

Europe: an overview

Gill Shepherd

Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| 2. | SETTING THE SCENE: EUROPE'S OWN FOREST HISTORY | 3 |
| 3. | THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN INVOLVEMENT WITH TROPICAL FORESTRY | 4 |
| 4 | THE STRUCTURE OF AID DELIVERY TODAY | 4 |
| 4.1 | Departments of development assistance | 4 |
| 4.2 | The status of aid within government structures | 6 |
| 4.3 | The administration of forestry assistance | 7 |
| 4.4 | Development personnel | 7 |
| 4.5 | NGOs and the forestry sector | 8 |
| 4.6 | Multilateral and multi-bilateral assistance | 11 |
| 4.7 | Assisted credit scheme | 11 |
| 5. | STRATEGY | 12 |
| 5.1 | General development co-operation policies | 12 |
| 5.1.1 | Aid process and progress | 12 |
| 5.2 | Tropical forestry policy and strategy | 13 |
| 5.2.1 | Social policies in non-forestry aid | 13 |
| 5.2.2 | Key international conferences, meetings and reports | 13 |
| 5.2.3 | The early role played by Sweden | 13 |
| 5.3 | Public pressure on governments for commitment to forests and the environment | 14 |
| 5.4 | Current tropical forestry policy in Europe | 14 |
| 5.5 | The definition of forestry | 14 |
| 6. | ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY | 14 |
| 7. | POLICY IMPACTS ON GEOGRAPHIC AND THEMATIC FOCUS | 16 |
| 7.1 | The narrowing focus of aid | 16 |
| 7.2 | Geographic focus | 16 |
| 7.3 | Thematic focus | 16 |
| 8. | PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT | 18 |
| 9. | DONOR COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE | 20 |
| 9.1 | Research strengths | 20 |
| 9.2 | Other kinds of comparative advantage | 20 |
| 9.2.1 | Colonial period experience | 20 |
| 9.2.2 | Europe's own experience of people–forest interactions | 21 |
| 9.2.3 | Specific skills | 21 |
| 9.3 | Learning from programme experience | 21 |
| 9.4 | The contribution of the European Community | 21 |
| 9.5 | Donor collegiality | 21 |
| 10. | ISSUES AND TRENDS FOR THE FUTURE | 22 |
| 10.1 | Devolution | 22 |
| 10.1.1 | NGOs | 22 |
| 10.1.2 | Consulting firms | 22 |
| 10.2 | The relationships between budgets and outputs | 22 |
| 10.2.1 | The cost of forestry projects | 22 |
| 10.2.2 | Aid volume for forestry | 23 |
| 10.3 | Institutional memory | 23 |
| 10.4 | Effective aid delivery and donor collaboration | 23 |
| 10.5 | Finding a way for larger and smaller donors to work together | 23 |
| 10.6 | The evolving relationship between forestry and environment | 23 |
| | REFERENCES | 24 |
| | ACRONYMS | 24 |
| | ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 25 |
| | ANNEX 1 | 26 |

1. INTRODUCTION

This book provides an overview of the ways in which Europe offers support to tropical forests through aid and research. Each of the Member States' current programmes is examined, along with those of the various Directorates-General (DGs) in the European Commission which support tropical forestry. It is called a Sourcebook because it will probably be used more as a work of reference than as a book to read from start to finish.

Its intended audience is threefold. Above all, its authors hope that it will be of value to the developing countries with which the European Union (EU) works. The book should make it simpler to understand the way in which aid to forestry is organised from country to country and within the Commission; it will indicate each donor's target countries for the funding of tropical forestry, and will suggest the particular interests of each. Contact points have been listed at the end of all chapters.

The second potential audience for the Sourcebook is the body of donors outside Europe. Hopefully it will offer more familiarity with, and a better understanding of, European tropical forestry experience in an easily accessible form.

Finally, donors within Europe are working interactively with one another to an ever increasing extent, and are more often co-funders of the same projects and programmes than in the past. At the same time, the importance of forestry in the portfolio, aid delivery mechanisms, implementation strategies, and vision for the future may all vary greatly from donor to donor. The authors hope that European donors will find it useful, therefore, to read about one another's structures and programmes. Their combined financial strength in the tropical forestry sector represents the largest single block of aid for forestry available in the world: the European Community and Member States funded 66.5% of all bilateral aid to forestry in 1993, and just under 40% of all aid in the sector (United Nations [UN] Economic and Social Council, 1996). This book should go some way to assessing the combined comparative experience of Europe as well.

The Sourcebook has been prepared in close collaboration with the donors concerned, and each chapter represents the combined efforts of at least one in-country Research Associate, and an ODI Research Fellow. The latter has in each case taken particular responsibility for the consistency and the comparability of each chapter with the others. After a brief review of the country's own forest history, and the history of its involvement in tropical forestry, each chapter analyses the structure of aid delivery, policy, the thematic and regional distribution of forestry projects, research and training, and project cycle management. Each chapter concludes with an examination of one or two key projects, or summarises project reviews conducted in-country, and looks at future trends,

This first chapter draws out some of the interesting comparative findings from the study, attempts an assessment of the totality of Europe's comparative advantage in tropical forestry, and identifies issues for the future.

2. SETTING THE SCENE: EUROPE'S OWN FOREST HISTORY

Despite the enormous differences between temperate and tropical forests, Europe's own forest history encapsulates many of the issues which it has subsequently encountered in the tropics. At the same time, Europe took to the tropics not only its own experience in forest management, but also, hardly surprisingly, the political and institutional assumptions of the time.

Most countries in Europe have an early history of slow domestic deforestation associated with agricultural expansion, charcoal-based industries, and the increasingly commercial use of timber. In some places, such as France, Germany, Belgium and the UK, demand on the forest from different groups led, five or six hundred years ago, to the development of rules which gave use-rights of varied kinds to different categories of people, and which managed forest to meet these uses through a variety of systems. Such systems often evolved where nobility and peasantry both needed access to the same resource. In other areas, such as in the Netherlands and in parts of northern Italy, local communities demarcated their own forests and evolved local associations to manage them. In Sweden and Finland individually-owned portions of forest were common.

All over Europe, too, the opportunity to begin to restore forest cover through reforestation programmes and through natural regeneration arose only when pressure could be relieved through a switch to coal from fuelwood and charcoal, and through increasing urbanisation and agricultural intensification.

Forestry practice and forestry education, particularly in Northern European countries, have been heavily influenced from the eighteenth century onwards by the experience of German foresters, who first developed inventory methods and silvicultural techniques for sustainable-yield forestry. The Danish/Norwegian king invited German assistance with Danish forests during the eighteenth century and France drew on German methods in part when establishing forestry training at the *Ecole de Nancy* in the 1820s.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries these skills were put to intensive use in the tropics by those European countries which acquired colonies. One unplanned outcome of the colonial period in these countries was that a cadre of foresters grew up who specialised only in tropical forestry. The tradition continued over into the post-colonial period, and it has often been the case that those who opted for a career in tropical forestry and those who worked in forestry at home have had only limited contacts with one another. As a result, there have been periods when there have been very different sets of preoccupations in the two areas. In the tropics, key debates of the last fifteen years have centred on the conflicting needs of local communities and the State for forest products, and the management compromises needed to accommodate these. In Europe, with a far higher proportion of its inhabitants living in cities, debate and – at times – tensions between forestry professionals and the general public have centred rather on the potential conflict between forests for production and forests for recreation.

It has been interesting to see these two strands coming together, as debate since the Rio Conference in 1992 has centred on broader definitions of sustainability, and as environmental concerns have been increasingly raised simultaneously, both for forests at home and for forests in the tropics.

The European Member States currently have widely varying proportions of forest cover, from those with relatively little, such as Ireland (8%), the Netherlands (9%) and the UK (11%) through to Sweden with 55% and Finland with 75%. In all cases, in sharp contrast to the situation in developing countries, the proportion of forest cover is rising (see Table 1).

3. THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN INVOLVEMENT WITH TROPICAL FORESTRY

Those countries with a colonial history (France, the Netherlands and the UK, and to a lesser extent Belgium, Germany, Italy, Portugal and Spain) developed an early expertise in tropical silviculture.

Initially, there was considerable reliance on German-educated foresters, as there had been in Europe itself. The Netherlands drew on German expertise in devising sustainable yield management systems for teak in Java. Britain appointed a German, Dr Dietrich Brandis, as the first Inspector-General of Forests in India in 1860. France's forestry school at Nancy based its curricula on German as well as its own experience.

The early impetus for Dutch and Spanish interest in tropical forests grew originally out of their supremacy in seaborne commerce, their large ship-building indus-

tries and the disappearance of suitable timber supplies in Europe. The Dutch shipped timbers from Java and (later) Dutch Guyana back to the Netherlands. In the case of Spain, shipyards were established in colonies such as Haiti, the Philippines and Cuba.

Colonial experience of tropical forest management can be said to have begun in South and South-East Asia, with Dutch management of teak forests in Java, German and British forest management in India and Burma, and French forest management in Indo-China. Lessons from these experiences were transferred to Malaya and East and West Africa during the British colonial period, and to Madagascar, West Africa and Equatorial Africa by the French.

After the colonies gained independence, many of the individuals who had been employed by colonial forest services transferred to work on newly emerging aid programmes. Indeed aid was seen, in the early independence years, as a temporary loaning of expertise to ex-colonies until they no longer needed it. A priority was consequently made of training in tropical silviculture, in sustained yield forest management, and plantation production. Commercial links were continued, not only in areas where the logging of hardwoods was important, but also at times where intensive plantations could be raised, as in the case of Spanish companies' investment in the tropics for pulp and paper to supply the home market.

Countries without previous involvement in tropical forests through colonies, developed an interest in tropical forestry through other routes. Both Finland and Sweden were major manufacturers and operators of forest logging and processing equipment for the home market, and became interested in the move towards industrial forestry in the tropics in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. Out of these commercial links grew other interests. In the case of Finland, training became a strong area of expertise. In the case of Sweden, possibly because of its own strong domestic tradition of farm forestry, as well as its traditions of social concern, came an interest in 'Social Forestry' and its funding for many years of the Food and Agriculture Organization's (FAO) 'Forests, Trees and People' programme. Denmark's experience of its own forest, which dwindled to a cover of only 3% at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and was then successfully rebuilt, led it to specialise first in domestic and then in tropical tree-seed production. Only very gradually, in the late 1970s and early 1980s did tropical forestry acquire the broader importance it has today.

Table 1: Forest Cover as a % of national land area in the European Member States

| Country | % of forest cover |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Ireland | 8% |
| Netherlands | 9% |
| UK | 11% |
| Denmark | 12% |
| Belgium | 22% |
| France | 27% |
| Italy | 29% |
| Germany | 29% |
| Luxembourg | 33% |
| Portugal | 36% |
| Spain | 45% |
| Austria | 46% |
| Greece | 49% |
| Sweden | 55% |
| Finland | 75% |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters, and Eurofor, 1994.)

4 THE STRUCTURE OF AID DELIVERY TODAY

4.1 Departments of development assistance

The majority of countries have a central aid administration programme. If there is a 'typical' pattern, it is that of an International Development Co-operation department located within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is the pattern in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, and Sweden. It was the UK pattern until May 1997, and is

the case with interesting variations in the Netherlands (see Table 2a.)

Sometimes, by contrast, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is given the responsibility of coordinating the aid efforts of a wide variety of other bodies as in the case of Portugal and – the most extreme example – Spain, where there are up to 19 bodies which deal with

forestry and environment aid. Spain too, is unique in the complexity of its decentralised aid. Several regional governments run substantial aid programmes of their own (especially the Basque country, Andalusia, Navarra and Cataluña). Even local councils and individual parishes run small aid programmes with towns and villages in the developing world with whom they have

Table 2a: Aid Delivery Structures for Forestry in the Member States

| Country | Delivery Structure |
|-------------|--|
| Austria | Department of Development Co-operation located in Ministry of Foreign Affairs; + several other Ministries. |
| Belgium | Tripartite Federal State. Aid spread across Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Finance and Agriculture. Most forestry comes under the Secretary of State for Development Cooperation and the General Administration for Development Co-operation (AGCD). |
| Denmark | South Group (Danida) located in Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Two separate Ministers, one especially for Development Co-operation. Implementation organised through South Group Regional Depts. and Technical Advisory Service (TSA). The DANCED (Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development) Unit in Ministry of Environment and Energy also important for Forestry. |
| Finland | Department for International Development Co-operation (formerly Finnida) now within Ministry of Foreign Affairs. There is a Minister for Development Co-operation, who is also the Minister for the Environment. Depts. for bilateral aid (one for Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) and one for other parts of the developing world), multilateral aid, and for policy and co-ordination with the EU. |
| France | In relation to 'concentration countries' (mainly ex-colonies) a State Secretariat delivers and implements aid. Overseas Departments and Territories have their own Secretariat. Aid to c100 other countries handled by Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Directorate for Cultural, Scientific and Technical Relations. Executive agency is the Caisse Française de Développement (CFD). Since 1994 an Interministerial Environment Fund, the Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondiale (FFEM) has been in existence. |
| Germany | Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development, BMZ, has main responsibility for budget, policy and coordination. Financial co-operation is administered by the government-owned Bank KfW, while implementation and technical co-operation is organised by the federal government-owned agency GTZ. |
| Greece | For forestry, the Ministry of National Economy devolves financial and management responsibility to the Ministry of Agriculture. |
| Ireland | Irish Aid is administered by the Development Co-operation Division (DCD) of the Department of Foreign Affairs. |
| Italy | Department for Development Co-operation (DGCS) within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Supported by a Central Technical Unit and monitored by the Interministerial Committee for Development Co-operation, and by a Consultative Committee with representation from research institutions, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Italy's Regions. |
| Luxembourg | The Department of Co-operation, within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, External Trade and Co-operation (MAE). |
| Netherlands | A Minister for Development Co-operation (with no ministry) works through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Programme is managed by DGIS (the Directorate General for International Co-operation) through country desks in the MFA, but implementation devolved to aid personnel in Embassies. |
| Portugal | Ministry of Foreign Affairs + 3 state bodies: the Interministerial Commission for Co-operation; the Portuguese Co-operation Institute; and the Economic Co-operation Fund. |
| Spain | Centralised aid: Ministry of Foreign Affairs co-ordinates efforts of up to 19 government bodies dealing with forestry and environment aid, inc. AECI, the Spanish Agency for International Co-operation. Decentralised aid (since 1990): several regional governments (Andalusia the main forestry donor), 124 local councils, and even individual villages are aid donors. |
| Sweden | Division for International Development Co-operation with its own Minister, located within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Bilateral assistance administered through Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) |
| UK | Alternation between an Overseas Development Administration under the Foreign Office and, as currently, a separate Ministry. (Previously, Ministry of Overseas Development, now Department For International Development). |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

developed twinning arrangements. Similar twinning arrangements are also encouraged in France.

France's very large aid programme is still strongly influenced by its colonial history, with distinct budgets and aid arrangements under a Ministry of Co-operation for 'concentration countries' (*pays du champs* – mainly ex-colonies), a special Secretariat for Overseas Departments and Territories, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs management of aid to other countries.

Only Greece and the UK (since May 1997), direct no aid through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs at all. Greece devolves management of its budget through the Ministry of National Economy to other appropriate Ministries (the Ministry of Agriculture in the case of forestry). The UK has a separate Ministry for aid, the Department for International Development.

In Germany arrangements are complex, with the Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ) being the key institution responsible for formulating federal development policies, and managing 70% of the federal aid budget. Financial co-operation (or capital assistance) and technical co-operation are administered on behalf of BMZ by the German Development Bank (KfW) and the German Agency for Technical Co-operation (GTZ) respectively.

In the case of the Commission, with its Directorates-General in place of Ministries, aid delivery is structured in a way somewhat reminiscent of France. Its arrangements for ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific) and ALA (Asian and Latin-American) countries set the Commission apart from most of the Member States.

The sheer size of the Commission is a second notable feature. There are relatively few forestry advisers (for the volume of money being spent) and these are therefore very over-extended. The work-load, and with the fact that the buildings of the different Directorates

working in forestry are now located inconveniently far from one another, have meant that regular informal exchanges of ideas about tropical forestry are difficult to organise.

Thirdly, while many Member States are internally organised around a pattern of fund-holding geographical desks with sectoral advisers working laterally with them all, it is rare to find structures comparable to the Commission's pattern, seen in DGs IB and VIII, of vertical **and** horizontal budget lines, run by desks and advisers respectively. That this pattern has caused tensions is hardly surprising. It has also had the unfortunate effect of weighing down advisers with budget-line duties, so that they have little time to offer advice to the desks, and may even be seen as competitors rather than facilitators. (See Table 2b).

4.2 The status of aid within government structures

The status of the Government body responsible for aid implementation is important since it may potentially affect aid strategies, and, even more importantly, funding levels. Where, as in the majority of cases in Europe, aid is administered as part of a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or a similar body, it may be vulnerable to being used to achieve diplomatic goals as well as developmental ones.

Several countries have therefore built in arrangements to give aid a stronger 'voice' within such a structure. The Netherlands has a special Aid Minister without a ministry; Sweden's Division for International Development Co-operation has its own Minister even though it is located within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and the same arrangement is found in Denmark. Finland has a similar arrangement with a Minister specially

Table 2b: Aid Delivery Structures for Forestry in the European Commission

| Directorate-General | Delivery structures |
|---------------------|--|
| DG IB | Responsible for aid to Asia and Latin America. Geographical ('vertical') directorates B and C manage 2 budget lines: (B7–3000) 'Co-operation with Asian developing countries'; and (B7–3010) 'Co-operation with Latin American developing countries'. Also 2 cross-cutting ('horizontal') directorates. DGIB D4 co-manages 2 horizontal budget lines with DG VIII/A/1: 'Actions in Favour of Tropical Forests' (B7–6201 – 70%) and 'Environment in developing countries' (B7–6200 – 50%). |
| DG VIII | Responsible for aid to African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Countries. Controls Member States' contributions to the European Development Fund (EDF), and manages the budget lines allocated by the European Parliament. 3 geographical ('vertical') and 4 cross-cutting ('horizontal') directorates. DG VIII/A concerns development policy. DG VIII A/1 manages forest policy and technical support, and co-manages 2 budget lines with DG IB D4: 'Actions in Favour of Tropical Forests' (B7–6201 – 30%) and 'Environment in developing countries' (B7–6200 – 50%). |
| DG XI | Responsible for Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection, it contains 5 Directorates. It drafts EU strategy on the environment, and takes part in the post-UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) activities of the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD), etc. DGXI D4, concerned with the Global Environment, has access to a budget line called 'International Environmental Activities' (B7–8110), used to support international conferences, workshops and publications on forests, biodiversity, climate change and global warming. |
| DG XII | Scientific and Technological co-operation with developing countries (known as INCO-DC), in the context of Research and Technology Development (RTD). Funded from the fourth Framework Programme, 1994–1998. Research funds available for forestry, agriculture, health and technology in the field of pure rather than applied research. |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters on the Commission)

responsible for both Development Co-operation and Environment.

Other countries, such as Italy and Portugal, have Interministerial committees which meet regularly to plan aid policy. The Commission has likewise established an inter-service steering committee, meeting two or three times a year both to discuss policy issues and to discuss forestry projects proposed for funding. Similarly, several bilateral aid programmes have established professional support groups for forestry. DGIS in the Netherlands relies on such a group, drawn from the National Reference Centre for Nature Management (IKC) and the International Agricultural Centre (IAC). The Department for International Development (DFID) in the UK has a Forestry Professional Coordinating Group which meets quarterly with professionals from OFI, NRI, ODI, IIED and WCMC.

An interesting feature of an increasing number of countries is the extent to which the broader public are increasingly consulted about aid priorities. This may be within the context of all aid, as is the case with Italy's Consultative Committee and Denmark's National Resource Base links. But also, after Rio, and sometimes before, several countries (e.g. Finland and the UK) established Consultative Groups for the discussion of forestry and environmental priorities between government and the general public.

4.3 The administration of forestry assistance

Most forestry assistance is the responsibility of the central aid-giving agencies of donor countries. Ninety-five per cent of Belgium's sponsored tropical forestry activities come under the office of the Secretary of State for Development, for instance, and the majority of UK-funded forestry projects come under the Department for International Development. In other countries, forestry is more widely dispersed. In the Netherlands, the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries is responsible for policy development, but the Ministries of Economic Affairs and of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment also have responsibilities for international forestry. France's aid structure also inevitably means that many different, relatively unrelated bodies are involved in forestry assistance.

In countries with smaller aid programmes, responsibility for sector aid often lies with the appropriate domestic ministry. The General Forestry Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture is Portugal's main forestry aid representative, for instance, and Greek forestry aid is managed by the Department of Agriculture. Spain's tropical forestry is managed through a great diversity of government bodies.

A further feature of funding often available to forestry, which reflects shifting priorities since UNCED in 1992, is that a number of countries have recently established separate budget lines to deal with global environmental issues such as biodiversity. These are often administered by departments other than those dealing with overseas development assistance to forestry. In Denmark the Environment and Disaster Relief Facility is administered by agencies in the Ministry of Environment and Energy, in collaboration with the

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. France's *French Fund for the Global Environment* is administered by an inter-ministerial Committee, and in the UK, the Darwin Initiative is administered by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR).

In the past, aid agencies often located forestry within agriculture departments. More recently, the trend has been for it to become more closely linked with the environment, as the previous paragraph attests. A second trend suggested by an analysis of country spending is that countries with smaller aid budgets have focused on the more agricultural aspects of forestry, while those with larger budgets have been able to tackle the larger and longer-enduring natural forest management issues. These have led inevitably to environmental considerations as well.

The integration of forestry with other sectors sometimes makes it difficult to detect trends in forestry policy, and the level of forestry aid commitments. The exception occurs where countries have decided to dedicate a fixed sum to forestry and have to monitor disbursement rates. This occurred in Germany from 1991, in the UK from 1989 to 1994 and in Austria from 1993–95. A similar process is seen in the case of the European Commission's Tropical Forests Budget Line.

The relative importance of forestry overall varies widely across the EU. The country with the largest proportionate contribution to forestry by far is Finland, followed by the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden. In volume terms the largest donors are Germany, the EC, the Netherlands, the UK, France and Sweden (see Table 3).

Aid to the forestry sector has generally increased over the last decade, though this may not be a continuing trend. In Germany the proportion of state funding which goes to forestry and environmental activities has seen a fourfold increase since 1988. There was also a fourfold increase in the UK as a result of the Forestry Initiative (from 1989 until 1994) and funding rose in the early 1990s in the Netherlands. Portugal, on the other hand, has seen a decline in aid to the agriculture sector including forestry, from 3.7% in 1991 to 2.2% in 1994.

Overall forestry spending through the European Community aid programme has remained steady, with the exception of the Tropical Forestry Budget line itself, which grew from ECU 2 m. in 1991 to ECU 50 m. in 1992, and will remain at this level until at least 1999.

The over-riding reason for the increased funding made available to forestry has been public concern about tropical forests within the donor countries. In the case of EC aid, it was primarily the concern of the European Parliament about tropical forests which increased the funds made available through the budget line created in 1991.

4.4 Development personnel

Tables 4a and 4b present information about the advice and arrangements for project implementation available to support forestry within each donor agency.

Several of the larger donors are still able to maintain a cadre of specialist advisers in forestry and environment at headquarters level, as Table 4a indicates. These are Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the UK. Sweden had such an adviser until 1997.

Other countries, such as Austria, Italy, Ireland Spain and Portugal, rely on advice from universities, specialised research organisations, the national forestry service, consulting firms and NGOs.

Those countries with tropical forestry programmes appear to make increasing use of their embassies in the developing world. Sometime this means simply attaching staff from the specialist agency at headquarters to aid divisions at embassies (Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, the UK) but some countries have gone further and are now experimenting with the devolution of many aid management functions directly to the diplomatic service (Denmark, Finland). The Netherlands is experimenting with the devolved management of the aid programme at embassy level. In the case of the EU, Country Delegations play an important role in the selection and monitoring of projects.

Few countries still maintain large numbers of technical co-operation employees, apart from France (500 for natural resource issues in concentration countries, of whom 25 specialise in forestry); Germany (115 GTZ employees working on forestry and conservation issues); and the UK (about 80 in forestry in recent years).

The others rely on NGOs, consulting firms and universities, for the most part. Some countries have been able to retain specialist applied research bodies for tropical forestry implementation, such as Tropenbos in

the Netherlands and CIRAD-Forêt and ORSTOM in France. Other important components of the cadre of tropical forestry implementers in Germany, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands, are the volunteer services. Finally a few countries have made strong efforts to involve wider civil society (what Denmark calls its 'National Resource Base') in aid delivery: businesses, trade unions, local government, parishes and villages. Germany's political and church foundations are also of interest here.

The European Commission, apart from its small number of forestry advisers, relies heavily on commercial European consulting firms for project implementation, in coordination with counterpart national co-directors, and also on universities, NGOs and research bodies.

4.5 NGOs and the forestry sector

Several of the European Member States have found that NGOs in general have qualities and capabilities which cannot readily be matched in their bilateral aid programmes. Austria and Denmark note the ability of NGOs to educate the domestic public about aid issues. Italy runs a developing country volunteer service as an alternative to military service. Countries such as Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Spain and the Netherlands have found, too, that NGOs can help them to simplify aid delivery. They may be able to work faster and more

Table 3: Official Development Assistance in Europe to the Forestry Sector in 1995 (US\$ million)

| Country/Agency | Total budget ¹ | % Forestry ² | Forestry budget in US\$ million |
|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Austria | 767 | 1.10 (1993–95 only) 0.11 (usually) | 8.4 0.84 |
| Belgium | 1 034 | 0.17 ³ | 1.7 |
| Denmark | 1 623 | 1.00 | 16.2 |
| Finland | 388 | 4.6 | 17.9 |
| France | 8 443 | 0.45 | 37.7 |
| Germany | 7 524 | 2.21 | 166.3 |
| Greece | 152 ² | n.d. ⁴ | n.d. |
| Ireland | 153 | 0.25 ³ | 0.4 |
| Italy | 1 623 | 0.30 | 4.9 |
| Luxembourg | 65 | n.d. ⁴ | n.d. |
| Netherlands | 3 226 | 2.47 | 79.7 |
| Portugal | 271 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Spain | 1 348 | 0.4 | 5.4 |
| Sweden | 1 704 | 2.10 ³ | 35.8 |
| UK | 3 157 | 1.55 | 49.0 |
| EC | 3 860 | 2.2 | 86.0 |

(Sources: ¹ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 1996, p. 125

² data from Sourcebook chapters except where indicated

³ data from Paper E/CN.17/IPF/1996/..., presented to the Inter-Governmental Panel on Forests (IPF) II of the CSD, UN Economic and Social Council, 1996. (The percentages used in this paper were calculated in 1993. The same percentage has been assumed for 1995 to produce the figure in column 3.)

⁴ Forestry cannot be disaggregated from general oda (official development assistance) spending)

Table 4a: Sources of sectoral advice and of specialists for project implementation in the Member States

| Country | Sources |
|-------------|--|
| Austria | Work of Department of Development Co-operation (DDC) sector specialists now contracted out to 74 different implementing agencies including universities, consulting firms and NGOs. Regional offices in each programme country staffed by DDC, embassy personnel or NGO staff. |
| Belgium | AGCD has no implementing agency. Co-operation sections located in 30 Belgian Embassies abroad. Projects implemented by NGOs, consulting firms, universities. |
| Denmark | In the TSA, 1 agroforestry specialist, 7 environmental specialists. Assistance also provided directly by embassies – who can choose projects and allocate funds up to DKK 3 m. Strong commitment to involving Danish Civil Society in aid delivery: NGOs, consulting firms, trade unions, universities. |
| Finland | Thirteen sector advisers, including a forestry adviser, located in the Policy and EU Relations Department. Twenty Development Co-operation professionals are based in Finnish Embassies. NGOs and consulting firms important implementers. |
| France | Ministry of Co-operation employs 5 forestry specialists in Paris. 500 Technical Co-operation officers work on environmental and economic issues in ‘concentration countries’. Other partner agencies include research institutes such as the Office de la Recherche Scientifique Outre-Mer (ORSTOM), the Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (CIRAD) and the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), French NGOs (especially in the Sahel) and consulting firms. |
| Germany | GTZ has 1,300 HQ staff, (10 Forestry and Conservation Advisers) + offices in over 50 countries. 115 GTZ field staff implement forestry and conservation projects. BMZ employs at least two foresters. There are 60 German volunteer foresters. NGOs undertake few tropical forestry projects, but consulting firms are growing in importance. |
| Greece | Involvement with tropical forestry is limited except for Greek technical assistance in multilateral projects. NGOs have not worked in forestry, consulting firms have been only incidentally involved. |
| Ireland | No Natural Resources Adviser. Development Co-operation Officers are attached to Irish embassies in priority countries. NGOs, some Irish APSO (Agency for Personal Service Overseas) volunteers, and a few consulting firms including Coillte (the Irish Forestry Board) are involved in tropical forestry. |
| Italy | No forestry adviser in DGCS. (Central Technical Unit two-thirds under-strength). Local Technical Units exist in some embassies in developing countries. NGOs and consulting firms have some role. |
| Luxembourg | Lux-Development implements most of the MAE’s bilateral aid. There are also 68 recognised NGOs. |
| Netherlands | Netherlands-based DGIS (Directorate-General for International Co-operation) staff are to be responsible for policy and support, and tropical forestry advice at this level will be strengthened. Aid personnel in embassies manage projects locally (from 1997), from identification to evaluation. NGOs and other bodies are important implementers of projects, with counterparts in the recipient country. |
| Portugal | No Forestry Co-operation advisor. Expertise and implementation capacity is located mainly with the National Forestry Station (EFN), the Portuguese Forest Directorate and the Tropical Scientific Research Institute (IICT). No NGOs or consulting firms in Portugal focus on tropical forestry. |
| Spain | Centralised aid: no forestry or environmental expertise in AECL. Instead, Ministry staff, university researchers, NGOs and consultants are relied on. Decentralised aid: Spanish NGOs and universities the main actors, with local-level partners in recipient countries. |
| Sweden | The Department for Natural Resources and the Environment is responsible within Sida for the administration of forestry projects and programmes. Development Co-operation Officers in Swedish Embassies are responsible to Sida for projects in their countries. Much of the project cycle is in the hands of consultants. |
| UK | The Natural Resources Division of DFID contains 10 advisers, 3 in forestry. Additional professional staff located in 8 key regional and country offices, while embassy staff provide support in other countries. DFID continues to employ Technical Co-operation Officers in Forestry (about 80 over the last five years). It also relies on specialist consulting firms, and NGOs. |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

flexibly than bilateral processes can, especially where large capable NGOs have been given block grants or framework agreements by the countries they belong to. NGOs are also valued where they have good local representation on the ground in developing countries,

for their ability to respond innovatively and monitor closely, and for reaching the poorest effectively.

In response, many of the European Member States are now spending increasing percentages of their total bilateral aid budget through NGOs – indeed, Ireland’s

Table 4b: Sources of sectoral advice and of specialists for project implementation in the Commission

| Directorate-General | Sources of Sectoral Advice |
|---------------------|---|
| DG IB | Two foresters manage the Tropical Forest Budget Line (one a seconded National Expert) under the Environment and Tropical Forests sector head. There is a specialist on timber certification and trade; a forestry project specialist in the Asia Technical Unit, and a forester in the Latin-America Technical Unit. Small projects are implemented by NGOs, universities or others. Large projects are usually implemented by European consulting firms. |
| DG VIII | 1 Forestry Adviser, (seconded National Expert). 1 Environment Adviser. Project management by desk officers (among whom 2 or 3 have some forestry competence) and delegations overseas (with few professional foresters among their numbers). Implementation by consulting firms, NGOs, universities, sometimes with local partner organisations. |
| DG XI | Unit D4 has a technical officer (a forester). Implementation is mainly by universities, NGOs, research organisations. |
| DG XII | Funds managed by 1 officer (successively an economist, a microbiologist, a forester). Research executed by universities and research organisations, through the mechanism of North-South partnerships. |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

NGO budget is larger than its modest bilateral budget. Apart from Luxembourg (30%), Denmark (17%), and Sweden (11%), however, typical NGO contributions still hover at under 10% with Finland, the Netherlands and the UK spending about 7–8%; Germany, Spain and Italy 5–6%; and France around 2%. But overall percentages continue to rise and several countries plan to increase allocations to NGOs. The DAC (Development Assistance Committee of the OECD) average as recently as 1990 was only 2.8%. NGO projects tend also to be financed or co-financed at generous levels in many parts of Europe. Italy offers up to 100% funding; Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland and Sweden fund at a 75–80% level; France and the UK offer co-funding at 50%.

NGOs are beginning to have a more official role, in line with their growing institutionalisation as conduits for aid. Countries as diverse as France, Ireland, and Italy now give NGOs a seat at the table on national level Development Co-operation Committees. As a result, perhaps, several countries note tensions between NGO desires for independence and the government's desire to implement its own policies through their agency.

Most NGOs tend to work in health, education, social services and general rural development. Although there are active lobbying NGOs such as Friends of the Earth raising environmental and forest issues in many countries in Europe, NGOs seem mainly to have avoided implementing forestry (except for farmer tree-nurseries in rural development projects) because they see it as too long-term and expensive. Even those countries with strong forestry traditions and relatively large forestry programmes, do not necessarily have extensive NGO involvement in the sector. For example, 80% of funding to Finnish NGOs was used for health, education and social services projects, and out of 348 projects implemented through co-operation with Finnish NGOs, only 20 dealt with forestry issues. However, Denmark, Ireland, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK seem to have NGOs which are a key part of bilateral forestry implementation. In the UK, 17% of all bilateral forestry funding is channelled through the

NGO sector, while in the Netherlands the figure in 1995 was 31%.

Yet this only presents part of the picture. Many more countries in Europe mention the importance of NGO advice in the forestry sector than would appear to be funding much NGO forestry. The explanation no doubt lies partly in the fact that NGOs which specialise in rural livelihoods and rural development may offer forestry advice. It is also the case that many of the NGOs which campaign on behalf of tropical forests, and meet with aid donors at various national fora, do not implement forestry projects. Sometimes European NGOs rely more on EC funding than on bilateral funds. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Belgium, for instance, works on Congo basin conservation, forestry and certification issues through DGVIII-funded contracts, issues with which the current Belgian bilateral aid programme has not been concerned.

In the case of the European Community Aid, the Tropical Forests and Environment budget lines (B7–6201 and B7–6200 respectively) managed by DG IB and DG VIII tend to prefer larger projects to fund because of their technical and administrative constraints. Average project size is over ECU 1 m.: suitable for consulting firms, but much too large for most NGOs. Projects of under ECU 1 m. and over ECU 250,000 are handled by these budget lines as 'small' projects.

Project proposals below that figure, go to the NGO budget line, 'Community participation in actions in favour of developing countries, carried out by NGOs' (B7–6000). Here, average grant sizes are under ECU 100,000 – a tenth the size of the projects funded under B7–6200 and B7–6201. This budget line is managed from inside DG VIII, and covers all countries. The NGO budget line funded 42% of all tropical forestry projects between 1992 and 1996 (140 out of 333) though the total sum expended under these projects was only 4%. The trend since 1993 is for individual NGO forestry projects to become larger, and for fewer of them to be funded.

4.6 Multilateral and multi-bilateral assistance

In many Member States, the proportion of the aid budget which is disbursed through multilateral agencies is increasing. Nevertheless, the proportion of funding which goes to multilateral programmes varies quite widely across the EU, as Table 5 shows. Greece's bilateral commitments are abnormally low, leaving multilateral commitments to take up 76% of the total budget. Seven countries contribute between 40–50% multilaterally (including Finland, Denmark, UK and Belgium), while seven contribute 24–36% (including France, Netherlands, Sweden and Germany). Those countries which have relatively low aid:GNP ratios have proportionately higher multilateral commitments, as would be expected. But more generally, as the multilateral component of the aid budget has increased, countries have become more concerned to influence the policies of multilateral organisations. Denmark calls it 'active multilateralism'. Spain has often tried to make sure that its multilateral EU contributions are mainly channelled to Latin America; DFID in the UK has seconded three social development advisors and two forestry advisers to multilateral organisations (including the Commission) to assist in policy development; and the Netherlands, Germany and Finland have all in turn also seconded a forestry adviser to the Commission. Donors who fund the Global Environment Facility (GEF), or CGIAR (Consultative Group on International Agronomic Research) centres such as the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) and the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) maintain close links with their programmes.

In the context of this understandable desire to see

substantial multilateral contributions well-spent, it is difficult to understand why the OECD has recommended the phasing out of 'multi-bilateral' or 'funds-in-trust' arrangements. They offered important benefits for both larger and smaller donors. Larger donors such as Sweden and the Netherlands made major contributions to the FAO on these terms, as did Denmark to the United Nations Sudo-Sahelian Organization (UNSO), and were able to help shape the thinking of these multilateral organisations in important ways in the process. Some smaller donors such as Italy have in turn been able to gain exposure to current tropical forestry approaches through their multi-bilateral involvement with FAO.

4.7 Assisted credit scheme

Some form of assisted credit scheme operates in several donor countries. Austria offers subsidised export credits to developing countries, to the benefit of Austrian exporters; Finland has its 'pre-mixed concessional credit' scheme; Portugal has an economic co-operation fund, and the UK ran its Aid and Trade Provision in co-operation with the Department of Trade and Industry for many years. In Denmark and France, 50% of aid has been tied to the provision of the country's own goods and services; in Germany, 52%; and, topping the list, 67% in the UK. Soft financial co-operation loans are made by Germany, Spain and Italy to countries with per capita incomes of under \$2,800 p.a. Finland's credit arrangements (40% of the total) mainly benefit forest industries in Asian countries. Swedfund, in Sweden, puts up risk capital for joint ventures between Swedish and local companies, in countries with per capita incomes of under \$3,000 p.a.

These measures have been criticised both by the DAC

Table 5: Aid Percentages spent bilaterally and multilaterally in Europe, 1995 (\$ millions)

| Aid percentages | Bilateral oda | | Multilateral | | Total | |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|
| France | 6429 | (76%) | 2015 | (24%) | 8443 | (100%) |
| Austria | 560 | (73%) | 207 | (27%) | 767 | (100%) |
| Netherlands | 2245 | (70%) | 981 | (30%) | 3226 | (100%) |
| Sweden | 1189 | (70%) | 515 | (30%) | 1704 | (100%) |
| Luxembourg | 43 | (66%) | 22 | (34%) | 65 | (100%) |
| Portugal | 179 | (66%) | 92 | (34%) | 271 | (100%) |
| Germany | 4815 | (64%) | 2709 | (36%) | 7524 | (100%) |
| Spain | 816 | (60%) | 532 | (40%) | 1348 | (100%) |
| Finland | 220 | (57%) | 168 | (43%) | 388 | (100%) |
| Ireland | 88 | (57%) | 65 | (43%) | 153 | (100%) |
| Denmark | 895 | (55%) | 728 | (45%) | 1623 | (100%) |
| UK | 1670 | (53%) | 1487 | (47%) | 3157 | (100%) |
| Belgium | 514 | (50%) | 520 | (50%) | 1034 | (100%) |
| Italy | 806 | (49%) | 817 | (51%) | 1623 | (100%) |
| Greece ¹ | 45 | (24%) | 144 | (76%) | 189 | (100%) |

¹ Data for Greece not available in OECD (1996) and taken from country chapter

and by the general public in many countries, on the grounds that such loans are always tied to benefits for companies in the lending country and may not be truly development-related, and stricter criteria are now used to assess the suitability of projects for this type of funding. Finland found that there was too little development content in proposals to its credit scheme, that it was poorly monitored, and that it skewed aid away from Africa towards Asia. It is now phasing out the scheme. The UK government undertook to abolish its Aid and Trade Provision in its November 1997 White Paper.

5. STRATEGY

5.1 General development co-operation policies

Most of Europe's donors currently have development co-operation policies which prioritize poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods, social equality, the rights of women, and progress. Some, such as Austria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Portugal, Sweden, and the UK seek for respect for human rights in the countries to which they offer official development assistance, along with attempts to promote democracy, good governance, and popular participation in the political process. Some too, (e.g. Austria, Portugal and Spain) explicitly seek to promote peace through aid. Forces which shape policy congruence include DAC, the

Development Assistance Committee of the OECD; UN and Bretton Woods institutions, and the Lomé Conventions. Since the UNCED Conference in Rio in 1992, almost all countries have, in addition, added an explicit policy commitment to environmentally sustainable development and resource protection. The European Union has had a formal policy towards developing countries only since 1992 (in the Maastricht Treaty of European Union). Three objectives are listed: sustainable economic and social development; the gradual integration of developing countries into the world economy, and the reduction of poverty. The Treaty also makes it legally obligatory to promote measures to deal with environmental problems.

Several countries have produced Aid White Papers in recent years: the Netherlands in 1990 and 1996; Denmark with the goal of assessing aid in the post Cold War period; Finland in 1993 when, in a context of dramatic budget cuts, it was necessary to defend and justify the very existence of aid; and the UK in 1997, after the election of the first Labour Government for eighteen years. The production of such documents demonstrates a continuing active engagement in development co-operation.

The other measure of commitment to development co-operation has conventionally been the percentage of GNP spent on official development assistance. There has been a general reduction in aid budgets during the 1990s, and currently only three countries attain or pass the 0.7% ideal (see Table 6).

5.1.1 Aid process and progress

Initially, in the 1960s, the aid process, for those countries with a responsibility towards newly independent ex-colonies, was conceived as a gap-filling exercise – providing personnel and other kinds of help until they were no longer needed. The 'trickle-down' theories of the 1960s and 1970s, which assumed that aid would supply missing investment and that industrialisation was the inevitable development path, fitted well with this view. Aid strategies were not evolved until the 1970s and 1980s, whereupon country strategy papers were gradually developed which laid down what a particular donor's priorities were, and what perhaps recipient country priorities might be as well.

Aid orthodoxy for many donors (Finland and Sweden describe this path) was initially to put individual experts in line functions (1960s); to support assistance through free-standing projects (1970s); and finally to move to larger programmes combining several projects or focusing on particular sectoral interests (1980s). In the 1990s, these donors have encouraged a further shift in the aid relationship, to recipient country primacy in decision-making, and donor support only as requested with technical assistance and policy development.

While sectoral preferences for funding still vary from country to country across Europe, certain broad aid trends in funding can be discerned. In recent years, many donors have reported a shift away from the provision of training, infrastructure, and support for agricultural intensification in high potential areas, towards a more profound engagement with poverty alleviation, and resource conservation. Projects have got smaller and more diverse as many donors have moved away from the funding of capital-intensive projects, and

Table 6: Per cent of GNP spent on official development assistance by EU Member States 1994–5

| Country | % of GNP |
|-------------|----------------|
| Denmark | 0.96 |
| Netherlands | 0.81 |
| Sweden | 0.77 |
| France | 0.55 |
| Belgium | 0.38 |
| Luxembourg | 0.36 |
| Austria | 0.33 |
| Finland | 0.32 |
| Germany | 0.31 |
| Ireland | 0.29 |
| UK | 0.28 |
| Portugal | 0.27 |
| Spain | 0.24 |
| Italy | 0.15 |
| Greece | 0.13 |
| EU Members: | |
| | mean – 0.41% |
| | median – 0.32% |

(Source: OECD, 1996, p. 125)

Note: since data for Greece is unavailable in OECD, 1996, it is taken from the Greek country chapter.

towards social and institutional capacity-building goals. Those who fund forestry note that it requires long-term commitment, however. (Germany's average is seven to ten years for technical co-operation projects.)

A further important shift has been the broader inclusion of social analysis into all kinds of projects, in acknowledgement that early projects did not always achieve development objectives, even where physical targets were reached. Several donors now incorporate social analysis into all project assessment. DFID (UK) social development advisors are involved from the earliest stages of the project cycle, and DIDC (Finland) requires institutional and participation analysis, as well as gender analysis, as part of baseline information collection. The degree to which this extends to forestry varies between countries, to some extent depending on the type of forestry project favoured. Efforts to integrate social considerations into forestry projects are being tried throughout Europe. So far, Finland and the UK are the only donors to have undertaken reviews or evaluations of the effectiveness of these attempts.

5.2 Tropical forestry policy and strategy

The earliest forest policies and strategies in Europe were concerned with what would now be regarded as a very narrow definition of forestry. Belief in industrialisation as the key to forest development and better livelihoods for the rural poor followed the FAO's Jack Westoby (Westoby, 1985) for much of the 1960s and 1970s. French, Dutch, Swedish and British policies in this period all stressed production, forest industry, inventory, plantations, logging and the training of workers. A re-orientation to tropical forestry policies which addressed local livelihoods more effectively came later, the impetus for change coming from several different directions.

5.2.1 Social policies in non-forestry aid

Firstly, social policies and changes in development theory have been very significant. Forestry moved later than many other sectors from models of industrialisation as the source of wealth, towards theories based on sustainable livelihoods and the inter-linkage between social and ecological sustainability. Nevertheless, these shifts in tropical forestry thinking occurred far earlier in aid institutions, where the theories shaping aid in other sectors influenced forestry, than they did in forestry research institutions, where the discipline as a whole has been more isolated.

5.2.2 Key international conferences, meetings and reports

The second important sources of new strategy, cited by several donors, were various international conferences, meetings and reports. The most important for many of those interviewed for the country chapters, are set out in Box 1.

5.2.3 The early role played by Sweden

Sweden was a key actor in the shift towards a broader brief for forestry. It had seconded foresters to FAO in the 1960s to deal with tropical forestry issues, and had supported bilateral projects in Ethiopia, Tanzania and Vietnam in the 1970s. It consequently became aware

Box 1: Change in the Tropical Forestry Sector: Influential Conferences, Meetings and Reports, 1972–1992

The UN Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm (1972) was important for putting environmental affairs onto the international agenda, and for the creation of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).

The World Bank Meeting (1973) first identified rural poverty and development as priorities for bank lending. For the first time the issue of livelihoods was put high on the agenda.

The 8th World Forestry Congress at Jakarta (1978) focused explicitly on people and forests for the first time. The Dutch were among the earliest donors, following this meeting, to incorporate a social dimension into forestry aid. Wageningen Agricultural University, probably the first in the world to do so, reorganised its teaching to include agroforestry and people's participation in its courses.

The 1980 FAO assessment of Global Forest Cover (FAO, 1985) brought deforestation, the woodfuel crisis and approaches to trying to deal with it into the aid thinking of Finland, France, Sweden, the UK and no doubt most other European donors.

The TFAP process (Tropical Forestry Action Plan, 1985–1995) gave many donors their first opportunity to act together in the tropical forestry sector, and to make preliminary analyses of the causes of forest problems in developing countries. It can be argued that TFAP came too early, when the forest sector had only just begun to orient itself towards working with local people on-farm and in forest management, and when best practice was still poorly understood. The process might have approached issues differently five years later. Yet the increased donor collaboration and financial commitment which it encouraged would probably not have occurred without it.

The International Tropical Timber Agreement (1985) and the creation of the *International Tropical Timber Organisation* were cited by several countries as events which drew them more deeply into tropical forestry interests.

The Brundtland Report, 'Our Common Future' (1987) was crucial for a reorientation of aid in response to poverty, and for the explicit recognition that environmental degradation could not be addressed without simultaneous attention to economic development. The Netherlands, the UK, and several other European donors published responses to it. The report laid the ground for Rio in many ways.

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio (1992) strongly influenced greater interest in conservation and sustainable development, and in tropical forests in general, even though no convention was signed. Virtually all European donors increased their funding to forestry and some also committed special funds to the environment.

earlier than many other donors of the limitations of an industrial strategy for forestry, if benefit to local people was, at least in part, the aim. As a result, it committed Funds in Trust for the FAO/SIDA Forestry for Local Community Development Programme (FLCD), and helped to initiate the social, community and farm forestry projects of the 1980s.

5.3 Public pressure on governments for commitment to forests and the environment

An important influence on policy has been public pressure on governments for commitment to forests and the environment, often articulated through campaigning NGOs. These groups have by no means always prioritised sustainable livelihoods.

Pressure for government support to tropical forests would seem often to have been triggered initially by events affecting the environment at home, which then led to concern for forests and the environment internationally. Public pressure for better nature conservation and management came about in Spain, for instance, because of the public's demand for better state control of forest fires, and more protected areas. The Nordic interests in the environment which led to the 1972 Stockholm Conference and to the Brundtland Commission, emerged from two directions – the consciousness of forest dependence in countries such as Sweden and Finland, and the consciousness of past forest loss in Denmark. In Germany, a government report on damage to domestic forests greatly sensitised the public, and also led to boycotts of tropical timber. The link is not always clear, though. In France, energetic debate about the use of domestic forests for recreation or production has not produced an equally general interest in the fate of tropical forests. In Italy, interest in tropical forests preceded interest in domestic forests.

Several countries have responded to public interest in tropical forests very directly. In Austria, substantial funds were committed for a fixed period after Rio, which were focused above all on the rights of indigenous people, on small-scale timber extraction and on ecotourism. The funds were spent bilaterally because the Austrian people wanted 'ownership' of funds and outcomes. Public pressure in Spain generally pushes for aid funds to be spent first in Latin America, and then in response to international events such as the Rwanda crisis. The majority of the larger funders of tropical forestry in Europe have established a regular Forum or Committee, at which NGOs and other members of the public can comment on tropical forestry strategy and policy and be involved in the planning process, and where they may be challenged on their failures.

At one level, donors would argue that these pressures are healthy and helpful. At another, they exacerbate the tension between conservation and production priorities already seen in the Environment and Forestry debate. Because forests in Europe are increasingly used for recreation, the general public may be reluctant for the production needs of the developing world to be given due weight. For instance, the main author of the Sweden chapter notes that while in Sida '... assistance shall be targeted at the sustainable use of biodiversity', this is at variance with the valuing of biodiversity that prevails in forestry within Sweden. More dialogue with the public on these issues is clearly needed.

This area is one where the Commission itself is as yet almost entirely in a vacuum. It hardly experiences public pressure on its activities in forestry or in anything else, dialogue is limited, and the need to respond to diverse concerns quickly is correspondingly minimal.

5.4 Current tropical forestry policy in Europe

Despite their interest in, and in some cases considerable commitment to tropical forests, Austria, Belgium, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal and Spain currently lack formal forest policies. Box 2 presents brief summaries of the forest policies of those Member States which have policies, together with the Commission's most recent policy position.

5.5 The definition of forestry

Varied attempts to define forestry underlie the figures for volume of forestry funding found in each country in Europe (see Table 3), and in each Directorate-General. Researchers have arrived at the best figures they were able using results generated by local coding systems, and by making judgements based on project title. In some cases there was no substitute for a project-by-project estimate of the percentage of forestry activity each had contained, kindly carried out by an individual with a long institutional memory. It was rare to find anything comparable to the EC Tropical Forests Budget line where all projects funded within the envelope could be counted as forestry.

In the case of Denmark, agroforestry, multipurpose tree-planting, soil and water conservation and forest management all come partly or wholly under forestry within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Forestry and other environment projects are also found under a separate budget in DANCED in the Ministry of the Environment. France counts environment, forest conservation, nature reserves, wildlife, and biodiversity projects within its aid to forestry. Spain, on the other hand, uses the Spanish equivalent of the word forestry only to mean reforestation, and groups many of the activities which France classifies as forestry under an environment heading.

Classification problems have a threefold origin. Firstly, forestry itself has changed and continues to change. Most countries that fund forestry projects now fund a broad array of activities which would not have been counted as forestry at all twenty years ago, but which are now in the tropical forestry mainstream. Secondly, what constitutes 'forestry' can occasionally be a contentious political matter as far as developing country partners are concerned: sectoral divisions can result in situations where important forest impacts are not acknowledged. Finally, it is quite clear that when funding expanded, as it did for forestry, it caused the definitions to expand as well.

6. ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Environmental issues came to prominence in the early 1990s for most countries, before and after the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. How high these issues have subsequently stayed on the agenda has varied from country to country. Countries such as Denmark and Germany, where public opinion on global environmental issues has been a constant political factor, have devoted much more of their aid budgets to the environment than those where such pressure is absent. This can be seen in a number of initiatives developed in

Box 2: Tropical Forestry Policy in Europe today

Denmark Current key policies are an emphasis on Natural Resource Management in the context of rural development forestry; watershed management and soil and water conservation; better revenues for local people; forest seed procurement, gene conservation and tree-improvement; forest conservation and the conservation of biodiversity (1995). Denmark also seeks 'active multilateralism' and the exploration of trade-offs between poverty alleviation and environmental improvement.

Finland Finland's recent policies were enunciated in a 1991 statement (Finnida, 1991) which stressed the removal of institutional, legal and political constraints to development, afforestation, small forest-based industries, and protected area management. This is augmented by a 1995 document (DIDC 1995) which underlines the responsibility of partner countries for their own National Forest Programmes, and the need for aid to support their expressed will. At the same time, the paper highlights key forestry topics for Finland – the sustainability of forest products and services, conservation, the importance of water catchments, bio-energy, and the mitigation and control of climate change. Key social targets are also mentioned: participatory formulation and implementation and poverty alleviation through economic development.

France France's tropical forestry policies have prioritised long-term commitments to partner countries and a strong research emphasis, covering both drylands and tropical moist forests, and focusing on natural forest management, plantations and agroforestry. Institutional support to forested countries and the conservation of protected areas through local development have been very important. France's 1980s *gestion des terroirs* approach (which combined sustainable natural resource management and local participation) has now evolved into looser more people-oriented 'local development'. In recent years France has also made major investments in the development of SPOT satellite imagery. France is a signatory to the anti-desertification convention, and gives strong support to the African Timber Organisation (ATO) and its certification programme.

Germany Germany began to commit DM 300 m. annually to tropical forests from 1988 onwards, and it currently contributes well over 15% of all international bilateral forestry aid. In 1992 it produced its most recent Sector Concept on forestry principles and guidelines (BMZ, 1992). These stress support to partner countries in the goals of protecting national forests for the benefit of the population and the economy, bearing conservation in mind. The policies look at forests in context of both development and resource protection; at external impacts; at the strengthening of national level policies and institutions in partner countries, and at the active participation of local people.

Netherlands The Netherlands' most recent forest policies are enunciated in its Policy Document on tropical rain forests,

1991 (Ministerie van LNV, 1992) and in its International Programme on Nature Management, 1996–2000 (Tweede Kamer, 1995). These recognise the rights of sovereign states over their rainforest; the responsibilities of all nations in the face of global problems; the relationship between rain forests and vulnerable forest dependent people. Appropriate responses include monitoring the possible negative impact of other projects on rain forests; controlled harvesting and well-planned timber production and afforestation; the empowerment of local people and the need to strengthen national level research and institutions.

Sweden Sweden's latest natural resource policy statements are contained in 'Sustainable Management of Renewable Natural Resources' (SIDA, 1992) and 'Guidelines on Biological Diversity' (SIDA, 1994). Sida's Forestry Adviser also wrote a key document for the IPF Process, 'Back to National Realities!' (Früling and Persson, 1997). A strategy document for forestry is currently under preparation. Sweden has committed itself to including both biodiversity and participation in all projects. It encourages a new relationship with partner developing countries, stressing each country's own responsibility for forests, and the support role that a donor must adopt. Sweden has maintained its dryland focus.

UK The UK's most recent policy shifts began with a review of previous forestry projects (Flint, 1992), which clarified the development purposes of forestry projects and the multi-disciplinary skills they called for. The 1996 Participatory Forest Management review highlighted the diversity of forest stakeholders, the need for greater devolution, and the complexity of managing forest processes as a result. The 1997 DFID Forest Strategy highlights shared forest management; capacity building for better forest harvesting; conservation with development and the conservation of biodiversity through sustainable use; and support for policy frameworks which encourage tree-planting. The last Biodiversity Strategy was drawn up in 1991, and a Manual of Environmental Appraisal was produced in 1992 and updated in 1996.

The European Commission The Commission has been extremely active in the tropical forestry policy arena in recent years. (The full picture is presented in the chapter 'Common elements of EC Tropical Forestry Aid'). The Commission Communication of 1989 entitled, 'The Conservation of tropical forests: the role of the Community' was the first that recognised that the Commission was prepared to take on a direct role in the protection of tropical forests, independent of the Member States. Various documents appeared before and after UNCED, most importantly the Commission Communication of 1993, 'Proposal for a Council Regulation on Operations to promote Tropical Forests', and the Regulation itself in 1995. In 1996/7 DG VIII published its technical Manual, 'Guidelines for Forest Sector Development Co-operation' which combines current policy and assistance with the project cycle and project implementation.

support of the global environment. After the UNCED meeting, several countries established independent funds for the global environment, and also contributed to GEF directly.

- France committed substantial funds to the GEF after Rio (FF 807 m.), and also endowed its own parallel fund. Since 1994 the Interministerial

Environment Fund, the FFEM has been in existence with funds of FF 440 m.

- The Environment and Disaster Relief Facility of Denmark is expecting a commitment of 0.5% of GNP annually by the year 2002. The facility has a broad brief: it spends half its funds in developing countries, and half on 'green' rather than 'brown' environment issues.

- The Netherlands intends to create a fund of 0.1% of GNP for activities related to international environmental policy by 1999.
- The UK's Darwin initiative is one of the smaller funds with a budget of £3 m. per year for collaborative projects to help conserve global biodiversity.

Countries with budgets too small to set up independent funds, have nevertheless usually been able to contribute to the GEF.

UNCED explicitly linked northern and southern environmental issues, and several European countries have also made commitments to increase forest cover, or to undertake conservation monitoring. These initiatives are not directly considered here. However, they have perhaps had an impact on aid programmes in two ways. Firstly, as section 5.3 indicated, the public has tended to link concerns about environmental issues at home to pressure for particular kinds of actions in the tropics. Secondly, there has been a move by several donors to increase support for conservation projects through the aid programme. The Netherlands increased its funding for the conservation of tropical forests from 2% in 1986 to 29% in 1992. Spain has increased spending on conservation at the expense of forest management initiatives and Germany also has an increasing number of conservation projects. This pressure is also reflected in the rainforest-oriented commitments of DG IB and DG XI. The environment, in short, is now a high aid priority for many countries.

7. POLICY IMPACTS ON GEOGRAPHIC AND THEMATIC FOCUS

7.1 The narrowing focus of aid

Many donors, faced with a reduction in overall funding capacity, have in recent years reviewed their policies and now focus more sharply on strategy objectives. In so doing, they have reduced the total number of countries to which they give funding, and their number of primary co-operation countries (also known as programme, priority, 'pays de champ' or concentration countries) as the DAC Committee of the OECD has recommended.

The criteria used for target country selection have also been formalised in many cases, and these now frequently include issues of democracy and human rights as well as the traditional poverty criterion. A further aspect of targeting being used by some aid agencies is only to support particular sectors within priority countries. Forestry remains a priority in all those Member States where it was important before.

The degree of concentration on primary co-operation countries nevertheless varies. Portugal and Italy spend 80% of bilateral aid on their concentration countries, but Finland only 44%. In the UK, 74% of forestry aid was disbursed in priority countries. The trend is likely to be for the increasing concentration of assistance on priority countries.

The main countries currently (1995) funded by each of the Member States in Africa, the Mediterranean and

Middle East, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean, are presented in Tables Ai, Aii, Aiii and Aiv.

7.2 Geographic focus

The tables in Annex I show several clear patterns. Firstly, poverty criteria are important: there are very few LLDCs (least developed countries) which do not have at least one European donor in this list. However, these criteria lead inexorably to a concentration on funding in Africa (Table Ai), followed by the poorer countries of other areas. Secondly, democracy and human rights criteria are having a major impact on the selection of countries to fund. Thirdly, there is strong donor loyalty to ex-colonies in the cases of France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal and to some extent the UK, and a strong loyalty to Latin America in the case of Spain. Fourthly, natural resource interests are clearly driving the wide-ranging donor interest that such countries as Indonesia and Brazil receive. Finally, Member States in southern Europe take a particular interest in the countries of the southern Mediterranean and the Middle East (Table Aii).

The problem which donors may need to address in due course is that the same poverty criteria and human rights criteria lead to the same set of countries. The paradox may well be that the very countries with the least institutional capacity and fewest trained professionals are having to work with five to nine donors from the European Member States alone. Here is a case where better donor complementarity might well engender better effects, for more recipient countries, with more successful outcomes.

The countries where the overlap is greatest are as follows:

| | |
|------------------|---|
| West Africa: | drylands – Senegal, Burkina Faso, Niger |
| | tropical moist forest – Cameroon |
| NE + E Africa: | Egypt, Ethiopia, Tanzania |
| Southern Africa: | Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe |
| Asia: | Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia and Vietnam |
| Latin America: | Nicaragua and Bolivia |

While India, China or Indonesia can no doubt absorb diverse donors, smaller countries may find it more difficult.

Countries which have, overall, maintained the strongest interest in Africa are Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden and the UK (see Table 7a). Latin America has in recent years been a particular focus for Austria, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain, while Asia continues to engage the particular commitment of Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK. France, in addition to its support for Africa, Madagascar and Mayotte (Comoros) makes substantial commitments to its Pacific Island Departments, and to Vietnam and Indonesia in Asia. The picture for the EC is set out in Table 7b.

7.3 Thematic focus

Most donors in Europe have shifted the thematic focus of the issues they choose to fund, as the individual

Table 7a: The regional distribution of forestry aid for each European Member State (% of funds)

| Country | Regional Distribution | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | Africa | Asia | Latin America | Global or Other |
| Austria 1993–95 (% of projects) | 22 | 14 | 61 | 3 |
| Belgium 1996 | 58 | 18.5 | 19.5 | 4 |
| Denmark 1995 | 63 | 17 | 13 | 7 |
| Finland 1995 | 50 | 26 | 11 | 13 |
| France 1995 | Africa and Indian Ocean 38% DOM-TOM 25% Other 37% | | | |
| Germany 1995 | 25 | 23 | 39 | 13 |
| Ireland 1984–96 (% of projects) | 74 | 6 | 10 | — |
| Italy 1985–1997 | 49 | 4 | 5 | 42 (Med) |
| Luxembourg 1995 | 1 project | — | — | — |
| Netherlands 1995 | 31 | 24 | 26 | 19 |
| Portugal 1989–96 | 100 | — | — | — |
| Spain 1995 | — 7 (env) | — 3 (env) | 74 (for) 85 (env) | 26 (for) 5 (env) |
| Sweden 1994/5 | 41 | 24 | 11 | 24 |
| UK | 38 | 38 | 8 | 16 |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

Table 7b: The regional distribution of aid within the Directorates General of the Commission

| Directorate-General | Regional distribution |
|---------------------|--|
| DG IB 1992–96 | Averages show 55% of DG IB forestry funding going to Asia, 43% to Latin America and 2% to global issues |
| DG VIII 1992–96 | ACP countries received 22.3% of all EC aid for forestry in this period. |
| DG XI 1991–6 | Global (7%) Regional (17%) Latin America (29%) Africa (12%) Asia (5%) |
| DG XII 1994–8 | Spread of collaborating research partners: Africa (51%) Latin America (20%) Asia (19%) Mediterranean (7%) other (3%) |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

chapters in this book show, in line with the changes of approach and policy outlined in Section 5. The shift away from industrial production and processing and towards increased support to forestry with local people has been all but universal. Afforestation and agroforestry receive less support than they did, while sustainable forest management, collaborative forest management, and an interest in non-timber forest products have all increased. Since 1992, donors have also made a substantial financial commitment to conservation projects and rainforests.

A further interesting shift is the extent to which support to forestry now consists of much more than mere implementation. It also involves support for the evolution of a forestry sector with the capacity to respond to the social and economic, as well as the biological conditions for sustainability. Table 8a

illustrates current priorities among Member States. Institutional and policy development is currently the lead issue being funded by these donors, followed by rural development forestry, conservation, research, and sustainable forest management. Afforestation and agroforestry, which might have led the list a decade ago, now come well below these other priorities in terms of donor interest.

Most donor plans for the immediate future continue to prioritise a very similar ranking of issues, with strong strategic support at national level, more management roles for those who live near forests, more integration of forestry and sustainable livelihoods, and more conservation. Some recognise potential conflicts of interest between poverty alleviation criteria and interests in tropical moist forest and environmental conservation objectives.

Table 8a: The Thematic distribution of forestry aid among the European Member States

| Country | Themes |
|------------------|---|
| Austria 1993–95 | NTFPs (28%) land rights for forest dwellers (22%) conservation (17%) ecotourism (14%) rural development forestry (14%) agroforestry (5%) |
| Belgium 1996 | afforestation (28%) research (24%) rural development forestry (20%) training (16%) sustainable forest management (9%) other (3%) |
| Denmark 1995 | land management programmes with a forestry component (58%) tree seeds (14%) agroforestry (14%) conservation (6%) sustainable forest management (4%) other (4%) |
| Finland 1995 | research and institutional development (55%) conservation (28%) sustainable forest management (17%) |
| Germany (1995) | afforestation (24%) rural development forestry (21%) conservation (21%) institutional development (19%) sustainable forest management (15%) |
| Ireland 1984–96 | afforestation; rural development forestry (no percentages given) |
| Italy 1993–97 | rural development forestry (56%) afforestation and sustainable forest management (26%) institutional development (18%) |
| Netherlands 1995 | institutional development (39%) rural development forestry (35%) conservation (17%) other (9%) |
| Portugal 1989–96 | institutional development (45%) research (37%) forest industry (15%) conservation (1%) other (2%) |
| Spain 1990–96 | 'forestry': agroforestry (30%) afforestation (24%) cork cultivation (12%) fire protection (9%) other (25%) 'environment': parks (22%) environmental education (18%) conservation (14%) sustainable forest management (11%) other (35%) |
| Sweden 1994/95 | rural development forestry (29%) conservation (18%) research and training (18%) policy development (17%) sustainable forest management (8%) industry (5%) other (5%) |
| UK 1993–94 | institutional development (48%) Sustainable forest management and conservation (34%) rural development forestry (18%) |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

Notes:

The percentages given here are based on financial commitments.

France does not present thematic data in a way comparable with this figure.

Luxembourg has only one project (forest management).

Greece has no bilateral forestry projects.

Table 8b: Thematic distribution of forestry aid management within the Directorates General of the Commission

| Directorate-General | Themes |
|---------------------|---|
| DG 1B 1992–96 | (By financial commitment) Conservation (35%) forest management (27%) capacity building (18%) research (6%) buffer zones (6%) forest peoples (5%) other 3% |
| DG VIII 1996 | (By financial commitment) For the tropical forests budget line: sustainable forest management (48%) capacity building (18%) conservation (12%) research (9%) certification (6%) other (7%) |
| DG XI 1991–96 | (By number of projects) Sustainable forest management (37%) environmental protection (23%) training (9%) participation (8%) indigenous peoples (8%) timber/trade issues (8%) other (7%) |
| DG XII 1994–98 | (By number of projects) Numbers too small to be significant, but a clear shift from 'pure' single tree species research to 'applied' research on whole forest ecosystems can be observed over time. |

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

Table 8b depicts the position for the EC, where an even stronger focus on sustainable forest management, conservation, buffer zones and the like can be observed, together with some interesting funding for forest peoples, certification and timber issues.

8. PROJECT CYCLE MANAGEMENT

Shrinking donor funds have led not only to the concentration of resources, but also to a determination to ensure greater effectiveness and impact. At the same time – and this has especially been true of the forestry sector since it began to move into unfamiliar territory in order to try collaboration with local people in forest

management and protected area management – blueprint projects have constrained timely and innovative responses to challenges as they appear. The response of most donors in Europe has been to adopt the logical framework approach to project planning, which sets clear objectives, but allows evolution and adaptation of the means by which they are reached, and the indicators which will be used to monitor progress.

Objectives-Oriented Project Planning (ZOPP) is closely associated with Germany, and has been used there since 1983. The methodology has been adapted to fit the needs of a variety of other countries, the UK using TEAM-Up, Belgium, *Planification des interventions par objectifs* (PIPO), and so on. Germany, and some of the other countries which have used the method for some time are already working on redesign to streamline and

simplify the process, and make it less costly, more flexible and a better communication and participation tool.

Others are only just beginning to adopt the method in all projects. They have found the EC Project Cycle Management Manuals (Commission of the European Community, 1993) of great value for materials development in their own countries. The *Forest Sector Development Co-operation Guidelines* (EC, 1996) are also beginning to be used and promoted, both inside and outside the Commission.

Logical frameworks have proved to have a strong potential for harmonising donor inputs, and pairs of bilateral donors in Europe have already used them to simplify aid delivery to particular countries in the forestry sector.

Box 3: Europe and tropical forestry research for development

Major donors

Denmark's key contribution to tropical forestry for many years was the Danish/FAO Tree Seed centre (from 1965) which became the Danish Forest seed centre in 1981. Its interest in tree-seed and genetic resources grew out of the threats to domestic forests which had occurred in the past. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and Asia.

Finland's research strengths are in afforestation techniques, community forestry, dryland forest management, rainforest ecology, research training and planning. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and Asia.

France's very strong commitment to forestry research focuses on both tropical moist and tropical dry forests, encompassing natural forest management and timber issues, plantations and agroforestry. France also pioneered the 'gestion des terroirs' (village land-use planning) approach from the early 1980s, and its evolution into a broader, more flexible 'local development' approach more recently. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and S.E. Asia and on its overseas Departments and Territories.

Germany's early supremacy in forest science gave assistance first to other countries in Europe, and then to the tropics in the colonial period. In addition to the tropical ecology research going on in universities, it has established two forestry research initiatives for applied research and information for the aid programme. These are the Tropical Ecology Accompanying Programme and the Programme of Research into Tropical Ecosystems. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Asia and Latin America.

Netherlands Tropical forestry research has been a major strength since colonial times, and supports current rain forest and biodiversity research. The Netherlands' drylands experience in the Sahel has also fostered research into local people's management of existing vegetation as well as tree-planting. It has a strong tradition of research on community forestry, and its tropical forest interests are in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Sweden Sweden has maintained a very strong interest in both farm forestry and community forest management. Other research priorities have been biodiversity and food security, and land management in dry areas. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and Asia.

The **UK's** substantial research strengths in tropical forestry were established in the colonial period, and have been steadily developed since. These strengths are based on

experience in both tropical dry and tropical moist forest, in forest management, and plantations. The DFID Forestry Research Programme complements strategic research with applied and policy-oriented research which supports forestry in the aid programme more directly. The UK's main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and Asia.

The European Community supports formal forestry research through DG XII. It is from here that the EFRN, the European Tropical Forestry Research Network is funded. More policy-oriented and aid-focused research may if appropriate be funded by the Tropical Forestry budget line managed by DG VIII (ACP countries) and DG IB (ALA countries).

Medium-size donors

In **Belgium**, the University of Gembloux and the Free University of Brussels are involved in EC-funded forest conservation and ecosystem research in the Congo basin, and in research on the future of rainforest peoples. The National Botanic Garden has maintained taxonomic research links with the Congo basin since the colonial period. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa and Latin America. **Italy** has a colonial tradition of research in N.E. Africa on dryland tree species and techniques, and a comparative advantage in forestry for the Mediterranean, and Middle East. These remain its strongest areas of interest. Other research of relevance to its aid programme is research on poplars, and on wood technology.

In **Spain**, the universities organise research and training programmes and exchanges in forestry and environment with Latin America, such as the Latin American Science and Technology Development Department Programme, and several natural resource research networks. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Latin America and North Africa.

Smaller donors

Austria's early experience in the field of timber certification has led to its support for research on criteria and indicators. It funds the headquarters of IUFRO (the International Union of Forest Research Organisations) in Vienna. At the time of the Rainforest Initiative, its chief area of interest was Latin America.

Ireland fosters the interaction of Government, NGO and University forestry research partners through the National Council for Forest Research and Development. Its main tropical forest interests centre on Africa.

(Source: Sourcebook chapters)

9. DONOR COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

Europe's donors may be divided into three groups as far as their contributions to tropical forestry are concerned. The largest donors are Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands, Sweden, UK, and European Community Aid. Belgium, Italy and Spain are medium-sized forestry donors, while smaller programmes of support are provided by Austria (since the end of its Rainforest Initiative), Ireland, Luxembourg and Portugal. Greece funds forestry almost entirely multilaterally.

9.1 Research strengths

Universities which offer degrees in which tropical forestry forms all or a substantial part of the degree exist in the UK, Sweden, the Netherlands, Finland, France, Germany and Spain. A brief summary of some of the main areas of country research expertise for development, and the main regional foci for this research, are given in Box 3.

9.2 Other kinds of comparative advantage

The eighty three countries in which the Member States

currently fund aid programmes are tabulated in Annex I. Member State and EC funding priorities, and thus the areas in which they are currently increasing their capacity and experience, are set out in Tables 8a and 8b.

There are a number of other general and specific areas of European comparative advantage worth mentioning here.

9.2.1 Colonial period experience

A powerful factor in encouraging continuing support to tropical forests for some countries, has been a tradition to draw on which has continued since the colonial period. The strongest colonial experience is found among the French, the Dutch and the British, with some experience in the case of Italy, Belgium and Portugal. Spanish links with Latin America are still strong. France has maintained the most stable and long-term commitment to its old colonies. Germany is a special case. Although it did not have colonies after the first World War, its early expertise in forestry, and the important role of individual German experts in the evolution of British and Dutch colonial forestry practice, have been one factor encouraging Germany's continuing commitment to tropical forestry.

Box 4: Donor Reviews in the Forestry Sector

Denmark Two recent reviews have been important.

- The *1993/4 Agricultural Sector Evaluation* (Danida, 1994) was critical of Denmark's successes in low agricultural potential areas, and recommended shifting support to high potential areas, with subsidies for food transfers to low potential areas as an alternative strategy.
- The *Environment and Development Evaluation, 1995–6* (Danida, 1996) was more optimistic. It was of the opinion that forestry's contribution to GDP is often underestimated, identifying both increased income and decreased labour time for women's fuel-gathering in one forestry project. Commenting on the first review, it suggested that working only in high potential areas would be detrimental to the environment, and to Denmark's commitment to poverty reduction.

Both reviews note the difficulty of monitoring benefits from natural resource and forest management projects, but the latter found hydrological changes a good proxy indicator.

Finland A *Synthesis Study of Finnish Aid from 1988–1995* (DIDC, 1996), including six forestry projects, concluded that these projects were quite good at reaching stated short-term objectives, but that physical targets had been reached more readily than others. However, project impacts were modest given Finland's expertise in the forestry sector, and had not slowed deforestation. The economic efficiency of projects was found difficult to measure, and post-project sustainability difficult to be sure of.

Germany Recent forestry reviews conducted by GTZ and KfW (Sepp and Haase, 1993; GTZ n.d.; KfW n.d.) contain the following key findings.

- Most sustainable forestry projects need at least a ten year donor commitment. More political, economic and

institutional analysis is needed during project preparation. There is a need to shift away from training individuals and towards capacity building for institutions. GTZ plans a greater devolution of planning and implementation to local GTZ offices and to projects themselves.

- KfW found that agriculture and forestry projects are more vulnerable than those of other kinds to extra-sectoral impediments in the shape of poor policies or unhelpful partner country interventions in the sector.

Sweden A *Review of Social Forestry Projects in India* (Chaffey et al., 1992) observed that forestry projects gradually broaden till they are like rural development projects in a natural resources context. This review made it clear how vital institutional development and relevant policies are for success.

UK Three reviews are of relevance.

- a recent *Review of the DFID Forestry Research Programme* (ODA, 1995) stresses that *how* research is done (demand-led, with local institutions, to a multidisciplinary design, and with a commitment to dissemination) is at least as important as *what* is researched.
- *Forestry synthesis evaluation study* Six forestry project evaluations conducted 1989–92 were synthesised (in Flint, 1992) the study concluding that forestry projects need multidisciplinary skills, process-project design, better-designed and monitored outputs, and more focus on institutional issues.
- *Participatory Forest Management Review* (Bird, 1996) Project attempts to give local stakeholders more share in forest management were reviewed, and best practice identified. The review noted the need for pre-project preparation, multi-disciplinarity, clearer goals, and the early planning of exit strategies.

9.2.2 Europe's own experience of people–forest interactions

A second factor of importance is the experience European countries can bring to forest-people interactions in the developing world. All have experienced forest loss, the generation of legislation to curb it, conflicts between local people and the State and the solutions adopted, and much is well-documented. Other experience is relevant here too. There is, for instance, a strong democratic and participative tradition in the Netherlands, fostered in the past by the village canal and dyke-management associations, which have been such an essential part of the country's survival.

Europe's most densely populated countries have had to incorporate many of their trees into farm landscapes. Less densely settled countries such as France have strong traditions of farmer and community management of patches of forest. Countries with more extensive forested areas such as Finland and Sweden have, in addition to these, complex systems of permits for forest use rights for non-timber forest products and hunting; shifting cultivation was still practised in some areas until the 1930s.

9.2.3 Specific skills

Some of the country chapters indicate highly specialised home-based experience – such as Austria's in the fields of ecologically friendly timber extraction on steep slopes; mountain hazard mapping, and the biological stabilisation of erosion and its prevention in mountain areas, for instance.

A few programmes offer specific implementation lessons. For instance, Ireland's support to a cluster of food security and environmental rehabilitation issues in Tanzania over a 10–18 year period, and its decade of support to forestry in the Sudan, offer an excellent example of a small donor with limited resources using them well in the natural resource arena. It achieved this by choosing only a few countries, by small, steady, long-term investments, and by a clear topic focus. The inputs have led to strong experience in drylands forestry.

9.3 Learning from programme experience

Donor funding has little meaning, however generous, if no efforts are made to draw the lessons of success and failure from what is funded: they are the only means by which the link between the implementation of field projects and global-level policy processes can be forged. Ideally, field projects are the testing ground for new ideas and approaches, and the results, like research results, are made public and can affect policy in due course. But this does not always happen in every case.

However, feedback mechanisms have been improving steadily in many of the Member States. Logical frameworks and the objectives-oriented planning process have been in use for several years. The result has been robust process project methodologies which facilitate better monitoring and evaluation practice, and lead to better outcomes. The production of Guideline documents has been excellent in several countries and within the Commission itself. On the evidence from the individual chapters in this book, one of the most illuminating mechanisms for learning has been the comparative reviews undertaken by donors from time

to time, where a selection of completed projects are examined. Usually only the bigger donors have the resources to conduct these commendably frank reviews, but the insights they yield are important for everyone working in tropical forestry. Box 4 gives some examples of these.

9.4 The contribution of the European Community

The European Community's comparative advantage in tropical forestry is potentially immense. It has substantial financial resources, and aid delegations all over the world. That its ability to deliver high quality aid in the forestry sector has limitations is to do with the rapid build-up of aid funds in the early 1990s, unmatched by an adequate increase in technical or administrative support. Nevertheless, there have been some important achievements.

DG VIII has made great progress in recent years in developing a strategic orientation for the Tropical Forestry budget line. Its increased funding for policy studies has been valuable (e.g. a paper on logging in the Congo basin by Pacific rim countries) and has heightened the budget line's profile. Work on certification and on the operationalisation of the EU commitment to complementarity, coordination and coherence are also important. Finally, the recently produced *Forest Sector Guidelines* are being widely used.

DG IB's strategy for the future is to programme its share of the Tropical Forest budget line in more detail, concentrating more on participation, natural forest management, and trade and certification issues, and less on conservation. More consideration of equity issues may lead to a wider selection of countries for funding in Asia and Latin America in future.

DG XI, too, is planning the development of a forestry strategy by the end of 1998. It has so far mostly funded small forestry and environment projects, many in the Amazon, on civil society issues.

Research funded from DG XII currently lacks a tropical forestry research strategy to focus limited funds more effectively. A recent evaluation highlighted the problems of overloaded staff, with no time to assist with project preparation, or build links to other forestry funders in the Commission. It also noted the many research problems caused by financial delays.

9.5 Donor collegiality

Forestry donors probably first began to debate issues together and act in concert through the TFAP process and through International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) meetings. In more recent years the Forestry Advisers' Group (FAG) has met regularly. Out of these initiatives, indirectly, came the formation of the European Tropical Forestry Advisory Group (ETFAG) in 1990. At first annually, and now biannually, forestry advisers meet as individuals to update one another about current initiatives, and to debate broader issues. The forging of informal working relationships through initially formal meetings has made it far more common for pairs of donors to share research under way at an early stage, or plan joint activities. As donors experiment with different aid delivery mechanisms, they consult others, invite comment, learn from one

another's mistakes. At one level, there is a constant donor tendency towards convergence; at another, comparative advantage is constantly being recreated, and there is little danger from over-homogenisation of approach. The outcome has been, rather, an excellent learning environment.

10. ISSUES AND TRENDS FOR THE FUTURE

Issues of aid management strategy with which the European Member States and the Commission are currently grappling, or which they will shortly need to address, are dealt with in this final section. All have important implications for the future, and for Europe's contribution as a whole to support for tropical forests.

10.1 Devolution

Firstly, almost all governments have reduced the number of government employees who are involved in aid delivery, and are seeking partners for implementation among NGOs, consultancy firms, universities, and through other arrangements. These changes are usually more to do with budget constraints and privatisation ideologies than with a belief that others will manage aid delivery better. Some countries have a strong commitment to the involvement of civil society in aid, however, with aid delivery through region-to-region or town-to-town twinning mechanisms, through trade unions, through support from small businesses in the north to similar small businesses in the south and from church to church. Nevertheless, the main mechanisms are NGOs and consulting firms, and each of these present particular problems in the aid context.

10.1.1 NGOs

The country chapters in this book make it clear that few NGOs, on the whole, have a strong track record in managing forestry projects other than rural development projects with a small forestry component. Forest management projects are difficult practically – they demand very specific skills, they are costly, and they must endure for longer than most NGOs would choose to be involved. More importantly, development NGOs are regarded with hostility and suspicion in some developing countries, and it has been easier for them to work in sectors such as mother-and-child health where they do not challenge government directly. In the case of forests (almost always state property), NGO approaches which prioritise local people's needs have often been seen as an unacceptable political challenge to the State, and proposals from them for institutional or policy change would be out of the question. It has been easier for donors with more money and more authority to make these challenges, or to experiment within a project context.

The exception has been environmental NGOs such as WWF, whose approach has, paradoxically, sometimes strengthened government's ability to exclude local people from access to forests, and who often manage particular protected areas for long periods of time.

10.1.2 Consulting firms

Consulting firms manage many, probably the majority,

of the tropical forestry projects which currently exist. But often their management model – that of timely delivery of physical outputs within budget – is more suited to a civil engineering firm building roads, than to support for what is currently a rapidly evolving and innovating sector.

The themes which this chapter shows European donors are currently funding in tropical forestry – policy and institutional development; collaborative forest management; sustainable forest management for a wider range of benefits than before; and the blending of conservation and development issues – require good facilitation skills, the capacity to implement flexibly and an interest in local people. Yet often consulting firms are conservative and old-fashioned. Their employees do not get time to read, and they are often among the last to be exposed to new ideas and policies. Preoccupied with the need to secure the next contract, they may not be well placed to challenge the structures within which they work. In an era where flexible logical frameworks are becoming a more and more powerful tool, they need to be encouraged not to implement in the old blueprint way.

There are ways round these problems, but they require much more investment from donor agencies in the form of training, briefing documents, seminars, and close interactive monitoring, than is usually offered at present. In the Nordic countries, an effort has been made to train consultants, and make them more familiar with government policies. A few consulting firms have a close relationship with in-house advisers, and are involved in all parts of the project cycle: not just implementation but often identification and evaluation as well. They effectively become additional advisers. But even they would say that there are problems with the current pattern, especially for field managers.

The reality is that devolution to other implementing bodies has been seen as a cheaper option for government development agencies than it really is. To be effective, more effort will have to be put into the planning and management of implementation by multiple diverse parties, and to their continued exposure to new thinking in forestry.

10.2 The relationships between budgets and outputs

There are several issues here relevant to the management of aid for forestry.

10.2.1 The cost of forestry projects

Firstly, the evidence from several countries in this book is that support to forestry in tropical moist environments is usually a long-term and complex business, expensive in terms of both money and aid management processes. Germany doubts that useful forestry projects can be delivered in less than 7–10 years. Not only do social economic and biological issues have to be addressed locally, but inevitable stakeholder conflicts involve both local and national-level issues simultaneously as well. Good quality field managers and a close donor advisory relationship with both the partner country and project managers is essential.

The less costly, but no less long-term alternative is to fund integrated rural development projects in which

tree-planting or forest management plays only a minor part, or to fund forest management in dryland areas where national and international interest in the forest resource is less, and complexities fewer. This is the path that Ireland has taken successfully.

10.2.2 Aid volume for forestry

A second issue is the volume of funds available and the organisational and administrative structures available to deal with them. In the case of Italy the Ministry of Foreign Affairs acknowledges that the country's aid budget grew too fast in the 1980s for its internal management structures to be able to keep up. Its control of aid quality was weak in consequence. Like other donors such as Finland and the UK, Italy has found that financial constraints have led to better quality aid because they brought aid volume back within the scope of good quality administration.

The European Commission has had to deal with these issues as well. Its aid budget for forestry grew rapidly in the 1990s, but it has not been allowed to recruit more professional staff to help with the administration of these funds. Consequently, understanding of complex tropical forestry issues may be poor. These limitations in turn have led to the weak monitoring and evaluation of projects, limited opportunities to learn from previous projects, and thus a weak information base for future project selection.

The Member States have tried to help by seconding National Experts to DG IB and DG VIII. DG VIII has decided to tackle some of its aid management problems in the forestry sector by contracting out aspects of project selection and management of the budget line to consultants. While this will lighten the work-load of over-burdened individuals within the Directorate, it is no alternative to a properly staffed, professional in-house team which can develop funding strategically. And as section 10.1.2 showed, consultants themselves may not be able to deliver the most effective tropical forestry outcomes without a great deal more support than they usually get.

Ideal project size is much debated inside the European Commission. Large projects are appraised, implemented and evaluated by consultancy firms, and thereby deal in a very satisfactory way with in-house staff shortages. While smaller projects are more effective, and use funds better, they are too management-intensive at current staffing levels. More redesign for aid effectiveness may be needed.

10.3 Institutional memory

Poor institutional memory is a major problem in some agencies. Sometimes this may be the result of poor archiving of project documents. But in reality most of the chapters in this book relied for important information on the memory of individuals who had been in post for some years. For although some countries now have their projects on a database, little information may be recorded beyond the title, date, type and total budget of the project.

Yet there may be fewer of these individuals in the future, who can remember what went on before, because of changes in the way many European countries are currently organising aid delivery. This is sometimes because of over-frequent internal changes, but is also

increasingly structural. In the case of Finland, the fusing of the diplomatic and Co-operation streams in DIDC, and the alternation of individuals between one kind of job and another, may spell the end of institutional memory. The Netherlands is currently experimenting with the decentralisation of project cycle management in its entirety to its embassies. This model may succeed in the short run, while there are still individuals who can remember the old structure, and make the new work on that basis. But in due course there is a risk that programme coherence and mechanisms for institutional learning may weaken.

10.4 Effective aid delivery and donor collaboration

There are a variety of practical aid delivery issues which currently present obstacles to effective donor collaboration. While country variation in choice of Ministry for forestry aid delivery does not present any difficulty, other choices require more adaptability. Projects funded by several donors often find that the heterogeneous payment schedules, reporting timetables and formats of different donors present them with time-consuming management tasks. It was railway timetables in the nineteenth century which provoked the need for governments to standardise time-zones rather than leaving every village to set its own time by the sun. Harmonisation of some quite minor details could greatly smooth the path of donor collaboration.

10.5 Finding a way for larger and smaller donors to work together

Looking at the country chapters, it is clear that the funding of tropical forestry has tended to be for the wealthier donors, for those with strong previous experience, or for those with strong forest industries inside their own countries. Yet several countries with smaller means and less experience would like to take more part in forestry initiatives – responding in part to the interests of the general public in their countries – and would welcome and benefit from the co-funding of projects with larger donors. Such arrangements would make particular sense in countries where both parties already have some comparative advantage – such as language, or strong colonial experience in the case of the smaller donor, and strong recent tropical forestry experience in the case of the larger. Donor complementarity and coordination would improve greatly from such initiatives.

10.6 The evolving relationship between forestry and environment

The most important problem of all for donors is how to manage the as yet imperfect marriage between forestry and environment policy, and aid delivery. It is only six years since the Rio conference, and both theory and practice are still evolving. For the moment, the environment is the dominant partner, and donor funding has been pulled in the direction of conservation, to the potential detriment of livelihood and sustainable use issues in forestry. It is interesting to wonder whether the balance would have been the same if a forestry

convention had been signed at the same time as the Biodiversity and Climate Change Conventions.

Several countries in our sample currently keep tropical forestry issues, as of old, in the Ministry which deals with tropical agriculture. But at the same time the Ministry of the Environment deals with both domestic and tropical environmental issues, inevitably including conservation aspects of tropical forests. In the case of EC aid there are currently parallel forestry and environment budget lines.

It is clear that many of the issues currently being dealt with in this way will have to be harmonised in due course. Meanwhile, their separate handling in the aid mechanisms of the north sends the wrong signals to the developing country partners with whom they work – where separate ministries and structures have in many cases also been established.

Where the forestry sector might have been leading the way forward, it has too often been fighting a rearguard action. It has been slow to exploit its importance to changing values in society, even though it has accepted a constantly increasing role for local people, NGOs and other stakeholders. The need now is for dynamism and flexibility in both research and field practice, to utilise new environmental awareness in forestry, and to tackle issues in a more integrated and international way. The important opportunities for synthesis still lie ahead.

REFERENCES

Note: This chapter is largely based upon summaries of the data available in the other chapters of the book. Since references to named countries or Directorates of the EC always make it obvious which chapter contains the data in question, individual chapters have not been referenced each time data are used.

- Bird, P. (1996) *ODA's Review of Participatory Forest Management. Synthesis of Findings*. Review Working Paper 6. ODA London, UK.
- BMZ (1992) *Sektorkonzept Tropenwald. Entwicklungspolitik-aktuell 14*. BMZ, Bonn, Germany.
- Brundtland, G. (1987) *Our Common Future*. The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, OUP.
- Chaffey, D., Aziz, A., Djurfeldt, G., Haldin, G., Pranjape, J., Sunder, S.S., Svanqvist, N., Tejwani, K.G. (1992) *An Evaluation of the SIDA supported Social Forestry Projects in Tamil Nadu and Orissa in India*. SIDA, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Commission of the European Community (1993) *Project Cycle Management: integrated approach and logical framework*, Evaluation Unit, European Commission, Brussels.
- Danida (1994) *Evaluation report. Agricultural Sector Evaluation* (3 volumes). Report No. 1994/8, MFA, Copenhagen.
- Danida (1996) *Evaluation report. Environment and development* (2 volumes). Report No. 1996/2, MFA, Copenhagen.
- DFID (1997) *Forestry Strategy*. DFID, London, UK.
- DIDC (1995) *Internal Strategy paper*. MFA, Helsinki, Finland.
- DIDC (1996) *Effects or Impacts? Synthesis study on evaluation and reviews 1988-1995*. Prepared by J. Koponen and Päivi Matilla-Wiro, for MFA, Helsinki, Finland.
- Eurofor (1994) *L'Europe et la Forêt*. Parlement Européen, Strasbourg.
- European Commission, Directorate General for Development (1996) *Guidelines for Forest Sector Development Co-operation*. Volume I: *Strategic Approach*; Volume II: *Tools for Project Cycle Management*, The European Community, Brussels and Luxembourg.
- FAO (1985) *Forest Resources 1980*. FAO, Rome.
- FINNIDA (1991) *Finnish Development Co-operation in the Forest Sector in the 1990s*. MFA, Helsinki, Finland.
- Flint, M. (1992) *Forestry Synthesis Evaluation Study*. ODA Evaluation report EV541. ODA London, UK.
- Frühling, P. and Persson, R. (1997) *Back to National Realities! Rethinking International Assistance to Forestry Development*. Sida, Stockholm, Sweden.
- GTZ (no date) *Erreicht die technische Zusammenarbeit die gesetzten*

- Ziele? Projektergebnisse der GTZ und ihrer Partner*. GTZ Eschborn. Germany.
- KfW (no date) Results of financial co-operation: third evaluation report on projects promoted in developing countries. KfW, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
- MINISTERIE VAN LNV, (1992) *The Dutch Government's Policy on Tropical Rainforests*. The Hague, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries. Netherlands.
- ODA (1991) *Biological Diversity and Developing Countries: issues and options*. ODA, London, UK.
- ODA (1992, revised 1996) *Manual of Environmental Appraisal*. ODA, London, UK.
- ODA (1995) *Review of Forestry research supported by ODA Natural Resources Research Department, during the period 1990-1993*. ODA, London, UK.
- OECD (1996) *Efforts and Policies of the Members of the Development Assistance Committee*. Development Assistance Committee, OECD. Paris
- Sepp, S. and Haase, G. (1993) *Inventur und Kategorisierung der Tropenwald-relevanten Vorhaben der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit*. Report by ECO for GTZ, Germany.
- SIDA (1992) *Sustainable Management of Renewable Natural Resources – Action plan for SIDA*, Naturbruksbyran. Stockholm, Sweden.
- SIDA (1994) *Biological Diversity – guidelines for SIDA support for the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity*. Natural resources Management Division, SIDA, Sweden.
- TWEDEDE KAMER DER STATEN-GENERAAL (1995) *Programma Internationaal Natuurbeheer (PIN) 1996-2000*. Vergaderjaar 1995-1996, The Hague, Netherlands.
- UN Economic and Social Council (1996) *Paper E/CN.17/IPF/1996/.. presented to the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests of the Commission for Sustainable Development*.
- Westoby, Jack (1985) 'Foresters and Politics'. *Commonwealth Forestry Review* 64(2).

ACRONYMS

- | | |
|---------|--|
| ACP | African, Caribbean and Pacific |
| AECI | Spanish Agency for International Co-operation |
| AGCD | General Administration for Development Co-operation (Belgium) |
| ALA | Asia and Latin America |
| APSO | Agency for Personal Service Overseas (Ireland) |
| BMZ | Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development) |
| CFD | Caisse Française de Développement |
| CIRAD | Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement |
| CSD | Commission for Sustainable Development (DG XI) |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee of the OECD |
| DANCED | Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development |
| DDC | Department of Development Co-operation (Austria) |
| DFID | Department for International Development (UK) |
| DG | Directorate-General |
| DGCS | Department for Development Co-operation (Italy) |
| DGIS | Directorate-General for International Co-operation (The Netherlands) |
| DKK | Danish Kroner |
| DM | Deutschmark |
| DOM | Département d'Outre-Mer (French Overseas Department) |
| EC | European Community |
| EDF | European Development Fund |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FFEM | Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial |
| FINNIDA | Finnish Development Agency (now known as DIDC) |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GNP | Gross National Product |
| GTZ | Deutsche Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit (German Agency for Technical Co-operation) |

| | |
|--------|---|
| IIED | International Institute for the Environment and Development |
| IPF | Inter-Governmental Panel on Forests |
| KfW | Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (German Development Bank) |
| LLDC | Least Developed Countries |
| MAE | Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, du Commerce Extérieur et de la Coopération (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, External Trade and Co-operation – Luxembourg) |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| NRI | Natural Resources Institute |
| oda | Official Development Assistance |
| ODI | Overseas Development Institute, UK |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OFI | Oxford Forestry Institute |
| ORSTOM | Office de la Recherche Scientifique Outre-Mer |
| PIPO | Planification des interventions par objectifs (Planning and Interventions by Objectives – Belgium) |
| SIDA | Swedish International Development Agency |
| TOM | Territoire d’Outre-Mer (French Overseas Territory) |
| TFAP | Tropical Forestry Action Plan |
| TSA | Technical Advisory Service (Denmark) |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNCED | United Nations Conference on Environment and Development |
| WCMC | World Conservation Monitoring Centre |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |
| ZOPP | Zielorientierte Projektplanung (Objectives-Oriented Project Planning) |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This chapter has benefited from discussion with a number of people including the following: John Hudson and John Palmer, DFID; and Mike Arnold, David Brown, Michael Richards and Kate Schreckenber, ODI. It also relies, as is very evident, on the research efforts of all the other authors of the book and those who assisted them.

Note on currencies: on 1 September, 1997, US\$ 1 was equivalent to:

| | |
|-------------|--------------|
| Austria | Sch 12.75. |
| Belgium | BEF 37.40. |
| Denmark | DKK 6.90. |
| Europe | ECU 1.09. |
| Finland | FIM 5.45. |
| France | FF 6.10. |
| Germany | DM 1.81. |
| Greece | Dr 284.79. |
| Ireland | IR£1.49. |
| Italy | L.1767.00. |
| Luxembourg | LUF 37.40. |
| Netherlands | NLG 2.04. |
| Portugal | Es 183.54. |
| Spain | Ptas 152.71. |
| Sweden | SEK 7.87. |
| UK | £1.61. |

ANNEX 1

Table A i: Main countries funded by European Member States in Africa, 1995

| S-S AFRICA | Au | Bel | Den | Fin | Fra | Ger | Ire | Ita | Lux | Nth | Port | Spa | Swe | UK |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|----|
| W and Central | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Benin | ◆ | | * | | | * | | | | | | | | |
| Burkina Faso | ◆ | ** | * | * | ** | | | | | ** | | | | |
| Burundi | ◆ | | ** | | | | | | ** | | | | | |
| Chad | ◆ | | | | * | | | | | | | | | |
| Cameroon | ◆ | | ** | | ** | * | | | | | | | | ** |
| Congo (Braz) | ◆◆ | | | | ** | | | | | | | | | |
| Congo (Za) | ◆ | | ** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Côte d'Ivoire | ◆ | | | | ** | | | | | | | | | |
| Gabon | ◆◆◆ | | * | | ** | | | | | | | | | |
| Gambia | ◆ | | | | | | | | * | | | | | |
| Ghana | ◆ | | | * | | | | | | ** | | | | ** |
| Guinea-Bissau | ◆ | | | | | | | | | ** | ** | | | |
| Mali | ◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Niger | ◆ | | ** | * | ** | | | | ** | ** | | | | |
| Nigeria | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | * |
| Rwanda | ◆ | | ** | | | | * | | * | * | | | | |
| Sao Tomé | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | ** | | | |
| Senegal | ◆◆ | * | ** | | * | ** | | | ** | ** | (*) | | | |
| Togo | ◆ | | * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cape Verde | ◆ | ** | | | | | | | ** | ** | ** | | | |
| N-E and East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Djibouti | ◆ | | | | | | | | * | | | | | |
| Egypt | ◆ | * | | * | ** | ** | * | ** | | ** | (*) | | | |
| Ethiopia | ◆ | ** | * | | ** | * | ** | ** | | ** | | | ** | * |
| Eritrea | ◆ | | | * | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Kenya | ◆ | * | * | * | ** | | * | * | | ** | | | * | |
| Sudan | ◆ | | | | * | | * | | | * | | | | |
| Somalia | ◆ | | | | ** | | * | ** | | * | (*) | | | |
| Tanzania | ◆ | * | * | * | ** | | ** | | | ** | * | | ** | * |
| Uganda | ◆ | ** | | * | | | ** | | | ** | | | * | * |
| Southern | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Angola | ◆ | | | | | | | | | * | ** | | * | |
| Comoros | ◆ | | | | * | | | | | | | | | |
| Lesotho | ◆ | | | | | | ** | | | | | | | |
| Madagascar | ◆ | | | | ** | | | | | | | | | |
| Malawi | ◆ | | | * | | | | | | | | | | ** |
| Mauritius | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | | ** | | | | | |
| Mozambique | ◆ | ** | | * | ** | * | ** | ** | | ** | ** | | * | * |
| Namibia | ◆◆ | * | | | ** | | | | ** | | | | * | |
| South Africa | ◆◆ | | | * | | | ** | | | | | | * | ** |
| Zambia | ◆ | | (*) | * | ** | * | ** | | | ** | | | * | * |
| Zimbabwe | ◆ | * | * | * | * | | * | | | ** | | | * | ** |
| missing LLDCs: Central African Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Liberia | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(Sources: (i) OECD 1996, Table 42 'Major recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid, 1994-95' Statistical Annex pps A70-A84; (ii) Data in Sourcebook Chapters)

** Donor Concentration or Programme countries

* Other countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor and in country chapter

(*) Countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor, but not in country chapter

Country status by per capita income (from OECD 1996, Statistical Annex p.A101)

◆ Least Developed Countries – per capita GNP < \$675 in 1992

◆◆ Lower Middle Income Countries – per capita GNP \$676-\$2 695 in 1992

◆◆◆ Upper Middle Income countries – per capita GNP \$2 696-\$8 355 in 1992

Table A ii: Main countries funded by European Member States in the Mediterranean and Middle East, 1995

| MEDITERRANEAN + MIDDLE EAST | Au | Bel | Den | Fin | Fra | Ger | Ire | Ita | Lux | Nth | Port | Spa | Swe | UK |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|----|
| Algeria | ◆◆ | * | | | * | | | * | | | * | * | | |
| Iraq | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | * | |
| Iran | ◆◆ | * | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Malta | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | * | | | | | | |
| Morocco | ◆◆ | ** | | | * | * | | * | | | * | * | | |
| Palestinian adm. /occ areas | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | * | | |
| Tunisia | ◆◆ | ** | | | | | | | ** | | * | | | |
| Yemen | ◆ | | | | | | | | | ** | | | | |
| missing LLDCs: Mauritania | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(Sources: (i) OECD 1996, Table 42 'Major recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid, 1994–95' Statistical Annex pps A70-A84; (ii) Data in Sourcebook Chapters)

** Donor Concentration or Programme countries

* Other countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor and in country chapter

(*) Countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor, but not in country chapter

Country status by per capita income (from OECD 1996, Statistical Annex p.A101)

◆ Least Developed Countries – per capita GNP < \$675 in 1992

◆◆ Lower Middle Income Countries – per capita GNP \$676–\$2 695 in 1992

◆◆◆ Upper Middle Income countries – per capita GNP \$2 696–8 355 in 1992

Table A iii: Main countries funded by European Member States in Asia, 1995

| ASIA | Au | Bel | Den | Fin | Fra | Ger | Ire | Ita | Lux | Nth | Port | Spa | Swe | UK |
|--------------------------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|----|
| Bangladesh | ◆ | * | * | ** | | ** | * | | | ** | | | * | * |
| Bhutan | ◆ | ** | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Cambodia | ◆ | * | | | | | * | | | * | | | | |
| China | ◆ | (*) | * | * | | * | | * | | | * | * | | * |
| India | ◆ | | * | | | * | | | * | ** | | | ** | ** |
| Indonesia | ◆ | (*) | ** | * | * | * | | * | | ** | | * | | ** |
| Korea | ◆◆ | * | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laos | ◆ | * | | * | | | | | | | | | ** | |
| Myanmar | ◆ | | | * | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nepal | ◆ | * | * | ** | | * | | | | ** | | | | ** |
| Pakistan | ◆◆ | * | | | | * | | | | ** | | | | * |
| Philippines | ◆◆ | * | | | | | | | | ** | | | | |
| Sri Lanka | ◆ | ** | | * | | | | | | ** | | | | ** |
| Thailand | ◆◆ | (*) | * | (*) | * | | | | | | | | | |
| Vietnam | ◆ | * | * | ** | * | * | | ** | ** | | | | ** | |
| Missing LLDCs: Afghanistan, Maldives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(Sources: (i) OECD 1996, Table 42 'Major recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid, 1994–95' Statistical Annex pps A70-A84; (ii) Data in Sourcebook Chapters)

** Donor Concentration or Programme countries

* Other countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor and in country chapter

(*) Countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor, but not in country chapter

Country status by per capita income (from OECD 1996, Statistical Annex p.A101)

◆ Least Developed Countries – per capita GNP < \$675 in 1992

◆◆ Lower Middle Income Countries – per capita GNP \$676–\$2 695 in 1992

◆◆◆ Upper Middle Income countries – per capita GNP \$2 696–8 355 in 1992

Table A iv: Main Countries funded by Member States in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1995

| LATIN AMERICA + CARIBBEAN | Au | Bel | Den | Fin | Fra | Ger | Ire | Ita | Lux | Nth | Port | Spa | Swe | UK |
|---------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|----|
| Nth Antilles | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Argentina | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | * | | | * | * | | |
| Belize | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | * |
| Bolivia | ◆◆ | | * | | | | | | | ** | | * | * | ** |
| Brazil | ◆◆◆ | | | | | * | | | * | | * | | | ** |
| Chile | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | * | | | | | |
| Colombia | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | * | | | * | | |
| Costa Rica | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Ecuador | ◆◆ | | * | | | | | | | ** | | * | * | * |
| El Salvador | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | * | | | | | |
| Guatemala | ◆◆ | * | | | | | | | | ** | | | | |
| Guyana | ◆ | | | | | | | | | | | | | * |
| Haiti | ◆ | | | | | | | | | ** | * | * | | |
| Honduras | ◆ | | | | | | | * | | ** | | * | | |
| Jamaica | ◆◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Mexico | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | | | | | * | | * |
| Nicaragua | ◆ | * | | * | * | * | | * | * | ** | | * | ** | |
| Peru | ◆◆ | | | * | | | | | * | ** | | | | |
| Surinam | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | | | * | | | | |
| Uruguay | ◆◆◆ | | | | | | | | | | | * | | |
| missing LLDCs: none | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

(Sources: (i) OECD 1996, Table 42 'Major recipients of Individual DAC Members' Aid, 1994–95' Statistical Annex pps A70–A84; (ii) Data in Sourcebook Chapters)

** Donor Concentration or Programme countries

* Other countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor and in country chapter

(*) Countries mentioned in the OECD top 15 aid recipients for each donor, but not in country chapter

Country status by per capita income (from OECD 1996, Statistical Annex p.A101)

◆ Least Developed Countries – per capita GNP < \$675 in 1992

◆◆ Lower Middle Income Countries – per capita GNP \$676–\$2 695 in 1992

◆◆◆ Upper Middle Income countries – per capita GNP \$2 696–8 355 in 1992