pham Trung Thong	Officer, Provincial FDP, DARD Lam Dong	2	
4.	Ms. Hoang Cong Hoai Nam	Head of Nature conservation unit, Provincial FDP, DARD Lam Dong	4	
5.	Mr. Pham Thanh Cong	Officer, DONRE Lam Dong	1	Only day 1
6.	Mr. Vo Thuan	Vice Chief, Board of Ethnicities, Lam Dong	1	Only day 1
7.	Mr. Vo Minh Tham	Vice director, Lam Dong Forest Protection and Development Funds	1	
8.	Mr. Lam Ngoc Tuan	Dean, Environment Department, Da Lat University	1	
9.	Mr. Ho Huynh Dzung	Deputy head, Da Nhim Protection Forest Management Board	4	Only day 2
10.	Mr. Tran Quoc Viet	Dai Ninh Hydro Electric Company	2	Only day 1
11.	Mr. Cao Duc Anh Trung	Dran Protection Forest Management Board	2	Only day 1
12.	Mr. Than Trong Toan	Head of office, Ethnicities Office, Lac Duong district	4	
13.	Mr. K'Boi	Bao Thuan Commune's Forestry Board, Di Linh district	4	From afternoon of day 1
14.	Mr. Mo Lom Su	Gung Re Commune's Forestry Board, Di Linh district	3	
15.	Mr. K'Brot	Gung Re Commune's Farmer	3	



		Association, Di Linh district		
16.	Ms. Lieng Trang K'Dom	Chair, Da Sar Commune's Women Union, Lac Duong district	3	
17.	Mr. Dang Ngoc Toan	Director, Central Highlands Center for Community Development & Climate Change – Buon Me Thuot	3	
18.	Mr. Truong Quang Hoang	Director, Centre for Rural Development in Central Viet Nam (CRD Hue)	2	
19.	Ms. Tran Thi Thanh Toan	Manager, SRD Hue Office	3	
20.	Mr. Nguyen Viet Dung	Vice director, PanNature	1	Not on day 2 afternoon
21.	Mr. Ngo Tri Dzung	Officer, Consultative and Research Center on Natural Resource Management (CORENARM)	4	
22.	Mr. Nguyen Xuan Lam	Officer, Pan Nature	4	
Organizing team				
23.	Ms. Nguyen Thi Hao	Vietnam REDD Office		
24.	Ms. Akiko Inoguchi	FAO Vietnam		Not on day 2 afternoon
25.	Mr. Tore Langhelle	UNDP		Not on day 2 afternoon
26.	Mr. Nguyen Quang Tan	RECOFTC		
27.	Ms. Hoang Vu Lan Phuong	UNDP		
28.	Ms. Do Thi Thanh Huyen	UNDP		For PAPI presentation

### Annex 3: Outputs of the working groups

#### Annex 3.1: The Indicator set

	Indicators	Source of data	Data collection techniques
<b>A</b>	<b>Issue:</b> Allocation of forests to local people (group 1 and 2)		
<u>A1</u>	<u>Component:</u> Conditions of local forests		
A1.1	Number of main non-timber forest species	Forest owners, FPD, Forest companies	Forest inventory, group discussion with farmers
A1.2	Number of main timber species	Forest owners, FPD, Forest companies	Group discussion with farmers
A1.3	Area of forest per types according to locations	Forest owners, FPD, Forest companies, DONRE, commune cadastral	
A1.4	Area of non forested forest land according to locations	DONRE	
A1.5	Standing volume of timber and NTFPs	District FPD, forest owners (state, private and communities)	Forest inventory, group discussion with farmers
A1.6	Distance to residential area	District DONRE and FPD, forest owners	Interviews
<u>A2</u>	<u>Component:</u> The effectiveness of forest management after allocation		
A2.1	Forest area and standing volume before allocation	Forest owners, district forest protection unit, consultancy companies, forest companies, forest land allocation files	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.2	Forest area and standing volume after allocation	Forest owners, district FPD, consultancy companies, forest companies, FLA files	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.3	Number of violation cases detected	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.4	Number of violation cases processed	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.5	Quantity of forest products confiscated	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.6	Number of forest fires occurred	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.7	Loss (in area and forest quality) due to fire	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners

A2.8	Number of people (or rate over total population) involved in forest patrol	Forest owners, Communal People's committee, district FPD	Compilation from secondary sources and interview of forest owners
A2.9	Share of forest income in household income	Households	Household survey (through questionnaire)
A2.10	Number of households (or percentage over total number of households in the sample) benefiting from the FLA	CPC, households	Household survey (through questionnaire), group discussion
<b>B</b>	<b>Issue:</b> Participation of local (commune) authority in decision making process related forest management (groups 3 and 4)		
<b>B1</b>	<b>Component:</b> Management and implementation capacity of communal authority		
B1.1	Number of commune officials trained in related areas (short terms and long term training)	Human resource files from commune and district, primary information from commune officials	Compilation from secondary data, and interview of selected commune officials
B1.2	Duration of time in processing a concrete issue (compared to standard time allowed by law)	Legal regulations (on one-gate administration work at CPC), primary data from commune officials	Compilation from secondary data, and interview of selected commune officials
B1.3	Number of documents submitted to higher (district) level to advise on specific issue(s)	Filing system at commune and district levels, primary information from concerned district and commune officials	Compilation from secondary data, and interview of selected commune and district officials
<b>B2</b>	<b>Component:</b> Transparency of concerned policy and their implementation		
B2.1	The duration between issuance date and date that the legal document receipt by the commune	Commune filing/ archive/ statistics system	Compilation from secondary data
B2.2	Quantity of legal and other types of documents received by the commune per year	Commune filing/ archive/ statistics system; Reports/ minutes of meetings/ events with list of participants Primary information from commune officials participating in events above	Compilation from secondary data and interview of commune officials, observation of commune filing system
B2.3	The number of channels through which new policies and information can be delivered to the commune	Minutes of weekly meeting, weekly/ monthly work plan, primary information from communal officials	Compilation from secondary data and interview of commune officials
B2.4	Number of commune officials received a copy of new policy, document, publication	Commune filing system, primary information from commune officials/ admin staff	Compilation from secondary data and interview of commune officials

### Annex 3.2: The data collection tools

**Issue:** Allocation of forest to local people

Component: Conditions of the forests

#### FORM FOR FOREST AREA DATA

District:

	Classified according to function			Classified according to forest quality		
	Special use	Protection	Production	Rich	Medium	Poor
Natural forest						
Planted						
Bare land						

#### GUIDE FOR GROUP DISCUSSION

1. Draw sketch map of the local forest areas (indicates types of forest, such as protected area, natural forest, plantation, etc.)
2. Indicate the main type of timber and non timber forest products in each area.
3. Assess the existing standing stock of NTFP (1: little; 2: average; 3: abundant)

Name of non-timber forest products	Availability

4. Assess the existing standing stock of timber species (1: little; 2: average; 3: abundant)

Name of timber species	Availability

#### HOUSEHOLD SURVEY FORM

1. How far is it from the commune center to the forest?
2. How is the road condition from the commune center to the forest?

Type of road	Distance (km)
Concrete	
Aggregate	
Dirt road	
Others	

Component: The effectiveness of forest management after allocation

**Household survey on income from forestland allocation**

Village:

Commune:

District:

Time:

Name	Age	Sex	Education	Ethnicity	Demographic		Main labor	
					Male	Female	Male	Female

1. Classification of household wealth:

rich    better off    average    close to poor    poor

2. Did you receive forest from FLA program?    Yes    No

3. Household income for the last 12 months

Source of income	Quantity	Source of income	Quantity
<u>Outside of allocated forests</u>		<u>From allocated forest:</u>	
Coffee		PES, protection fee:	
Vegetable		Non timber forest products	
Flower		Coffee	
Livestock:		Vegetable	
Service provision		Livestock and other crops under forest canopy	

**Issue:** Participation of local (commune) authority in decision-making process related forest management

Component: Management and implementation capacity of communal authority

FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION ON TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMUNE OFFICIALS

Full name	Position	Technical qualifications					
		University/ postgraduate	College	Technical school	Certificate	Non certificate	Type of training

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNE OFFICIALS:

What kind of problems/ issues do you often encounter when dealing with daily work:

- No background training
- The work assigned does not suit the training received
- Problem with health
- Long distance to travel to work from home

Do you need more training? Yes            No

Why so/ not?

FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION ON TIME TO PROCESS A CONCRETE ISSUE

Full name of official in charge	
Full name of person submitting the documents:	
Contents of the documents submitted:	
Date of receipt:	
Expected date of answer:	
Actual date of answer:	

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR LOCAL PEOPLE:

Do you get delayed answer to the issue/ document you submitted? Yes            No

If yes, please explain the issue you submitted

If yes, please indicate the reason for the delay

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNE OFFICIALS:

Can you please explain the reason for delay in case XYZ?

FORM FOR DATA COLLECTION ON QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF ADVISORY DOCUMENTS

Advice sent by (commune):	
Advice received by (unit/ district):	
Main contents:	

Sent date	
Endorsed by:	

Based on the secondary data collection, identify a few officials (at district and commune levels) to conduct face-to-face interview:

Questions for district officials:

- How do you evaluate the advice provided by (commune XYZ)?
- What have you done in response? (Changes/ modification made)

Component: Transparency of concerned policy and their implementation

FORM FOR COLLECTION OF SECONDARY DATA

1. General information

Province:                      district:                      commune:

List of legal documents to be received:

Name of document	Main contents	Receipt date	Received by	Note

Information on communication channels, events

Channel	Time/ frequency	Participated by	Note

FORM FOR PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION:

Interviewee	Questions
Person in charge of statistics at commune level	The management of existing documents Is there regular check of the existing documents?
Person in charge of receiving mail in	Entry into document-in book Transfer received documents to whom/ which unit
Local forest protection agent	Frequency of receiving document

	<p>Types of document received</p> <p>When to receive the documents</p> <p>How many copies? Do you have to list the document received?</p> <p>Participation in communication / awareness raising event: contents of the event, mode of participation, comment on the event</p>
--	---

For more information, presentations and background documents to the workshop, please visit the UN-REDD workspace folder for this meeting [here](#).