

































































































## VIII. KEY INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL OBSTACLES

This year's IM Terms of Reference instruct the IM Team to "identify internal and external obstacles to progress and make recommendations to address those obstacles." This could occupy several IM teams for a period much longer than the one dedicated to this project. For a network implementing such a variety of projects and programs in radically different contexts, there are literally dozens, if not hundreds, of obstacles to progress. Luckily, there is a remarkable consensus among the sources consulted for this project concerning some of the key external obstacles faced by RRI, as a whole. The Blue Sky meetings conducted by RRI in 2011, and the analysis and discussions that followed those meetings seemed to create the basis of a broad consensus, at least among RRG and most RRI Partners, concerning those external threats, including:

1. The continuing global economic crisis, which erodes foreign assistance budgets and intensifies the challenges faced by alternative community forest enterprises seeking to sustain themselves;
2. The lack of political will in the industrialized countries to seriously address the looming challenges of climate change, even as the challenges begin to manifest themselves in those very industrialized countries;
3. The failure, to date, of REDD or REDD+ mechanisms to effectively address the primary drivers of deforestation, and the related failure of the long-awaited private market in carbon to materialize on a scale that can begin to provide adequate financing for environmental services in the heavily-forested countries of the Global South;
4. The surge in global commodity prices and the accompanying explosion in demand for the land, mineral and other resources present in Africa, Asia and Latin America, leading to the trend toward large-scale land acquisitions across those continents;
5. In the context of the race for resources across the Global South, national political environments that strongly favor the extension of resource concessions to private interests over respect for the tenure rights of forest communities, even where there is formal legal recognition of those rights;
6. Climate change, itself, and the havoc it is beginning to wreak on fragile ecosystems—including forest ecosystems--across a wide variety of geographies; and, last, but not least,
7. The ongoing exclusion of women from the benefits of tenure rights, even where those rights exist for men, and, in some cases, the stubborn resistance to women's demands that their voices be heard in movements for tenure reform.

These obstacles express themselves in a dizzying variety of forms across the myriad landscapes in which the work of RRI plays itself out both on the global stage and in diverse national environments. Framework Proposal II emerges as a combination of continuity and "New Directions" for RRI, in response to these and other perceived obstacles and an equally complex set of opportunities seen to be emerging alongside them.

Not surprisingly, the relative agreement concerning the global obstacles faced by the Initiative is not replicated in all discussions about the internal obstacles that RRI must overcome in the next period. Among the internal obstacles that the IM Team has heard mentioned most often are:

1. While RRI is a magnet for uniquely capable and experienced people and organizations, the network, as a whole, faces enormous challenges regarding lack of capacity, at all levels, to confront obstacles on the scale of those outlined above;
2. The same diversity of membership that is a real strength of the RRI network also gives rise to a network containing organizations (national CBOs, national NGOs, international NGOs, university-based research organizations, independent research centers, global secretariat, etc.) that are positioned very differently vis a vis issues of tenure reform on the ground in Africa, Asia and Latin America. This diversity of positioning can, in some cases, imply varying perspectives on particular tenure reform processes and create challenges around facilitating coherent collective responses;
3. In practice, one of RRG's key roles is that of financial intermediary between a set of large funding organizations and an extensive network of organizations doing national, regional and global work on tenure reform. This role provides critical resources for tenure reform and alternative development work as well as important incentives for participation in RRI, but it also can act in contradiction to RRG's other role as leader and facilitator of a global advocacy network able to act strategically and opportunistically at the local level.
4. RRG's strong collective leadership introduces a subjective factor that contributes much to RRI's unique ability to energize tenure reform from multiple platforms. RRG and RRI are both exceedingly dependent on this small number of people;
5. While RRI has done much to promote women's participation and leadership in the global struggle for tenure reform, the network is not immune to the gender dynamics described above as a key external obstacle;
6. Given the complexity of the RRI network and the tasks it addresses, RRI's systems of internal analysis and learning will be as important to its success, in the long run, as its ability to analyze and act upon its external, tenure reform context. RRI has made significant investment in strategic cycle interventions (planning, monitoring and evaluation) resulting in important advances in each area, but growth in strategic-cycle capacity continues to lag behind other strategic analysis capabilities and will eventually act as a brake on the network's development...if it is not already doing so.

The Recommendations section of the report focuses particularly on addressing some of these internal obstacles.

## **IX. CUMULATIVE AND COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL PERIOD I**

Quite distinct from previous IM exercises, the 2012 IM Terms of Reference instruct the IM Team to include elements of a “cumulative and comprehensive assessment” in this report. This is difficult to accomplish without blurring the boundary between an annual monitoring exercise and

the end-of-term evaluation of a program or project. As will be apparent from the Recommendations section of this report, we believe that a “final” evaluation of RRI’s implementation in FP I would be an important exercise, and the current exercise is emphatically not that evaluation.

1. Comment on the extent to which RRI achieved its Project Objectives during the first Framework Proposal period.

This is an ambitious task to which the IM team is able to offer a few reflections from the Independent Monitoring perspective. By “Project Objectives,” we understand RRI to mean the Development Objective/Goal and the Project Objective/Purpose included in the original Logical Framework for FP 1.

The Development Objective/Goal was:

*Contribute to reducing poverty, enhancing well-being and strengthening democratic governance and development in forest areas of developing countries.*

As its Project Objective/Purpose, RRI identified:

*Accelerate the establishment of more equitable forest tenure and related policies in priority developing countries, leading to reduced poverty and violent conflict in forest areas, advancement of human and civil rights, increased contribution of industry and markets to social and economic development, and strengthened conditions for restoring the ecological integrity of forests, and mitigation and adaptation to climate change.*

The four monitoring exercises performed by various KMSC Monitoring Teams have uncovered incontrovertible evidence that RRI has beyond any question fulfilled both the Development Objective and the Project Objective, as written. There can be no doubt that RRI has contributed to reducing poverty, enhancing well-being and strengthening democratic governance in the countries in which it has worked. Measuring changes in poverty levels within forest communities has proven to be a great challenge, and the story is different in each country, but both independent and internal monitoring have turned up many examples of progress in each of these areas over the past four years. Similarly, while RRI cannot point to the acceleration of tenure reform processes in every country in which it has worked, tenure reform processes have certainly advanced (or efforts to roll back tenure gains have been defeated) in a critical mass of those countries. The question, of course, is the extent of these achievements.

In the Logical Framework methodology being used by RRI (and in most Logical Frameworks), the organization was not required to indicate how it would measure progress on its overall goal. RRI did, however, provide two “Objective measurable and verifiable indicators” by which it would be possible to discern whether or not RRI was achieving its purpose. They were:

*Forest area under local ownership and administration doubled by 2015, with secure rights to conserve, use and trade in products and services*

*Poverty incidence reduced by half by 2015 in the forested areas of the world.*

These dramatic and clearly defined indicators became the subject of much discussion when RRI turned to the design of its internal monitoring system in early 2010. At that time, RRI decided that it did not want to measure its success solely on the basis of these two indicators. Instead, RRI would establish a set of desired “Strategic Outcomes” that would each be connected to an outcome indicator and measureable markers of progress or Milestones. The two global indicators above would be retained, but as outcome indicators related to two of the Strategic Outcomes, one focused on tenure reform and the other on implementing new alternative economic models that would lead to poverty reduction. In designing indicators for Strategic Outcomes, RRI opted for numbers of countries in which tenure reform was advancing and numbers of countries in which alternative economic models were advanced.

RRI Global Programs continued to develop its methodology for tracking tenure reform and to consider how to best demonstrate a relationship between tenure reform and poverty. In the area of tenure tracking, progress was made to the point that RRI’s tracking methodology is being widely disseminated, commented upon and even adopted by global institutions that track changes in land tenure.<sup>10</sup> In its report, “Respecting Rights, Delivering Development,” RRI offers a details description of its methodology and reports that, since 2005, the percentage of forested land under community management has increased from 11% to 15% percent, globally. This represents a notable increase of 36%, but still far less than the doubling of forested land under community management by 2015 that RRI originally projected.

RRI has faced more daunting challenges in the area of measuring changes in the incidence of poverty in forested areas. The Initiative has worked with its Partner, International Forestry Resources and Institutions (IFRI), to develop an approach to overlaying maps of forest tenure and poverty in ways that will confirm the correlation between the two, if one exists. According to both RRI and IFTI, it will be some time before this approach can generate data to track RRI interventions to changes in poverty incidence in forested areas.

RRI has, then, continued to pay great attention to the two “global indicators” identified in its original log-frame, even those these indicators were not prominent in the revised log-frame. This appears to the IM team as a very good example in which the actual implementation priorities of RRI diverged from those highlighted in the log-frame that served as the primary reference for both internal and independent monitoring. The log-frame could have been revised, again, to take this into account, but it was not. As a result, monitoring progress on these indicators was not at the center of reporting by either RRI monitoring staff or the Independent Monitor, even though advances in forested land under community management was considered to be an important

---

<sup>10</sup> See Section IV, above, on Measuring Progress on the Achievement of RRI’s Strategic Outcomes, in which the IM team analyzes RRG’s claim of important progress in this regard.

achievement by RRI and was reported, as such, to the donors. There is every indication that a close examination of this indicator could have provided a revealing vantage point from which to monitor the impact of RRI's work on the real tenure situation of forest communities.<sup>11</sup>

In any case, the logic behind the revised RRI Logical Framework for SP I was that the Initiative would demonstrate its attainment of its Objectives by demonstrating progress on its Strategic Outcomes. It is from this perspective that the IM Team is able to offer some assessment of RRI's project toward objectives. Table 3, above, becomes relevant, once more, for evaluating that progress, as it indicates the extent to which RRI has documented success in reaching its identified Milestones. We reproduce that table, here.

**Table 3**  
**RRI Milestones Achieved vs. Benchmarks Established, 2008-2012**

Out-come	Outcome Indicator	Progress Marker For 2012	Achieved as of end of 2012	+/-
SO1	Number of effective value-added joint actions facilitated/organized	20	10	-10
SO2	Number of engaged networks becoming more capable of influencing tenure policy	6	6	0
SO3	Number of key tenure policy institutions changing policies or practices	5	5	0
SO4	Number of countries adopting/advancing legal/legislative reforms	6	5	-1
SO5	Number of countries in which more equitable tenure/enterprise models increase community access to markets/resources	5	4	-1

These Strategic Outcomes constructed by RRI in its revised Log-Frame identified three pre-conditions of the needed reforms (effective pro-tenure collaborations created by RRI, engaged and effective policy networks and altered policy perspectives within key institutions), one outcome related to tenure/governance reform and another related to generating new production models that increase community access to resources.

---

<sup>11</sup> It appears that the Logical Framework for FP II has restored this indicator to its rightful place at the center of the Initiative's monitoring effort. Changes in the percentage of global forest cover under community management result from a variety of inputs, so the analysis of RRI's contribution to these changes should yield rich analysis of the ways in which RRI's efforts complement those of other actors in the realization of complex and critical outcomes. See [http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blogs/exploring-contribution-analysis#.UNhD\\_ncnlfU](http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blogs/exploring-contribution-analysis#.UNhD_ncnlfU) for an interesting brief analysis of how the discipline of "contribution analysis" might be used to analyze cause and effect in peace-building efforts.



Over the past four years, the IM's monitoring of data presented by RRI reaches the final conclusions.

1. **RRI has facilitated the desired volume of productive, advocacy collaborations in the service of tenure reform, but, with the permission of the RRG Board, it did not fully document those Milestones;**
2. **With RRI support, the desired number of civil society and governmental networks have shown increased capacity to influence tenure policy in a positive direction;**
3. **RRI targeted and then successfully influenced the tenure policy positioning of the desired number of major institutions influencing forest tenure outcomes;**
4. **RRI national platforms successfully and demonstrably advanced tenure reform processes in five countries, but had projected that it would do so in six countries. In this latest set of Milestone reports, RRI claimed to have made such progress in the DRC, but the monitoring team concluded that this evident success represented a very valuable RRI-inspired collaboration, rather than the advance of a conscious pro-community tenure agenda by an RRI platform in that country;**
5. **RRI committed itself to substantially increase community access to resources via more equitable tenure/enterprise models in five countries. It fulfilled this commitment with its report on progress in Liberia in 2012.**

Table 3 is a summary of Table 6, below, which presents a complete list of all Milestones claimed by RRG and validated by the IM Team during FP I.

**Table 6**  
**RRI Strategic Outcome Milestones for the period 2008-12<sup>12</sup>**

<b>Out-come</b>	<b>Identification</b>	<b>Summary of RRI Monitoring Hypothesis</b>	<b>Yr. Rep.</b>
SO1	National Forestry Alliance in Guatemala	RRI helped facilitate the formation of an unprecedented alliance of forest communities from the Western Highlands and from the Petén, a large lowland department in northern Guatemala.	2010
SO1	Tenure reform coalition in Cameroon	With RRI's help, an important coalition of NGOs and forest community groups has emerged in Cameroon with the goals of protecting traditional community rights and advocating for a rights-sensitive national Forestry Law. The RRI-sponsored forest tenure conference in Yaoundé in May 2009 boosted the coalition's efforts to influence debate on a new Forest Law.	2010
SO1	Global Rights and Climate Dialogues	In concert with a variety of other actors, RRI has organized a series of global policy dialogues highlighting the centrality of the rights agenda to any serious effort to address forest degradation. These dialogues helped reinsert rights issues into REDD debates and placed the question of REDD safeguards on the screens of key REDD actors.	2010

<sup>12</sup> Note that because reporting on Strategic Outcome Milestones began in 2010, RRI reported on Milestones for 2008, 2009 and 2010 in 2010

<b>Out-come</b>	<b>Identification</b>	<b>Summary of RRI Monitoring Hypothesis</b>	<b>Yr. Rep.</b>
SO1	Pro-Tenure Rights Coalition in Bolivia	RRI has facilitated the creation of a coalition committed to inject the rights-based concerns of Bolivia's lowland forest communities in national debates concerning forest governance. The coalition immediately helped channel indigenous concerns into the consideration of a new Autonomy Law.	2010
SO1	Tenure Champions in Burkina Faso	Under challenging conditions, RRI has helped identify a number of "tenure champions" committed to developing a joint agenda to advance tenure reform in Burkina Faso.	2010
SO1	NRM Federation in Nepal	Primarily through its national Partner, FECOFUN, RRI supported an effort to broaden the coalition of forest user groups coming together to defeat government efforts to "rollback" tenure rights.	2010
SO1	Yaoundé Tenure Reform Conference	RRG worked closely with the entire Africa Regional Program of RRI to deliver a regional tenure conference in Cameroon that not only influenced the tenure debate within that country, but resulted in the formation of a regional network of women community forest activists and raised the profile of the tenure reform debate, regionally.	2010
SO1	African Community Rights Network (ACRN)	Through its support for the creation and development of an African Community Rights Network, RRI has helped strengthen the African organizations participating in the network, and contributed to concrete results in the area of the promotion of community tenure rights.	2011
SO1	Indonesia Rights Debate	In 2011, under pressure from a number of sources inside and outside of Indonesia, the Ministry of Forestry publically expressed an awareness of the connection between forest tenure and climate change, and a willingness to consider recognizing the tenure rights of indigenous and other forest communities. Among the most important factors contributing to this outcome was ongoing work of a group of Indonesian NGOs that came together around RRI's Indonesia coalition to plan and coordinate the Lombok Forest tenure conference.	2011
SO1 <sup>13</sup>	Catalyzing a Multi-Stakeholder Research Process on Tenure Reform in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	By mobilizing a broad-based research coalition of local, national and international NGOs and IOs from a variety of sectors and geographic specialty areas to develop and begin the implementation of a broad-based tenure baseline study, RRI has positioned itself as a primary interlocutor in ongoing and future discussions related to natural resource tenure reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).	2012

<sup>13</sup> RRG reported this Milestone in relation to SO4. The analysis of the IM Team confirms that this represents a Milestone for RRI, but that the Milestone is more closely related to SO1 than SO4.

<b>Out-come</b>	<b>Identification</b>	<b>Summary of RRI Monitoring Hypothesis</b>	<b>Yr. Rep.</b>
SO2	MegaFlorestais	RRI facilitated the creation and staffing of a network of senior forestry officials from many of the world's most-forested countries. The network has provided an informal platform for international dialogue on issues at the center of RRI's agenda, and has allowed for the formation of relationships that have influenced national tenure reform debates in several key national contexts.	2010
SO2	Network of Women Forest Activists in Africa	Among the attendees at RRI's Yaoundé conference in 2009 were a number of women activists interested in forming a regional network to provide information exchange and a forum for information exchange and joint action. While facing many challenges, REFACOF has continued to raise the profile of women's rights within the regional debate on the recognition of customary forest rights across Africa.	2010
SO2	Global Alliance of Community Forestry	RRI and some of its Partners came together to form this global network of community-based forestry organizations. The network provides a vehicle for the voice of forest communities in a variety of international spaces.	2010
SO2	Civil Society Advisory Group	After becoming a formal participant in a fairly ineffective network, RRI put energy into re-invigorating CSAG and making it a more effective voice for forest tenure reform within the ITTO structure.	2010
SO2	Next Generation	Through MegaFlorestais, RRI has gained access to an emerging generation of national level forestry leaders. A series of "Next Generation" programs organized by RRI have built network connections among these future leaders, increased their awareness of the tenure and governance issues and created the basis for future dialogue in service of a tenure reform agenda.	2011
SO2	Rethinking Forest Regulations	By involving them in this process, RRI has helped targeted forest agency leaders and civil society representatives develop a clearer understanding of regulatory options for increasing rural development and respecting local community and Indigenous Peoples' rights.	2012
SO3	ITTO	Over a period of years, RRI, both directly and through the Civil Society Advisory Group has developed strong relationships with a variety of key people within the ITTO. ITTO has teamed with RRI on a number important international events, and its policies and publications have evolved to show a much greater awareness of the contributions of community forestry.	2010
SO3	REDD Programme Policy Board	Seeing the importance of influencing the director of the UN REDD Programme, RRI has developed strong relationships with the Policy Board. Inputs from both RRI and the Independent Advisory Group (IAG) have contributed to notable shifts in the degree of sensitivity around safeguards and the importance of secure tenure rights to the REDD agenda.	2010

Out-come	Identification	Summary of RRI Monitoring Hypothesis	Yr. Rep.
SO3	Influencing Bilateral Aid Policy	Since RRI came into existence, two of the most important bilateral donors to climate change mitigation/adaptation (NORAD/NICFI and DFID) have gained a stronger appreciation for the importance of forest tenure reform to the success of any effort to control deforestation and forest degradation. RRI's engagement with both institutions has been a factor in the evolution of this perspective.	2011
SO3	UNFF Voluntary Agreement	The <b>United Nations Forum on Forests (UNFF)</b> is an important multilateral forest policy body. Over a period of years, RRI has influenced the UNFF Secretariat and some Forum members with its arguments on community forest enterprises and other tenure-related issues. This engagement resulted in the Secretariat inviting RRI to present a policy paper on community forest enterprises at the Forum conference in January 2011. This reflects influence with the UNFF Secretariat and with some member governments.	2011
SO3	UN-FAO and the Influence of RRI Tenure Tracking	RRI's innovative and robust tenure tracking methodology and analytical products influenced FAO's forest tenure monitoring and has led to widespread adoption of RRI's tenure data findings by key actors in the forest and climate change arenas.	2012
SO4	Brazil	RRI engagement in Brazil, especially in relation to the 2007 conference co-sponsored with ITTO and GACF, was one factor in creating support in the Brazilian forestry administration for the creation of a Federal Program to provide economic support to community-based forest enterprises.	2010
SO4	China	Building on a long history of work by RRI Partner, Forest Trends, RRI has continued to contribute to the momentum for forest tenure reform there. Chinese officials have been active participants in MegaFlorestais, and events co-sponsored by RRI and Chinese institutions in 2008 and 2009 helped advance the pace of reform.	2010
SO4	Bolivia Land Legislation	Advocacy work undertaken by members of the RRI coalition influenced legislative debates on the Autonomy Law, the Integral Law on Development in the Amazon and other key legislation in favor of full recognition of the tenure rights of indigenous and <i>campesino</i> communities.	2011
SO4	Liberia Community Rights Law	Determined advocacy by RRI collaborators and their allies, led by SDI and Green Advocates, resulted in almost unanimous legislative support for a Community Rights Law, recognizing traditional community forest rights. The president refused to sign that law and had the law re-drafted and passed without many of its strongest provisions. RRI's local coalition continued to work with the government on implementation and achieved positive changes in the regulatory framework. The struggle to compel government implementation of the law continues.	2011

Outcome	Identification	Summary of RRI Monitoring Hypothesis	Yr. Rep.
S05	Nepal	The local RRI coalition in Nepal, which includes the largest of the Federations of community forest user groups has played a key role in promoting the pro-tenure-reform position in the country's constitutional debates. The coalition has also led efforts to stand against government efforts to create new national parks or amend forestry laws to limit the existing rights of forest communities.	2010
S05	Tenure reform and small-scale enterprise in China	Support for highly professional research has been a key RRI strategy in China. Over time, the research has supported the case for tenure reform in ways that have attracted the attention of policy makers and influenced policy outcomes.	2010
S05	Nepal	Working closely with community forest user groups from around the country, the RRI coalition was able to influence the government debate on a set of proposals that would have had the effect of rolling back some existing protection of the rights of forest-dependent communities. Because people practicing community forestry tend to have greater access to markets and resources in other communities, that rollback would have had the effect of limiting that access. As a result, the RRI advocacy intervention had the effect of making community access to resources and markets greater than it would have otherwise been.	2011
S05	Liberia Pitsawing Regulations and Related Capacity Building	In March, 2012, the Forest Development Authority (FDA) of Liberia issued a new regulation that legalizes community pitsawing for the first time, facilitated in part by RRI support to Liberian pitsawyer advocates and the pitsawyers' union (the Liberian Chainsaw & Timber Dealers Union, or LICSATDUN). This regulation has allowed the pitsawyers union to build its capacity to demonstrate credibility in its operations and markets, develop improved relationships between pitsawyers and forest managers and market players, and generally improved the business environment for pitsawyers.	2012

From the perspective of the IM Team, the table above contains a very good list of some of the most important **planned** accomplishments of RRI during FP 1.<sup>14</sup> If the Strategic Outcomes in the Revised Log-Frame genuinely represent progress toward RRI's Objectives, then the extent of achievement of these SOs reflects the extent of realization of the Objectives. While the SOs were not fully realized in the sense of reaching the planned level of achievement of each outcome, the data collected and presented over four years suggest that the Strategic Outcomes, and, hence, RRI's Objectives were realized to a significant extent. There is also reason to believe that RRI could have made a good case for additional Milestones related to almost every one of its Strategic Outcomes, so the apparent

<sup>14</sup> The monitoring system has not proven as good at capturing the **unforeseen** accomplishments of RRI that may not be as directly relevant to one of the pre-identified Strategic Outcomes of the Initiative. The report returns to this point in the Conclusion, below.

failure to reach certain milestones could well be a question of data collection and reporting capacity, rather than real achievement of desired outcomes.

This finding assumes that the identified Strategic Outcomes actually represent progress toward the Development Objective and the Project Objective, as defined in the original Log-frame, i.e., that the SOs identified by RRG at the time of the revision of the Log-frame were the “right” outcomes. A final evaluation of the results of RRI’s Framework Period I might usefully analyze the extent to which RRI chosen and achieved Strategic Outcomes actually advanced the Initiative’s overall objectives and validated its essential value proposition.<sup>15</sup>

Interestingly, some readers of this report raised questions about the veracity of Milestones validated by the IM Team on 2010 and 2011, after not having raised those questions at the time of the original validation. This could simply be a matter of more attention given to the current report, but it also points to a real limitation of any monitoring methodology. Monitoring provides a kind of snapshot of the achievements of a process, a network or an organization over a fixed period of time. In the following year, monitoring will focus on the achievements of a new period, without paying as much attention to the achievements of the earlier period. One function of a well-integrated evaluation is to take a longer view of the real significance of organizational outcomes and outputs. Good evaluation determines, among other things, whether or not validated achievements stand “the test of time.”

2. Using the results of previous IM exercises, comment on the extent to which internal and independent monitoring systems provide information that made possible mid-course adjustments;

Monitoring information did provide information that helped RRI make mid-course adjustments. Monitoring information gathered through RRI’s independent and internal monitoring systems was not, however, the only or even the main resource relied upon by management for this purpose.

From the earliest considerations of creating integrated Independent and Internal Monitoring systems, the primary justifications for the necessary investments in such systems have been four:

- To collect information that would inform strategic evaluation to be carried out alongside the integrated monitoring effort;
- To promote institutional learning, over time and across programs and functional teams;
- To provide decision makers with the information necessary to mid-course adjustment of tactics and, in rare cases, strategy; and
- To facilitate the accurate and timely reporting of mission-driven results to funders and other stakeholders.

---

<sup>15</sup> RRI Institutional Business Arrangements states that, “with a limited incremental investment in improved coherence and coordination, existing organizations can dramatically increase their contribution to the rights, dignity and development of forest dependent people globally as well as to forest conservation and more equitable economic and social development.”

RRG is asking the IM Team to reflect on the Independent Monitoring experience of the past four years from the perspective of this third rationale for a systematic approach to monitoring.

One thing that is clear from the last four years of Independent Monitoring of RRI is that mid-course corrections are very much a part of the culture of the Coalition. The idea that strategy is a fixed road map toward the fulfillment of static goals is entirely foreign to the Initiative, at all levels. Especially at the level of Global Programs led by RRG staff and senior management, strategy is much more a filter for making adaptive decisions than a road map toward fixed outcomes.

The Log-frame establishes a type of strategic framework and annual plans attempt to identify lines of intervention likely to advance strategic intent. RRG takes these plans seriously, but senior management is quite ready to reallocate resources toward areas of perceived opportunity. In both 2009 and 2010, the Global Planning process set ambitious goals in the areas of Realizing Rights and ATEMs, but when senior management noticed an opening to inject rights considerations firmly into the discussion of REDD and REDD+, it made Rights and Climate change the overwhelming priority of Global Program work in those years, to the point that RRI analyzed the danger that it might become a “one-trick pony” focused exclusively on that theme.

The idea that RRI might play a role in the creation of a network of senior forestry officials of heavily forested countries was certainly on the screen of RRI during the Global Planning process at the end of 2009, but when it became evident that there was great interest in such a network, and a feeling that RRG should act as a kind of secretariat for that network, RRG changed course abruptly to direct more energy toward the conception of this network and consideration of the positioning possibilities that it offered to the Initiative.

The vast majority of the many mid-course corrections by RRG came about in this way. Senior management takes in information from its own sources and analyzes that information, often together, very much in real time. RRG leadership then seeks input and consultation with trusted advisors or confidants, and makes decisions about the re-allocation of effort and resources. This sort of dynamic management style has very little to do with monitoring information, laboriously and methodically gathered in the form of reports. In fact, senior management has remarked to the IM team on several occasions that they seldom, if ever, have a chance to read monitoring reports, other than the ones they work on, themselves.

RRG’s own annual reports to the IM Team on the management response to the IM recommendations affirm that some mid-course corrections result from monitoring inputs. These occur by a process very different than the one described above. Based on monitoring data, the IM Team always makes 4-6 recommendations to RRG senior management as part of the annual IM report. Such recommendations—such as increasing communications or administrative capacity, ensuring continuity of attention to the roadmap to tenure reform in Indonesia, putting in place an internal monitoring system or altering the nature of Partner participation in RRI governance—serve to put an issue on the agenda of senior management for the coming year. In some cases, like the Indonesia case, the issue is already very much on that agenda and might well have been

addressed in the absence of any mention by the IM team. In other cases, the IM recommendation focuses attention on an issue that was not previously viewed as a priority. In fully half the cases, senior management looks at the issue and either determines that the recommended action is not possible—as in the case of opening the contracting system to multi-year contracting—or is not desirable, as occurred in the case of the recommendation regarding a stronger commitment to national facilitation. RRG’s “response to recommendation” reports affirm that some IM recommendations do lead to actions that could be deemed “mid-course tactical corrections.” Most often these are corrections in internal processes, rather than programmatic shifts.

Much of the monitoring information generated by RRI relates to decision making at the programmatic level, especially in Country and Regional Programs. When consulted for this and other reports, some staff suggest that the commitment to a serious assessment conversation—the core of the monitoring commitment at the Country and Regional level—has changed the nature of the country planning process in important ways. The reports coming out of those discussions (APMRs) don’t lead to tactical corrections, but the assessment dialogue can lead to such changes. This was precisely the intent of the country-level monitoring activity.

It is a minority of the regional staff who have responded this way. More common is the observation that all of the monitoring work comes at a very difficult time of year, making it extremely burdensome for staff. Furthermore, according to this narrative, Partners and Collaborators tend to see the whole monitoring enterprise as simply a different kind of accountability exercise vis a vis the Secretariat. As such, they fail to see the benefit of it for their work.

All of these observations must be understood against the backdrop of the IM Team’s perception that Country and Regional programs are, by their nature, less flexible and adaptive than RRI’s Global Programs. The contracting process and the financial interest of participants both tend to generate a certain level of inertia in the process, and a continuity in proposed and approved activities that simply doesn’t exist in the Global Programs.

Finally, the RRG staff (mostly Global Programs staff) responsible for gathering and presenting the information used to support claims that the organization has reached a Strategic Outcome Milestone definitely share the sense that monitoring activity occurs at the worst possible time of year. Some suggest that, absent the time pressure, the documentation of Milestones could be a useful exercise, but few suggest that it drives considerations of tactical corrections in their programs. The IM Team has been informed on a number of occasions that the realization that the Log-Frame projections required progress on a certain outcome did stimulate a more focused discussion on how to advance that work, but this probably does not rise to the level of a mid-course correction.

In summary, RRI is a network that gains much of its comparative advantage by being strategic in the sense of acting on a set of widely shared principles and highly intentional medium to long-term intent. It also derives great benefit from being able to execute effective mid-course tactical adjustments that are consistent with that strategy. By no means do all such corrections work out for



the Initiative, but enough do bear fruit to make this adaptive nature a notable aspect of RRI's organizational culture.

Monitoring information has come to play a role in how the Coalition makes these adjustments, but it is by no means the primary driver of the adaptive culture at RRI. In a context where capacity is so strained and so much is expected of everyone, all activities that demand serious attention and aren't seen to directly support the day-to-day efforts of staff will come under increasing scrutiny.

In response to that entirely predictable scrutiny, the IM Team would ask the following questions:

- Would monitoring information be seen as more valuable if monitoring were more more fully integrated with other strategic cycle interventions, such as planning and evaluation?
- Have all Staff, Partners and Collaborators responsible for RRI's gathering and presenting monitoring information been fully trained in RRI's monitoring approach and its relationship to other key mission functions?
- How might senior management integrate their own methods for accessing and analyzing information into RRI's monitoring approach in ways that increase organizational learning?

The answers to these and similar questions might help define the nature of RRI's commitment to Monitoring and Evaluation in FPII.

3. Note some of the emerging strengths and weaknesses of RRI methods of monitoring and implementation.

This is another item in the IM's Terms of Reference that might be more fully addressed in a Final Evaluation of the entire experience of FP I. As in the other parts of this section, we offer reflections here from the perspective of four years on Independent Monitoring exercises.

#### Monitoring Approach: Emerging Strengths and Weaknesses

The first point to make about RRI's monitoring approach is that its senior management has fully supported the design and implementation of an internal monitoring system, as well as the establishment of protocols for independent monitoring that interface quite smoothly with the internal system. It has also invested significant resources in the implementation of five comprehensive Independent Monitoring exercises, addressing (if not fully implementing) all of the formal recommendations of those exercises. RRI Partners and Collaborators have participated in over 200 interviews, focus groups and review meetings related to Independent Monitoring and have been uniformly open to sharing information and perspectives on the progress of the Initiative, as well as its persistent challenges. RRG staff have shouldered much of the burden of both the internal and independent monitoring systems. While staff have evidenced different degrees of "buy in" to a system that carries additional responsibilities for them, staff have performed monitoring tasks with a high degree of professionalism and commitment. In every aspect of this overall assessment, RRI is some distance ahead of the vast majority of organizations with whom it has been

the privilege of KMSC to collaborate. At least two of RRI's core funders have used the Initiative's monitoring approach as an example in internal discussions of assessment design and strategy. Any additional comments about the strengths and weaknesses of RRI's monitoring approach must rest on this conceptual foundation. The IM Team is not clear if, in the absence of the gentle insistence of its Donor Consortium, RRI would have opted to establish a monitoring approach with the rigor of the current system, but once they decided to do so, the RRG staff members responsible for this system have been admirably serious and consistent in its implementation. The reason for that consistency matters little.

### Strengths

- Consistent management support for internal/independent approach and positive disposition among staff and stakeholders to share information with IM
- Consistently and almost completely implemented each year
- Comprehensive...addressing all program areas in some way
- Designed with sustainability of staff support in mind (whether or not this design concept has been successfully reflected in the practice is a matter of discussion)
- Systematic...based on a set of protocols implemented annually
- Outcome-based, rather than output or activity-based
- Relatively well-integrated with planning processes (integration creates some of the timing issues)
- Combines qualitative and quantitative measures of progress
- Participatory...built on inputs from a variety of stakeholders
- Reports support interaction with donors and other stakeholders and allies
- Validation based on multiple, internal and external sources of data and perspective
- Promotes systematic collection of data on network implementation experience

### Weaknesses

- Management support, but no true "champion" among leadership
- No overall staff coordinator with strong commitment to making the system work and time to operationalize the commitment
- Poor timing of many monitoring functions...coinciding with time of high demands on staff (difficult to know when this would not be the case)
- Insufficient methodological integration between monitoring approach and evaluation practice (MTR)
- Inadequate training of monitoring participants leading to uneven knowledge across all stakeholders of intent of system and uses of information
- Methodologically constrained by Logical Framework approach that requires adaptation for advocacy-driven mission
- Need for improvement in selective program-level validation of staff-generated data
- Perception of low benefits for high cost in staff time and effort

- Referenced to Logical Framework that may not reflect network’s true strategic priorities...LF developed as a technical output, but serving a strategic function
- Perceived duplication of scope of monitoring instruments
- Insufficient overlap of process or data with “informal monitoring” practice of senior management that drives most mid-course adjustments
- Close review of monitoring reports, but less engagement with results

There is much to improve in RRI’s monitoring approach, but the more important point is that there exists a functioning system with five years of experience that can be improved. In those five years, both the IM Team and those engaged in internal monitoring have learned a great deal about the RRI network, its many achievements and the daunting obstacles that it faces. The Conclusion section below includes a more nuanced interpretation of the KMSC experience as Independent Monitor of RRI, but these observations provide points of departure for a thorough analysis of the monitoring experience.

#### Implementation Approach: Emerging Strengths and Weaknesses

While the IM exercise is not designed primarily as a review of implementation, four years of monitoring engagement has given the IM Team a broad view of the way RRI works. The following list of strengths and weaknesses of the Initiative’s implementation approach is rooted in that monitoring perspective. As is often the case, some of RRI’s most notable strengths are closely related—almost the other side of the coin—to some of its greatest challenges.

#### Emerging Strengths

- Powerful combination of active local platform and global analysis/advocacy voice
- Advocacy positioning sits on strong research/evidence foundation
- Strong technical and adaptive leadership at all levels
- Coalition brings together critical mass of key civil society actors on forest tenure issues
- National platforms often combine local and international actors
- Unique strategic analysis capacity present as core competency that created immediate credibility and notoriety within community forestry sector
- Ability to convene diverse actors (especially academics, government and CSOs) to various discussion platforms (dialogues, conferences, ongoing networks) became clear during FP I; emerging emphasis on expanding/reinventing private sector connections
- Steady, if uneven, growth in capacity to communicate RRI perspective and impact to key constituencies/audiences
- Global programs highly flexible and opportunistic; SRM offers a measure of agility to Country and Regional interventions
- Committed to understand and act upon unique challenges and opportunities faced by women and indigenous people seeking tenure reform/recognition
- Has been able to attract resources for global advocacy/analysis as well as local tenure-reform actions

- Strong thematic identity as a “player” in rights and climate change debate
- Through exchanges and other mechanisms, attention given to learning across national experiences
- Has resisted temptation to grow and bureaucratize Secretariat
- Consistent commitment to each element of the strategic cycle: planning, monitoring and evaluation.

### Implementation Challenges

- Resources that make national level work possible also create internal “donor-grantee” dynamic that can complicate smooth functioning of coalition
- Operational/strategic synergy at national level difficult to achieve...always easier for individual organizations to implement on their own...productive coordination among Partners and Collaborators requires intentionality and facilitation
- Nature of partnerships that underlie country and regional programs make those programs less flexible and opportunistic, in general, than global programs
- Divergent views within RRG, among regions and between RRG and some Partner/Collaborators on proper relationship between RRI and private sector will challenge implementation of “New Directions”
- Lack of administrative/operational capacity in RRG, given administrative demands of “re-granting” role and commitments around monitoring and evaluation
- Donor requirements for use and reporting of funds enforce internal implementation cycle/calendar that is less than optimal
- Heavy dependence on small group of RRG senior managers
- Continuing challenges of making operational the Initiative’s principled commitment to empowerment and mobilization of women in tenure reform efforts

## **X. CONCLUSION**

The conclusion to the Independent Monitor’s Report generally focuses on summarizing the results of the annual monitoring exercise. Given the slightly different focus of the IM Terms of Reference in this final year of the first Framework Period, the focus is slightly different. This conclusion seeks to accomplish two things: (1) Signal what we consider to be a few “indicative moments” occurring during the first five years of RRI’s history, and briefly suggest why we consider them to be occurrences that reflect something particularly noteworthy about the Initiative; and (2) Offer a concluding reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the RRI’s monitoring effort during FP I.

In an experience as rich and diverse as that of RRI over the last period, it is always dangerous to highlight a few occurrences as indicative moments. We do so here, fully aware that we are choosing a few such moments among many that are considered noteworthy from the perspective of the Independent Monitor. Indicative moments are not highlights or signal achievements, but they are occurrences that indicate the consolidation of the character of a given process. As such, they say something important about that process. These moments are placed roughly in chronological order.

1. **Agreement on Institution Business Arrangements for RRI and a Memorandum of Understanding among RRI Partners and RRG:** Few coalitions or working partnerships of global civil society (none, in our experience) take the time to agree on the way the entity is going to operate and make decisions in the way RRI did during its founding period. These documents have proven imperfect and in need of review and adjustment, but that they exist, are taken seriously and can be changed sets RRI apart and provides part of the explanation for the Initiative's successes during the intervening period;
2. **The publication of the RRI report, "Seeing People through the Trees":** In 2009, when KMSC participated in RRI's IM exercise for the first time, an eye-opening number of the external sources (and some internal sources) mentioned this report as something that "put RRI on the map" for them. The report formalized important elements of the then quite unique perspective on forest tenure reform that would come to characterize RRI, and established RRI as an important "new" source of original strategic analysis of the forestry sector. It also signaled the Initiative's intent to "scale up" tenure reform through a combination of global advocacy presence and national policy change efforts.
3. **The publication of the first RRI Independent Monitoring Report:** RRI's commitment to submit itself to the cost and inconvenience of "independent monitoring" might well have been a rhetorical flourish to calm jittery donors making a significant commitment to a relative unknown. The publication of the first report established that, even in the frenzy of getting RRI off the ground, the RRG leadership was committed to independent monitoring (and, much more importantly, organizational learning) as a foundational element of the Initiative's practice.
4. **The successful organization of the Yaoundé Conference:** The regional conference in Cameroon established not only that the country networks at the base of RRI were real, but that those networks, in regional coordination with RRG had significant convening power at the regional level. Most importantly, once the perspective on tenure reform at the core of RRI achieved such a regional projection, it could bring public decision makers to the table in ways that held out the possibility of very concrete impacts on tenure policy at the national level. This event also put on display for RRI the tremendous logistical demands of taking advantage of the Initiative's unique positioning and potential.
5. **The incorporation of RRI Partners into Global Program planning:** RRI's foundational agreements establish that the strategic drivers of RRI's Country and Regional programs would be RRI Partners and Collaborators, with RRG playing an important role via participation in C & R planning processes. Those agreements also make RRG the driving force behind Global Programs, but the active participation of Partners and Collaborators in the planning and implementation of Global Programs was not as clearly established. The inclusion of Partners in the 2009 Global Planning meeting did not immediately achieve the full engagement of those Partners in RRI Global Programs, but it signaled RRG's intent to achieve this integration. The impact of this change has become evident in the gradual change in the nature of Global Programs, and the quality of Partner participation in those programs, since that time. Obviously, this is a road along which there are still many miles to go.

6. **The formation of Megaflorestais, with RRI playing a key facilitating role:** The importance of productive engagement with key governmental actors in heavily-forested countries was a foundational principle of RRI. The Coalition’s role in the establishment of an ongoing network of senior forestry officials of most of the world’s heavily-forested countries was something of a surprise even to those who made it happen. Never was a key strategic outcome less planned or expected. This particular result indicated that RRI’s convening power, when properly framed, most definitely extended to the public sector. It also exposed/put on display the “opportunistic” nature of RRI in the sense that it was able to grasp an unforeseen opportunity when it appeared, and then act to turn that opportunity to the advantage of the RRI agenda. Since RRG’s actions in relation to the formation of Megaflorestais might not have been seen as a priority by the entire coalition, this case also exemplifies RRG’s sometimes controversial—but from the perspective of the IM team, important—ability to act with relative autonomy from the entire coalition, and then work to demonstrate the benefits and appropriateness of its steps, in practice.
7. **The facilitation of closer ties and working coordination between lowland (Petén) and highland forest communities in Guatemala:** The RRI country platform in Guatemala made an important contribution to this important advance of the movement for tenure reform in Guatemala. Closer coordination between national organizations such as Ut’z Che’ and ACOFOP did not result in immediate recognition of community tenure rights in Guatemala, but it has shifted the terms of the national discussion there. This was one of the first cases examined closely by the IM Team that affirmed RRI’s ability to really add value at the country level.
8. **The withdrawal of CIFOR and IUCN from RRI:** Most global initiatives measure success by their ability to attract new members to their coalition. This ability to incorporate new Partners and Collaborators is certainly an indicator of the success of RRI, but so is its ability to survive the decision by two founding global Partners that Partner status in RRI no longer served their organizational interest. The departure of CIFOR and IUCN certainly had an impact on RRI’s implementation capabilities at both the local and global levels, and reflected the enduring tensions within the Coalition over the proper division of power and responsibilities between the Partners and RRG. The fact that the Coalition managed that challenging transition without losing direction or support established its resilience and seemed to surprise more than a few observers.
9. **The Stora Enso Affair:** The case of RRI’s press work and advocacy actions in relation to supply chain issues faced by the Finnish forestry giant, Stora Enso, in China demonstrated that RRI’s engagement at the country level was putting it in a position to gather important information concerning private sector operations in China, and to act on this information in a timely and effective way. RRG’s work to bring this information to the attention of the international press showed both the credibility that the Initiative had established and its ability to do effective communications work. Finally, RRG’s ability to engage in direct negotiations with Stora Enso officials and achieve some of its desired results in those interactions spoke to the extent to which RRI had become an advocacy “player” at the global level.

- 10. Opening the “roadmap” to tenure reform in Indonesia:** RRI’s contribution to active negotiation of tenure reform proposals by the government of Indonesia and Indonesian NGOs indicated several things about the maturity of the Initiative. A long and complex process preceded this outcome, but the public breakthrough in this process took place at a national conference in Lombok, Indonesia co-sponsored by RRI, the Indonesian Ministry of Forestry and the International Timber Trade Organization. The existence of such an event would have been unlikely, even three years before, and RRI’s own credibility across multiple forest sector actors was a key factor in the successful organization of the event. A representative of Indonesia’s President with strong ties to sectors of Indonesian civil society, opened the event with a spirited call for recognition of the customary tenure rights of the country’s indigenous and other forest communities. Then, in front of a variety of civil society actors, the MoF official present echoed this call and committed his Ministry to establish and to negotiate a roadmap for the formal recognition of those rights. Some civil society actors remain skeptical about this roadmap, and there is no question that the road to tenure reform in Indonesia will be a long one. But the fact that it is even being discussed in a serious way indicates RRI’s ability (that is, RRI as a national/international civil society platform and a global secretariat) to influence the path of tenure reform in a key forested country.
- 11. The Bangkok “New Directions” meeting of RRI:** The Bangkok meeting marked the conclusion of the strategy review process in which RRI sought a wide variety of external views on the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy that guided it through the first Framework Proposal period. The results of the meeting reflected the network’s ability to (1) conduct an in-depth strategic self reflection; (2) reach conclusions, at the leadership level of RRG, concerning necessary strategic adjustments; and (3) present those proposed adjustments to RRI Partners and achieve general agreement to press forward with exploring the possible implementation of those adjustments. Several Partners—notably all Latin American Partners—were not present at the Bangkok meeting, and none of the RRI Collaborators were there to discuss the “New Directions,” but the meeting nonetheless affirmed that ability of the Initiative to consider and discuss important changes in its overall strategy.
- 12. RRI positioning around the Rio + 20 events:** RRI released an important new study at Rio + 20 (“What Rights?”) and located important spaces to publicize the Coalition’s work as well as that of its Partners and Collaborators. These capacities and characteristics of the network had long since been established in relation to previous global gatherings. The Rio + 20 interventions of RRI, however, were most noteworthy for what they showed about the maturation of its communications work, and the concrete results of the Initiative’s increased investments in that work. RRG mounted a full-scale communications effort around the conference and achieved extremely important earned media placements in concert with Partners, Collaborators and, in at least one important case, a member of the Donor Consortium. The Communications Team also used the event as an important capacity-building opportunity for select Partners and Collaborators. The results of RRI’s work around Rio + 20 complement the findings of the 2012 Communications Audit in

establishing the impressive expansion of RRI's communications footprint, especially over the past 2-3 years.

### **13. The participation of RRI Collaborators in important strategy and Global Programs**

**Planning deliberations.** For the first time, at least 15 RRI Collaborators from Africa, Asia and Latin America participated in the planning and strategy meetings that took place in Washington in November 2012. This participation was costly for RRI and created a host of logistical and facilitation challenges, but it was a very important step for the network. It marks the Initiative's recognition that Collaborators have become important drivers of much of RRI's country level work and that the planning of regional strategies, Global Programs and the overall strategic direction of the Initiative must somehow take this important change into account.

As suggested above, these thirteen "indicative moments" are signal events that establish an important characteristic of RRI or point to the emergence of an important trend over the course of the first Framework Period. Some of them were very much planned, in the sense of identified as a Milestone in the achievement of one of RRI's Strategic Outcome, but many of them were unplanned. Attempting to point out such moments in a history as complex as that of RRI is, itself, an important exercise. Presumably, telling the story of how each of these moments came about would provide an important perspective on both FP I and the challenges and opportunities likely to present themselves in FP II. This provides, perhaps, a useful segue way into a final discussion of RRI's monitoring approach over the first five years of its existence.

The IM Team has emphasized throughout this report, and in all of the previous IM reports, that RRI has made a commendable and quite unusual commitment to monitoring its work. That is, gathering information about RRI's progress as that progress takes place, and then organizing and presenting that information in a form that would allow it to inform decisions about deployment of human resources and the allocation of financial and other material resources. It has also invested considerable resources in an independent monitoring process to help RRI design its internal monitoring system, and to provide selective validation and analysis of the information collected by that system.

The Initiative's internal monitoring system was designed to interface smoothly with the function of the Independent Monitor and these two processes have been reasonably well-integrated. In general, the Independent Monitor has:

1. Confirmed that the key elements of the internal monitoring system are being implemented, as designed by RRI;
2. Selectively validated the data gathered by RRI;
3. Commented on the extent to which the data affirm that RRI is on track to achieve its Strategic Outcomes; and
4. Made recommendations for tactical adjustments that will accelerate the achievement of those Strategic Outcomes.



Neither the internal monitoring system nor the independent monitoring exercises can easily assess the appropriateness of RRI's strategy (has the organization chosen Strategic Outcomes that will effectively advance its overall objective?) or the validity of its theory of change. These considerations often form part of the agenda of the evaluation component of the strategic cycle.

RRG organized two evaluative exercises during FP 1: the Mid-Term Evaluation, completed in mid 2011 and the program-level evaluation of the Communications program. These were well-managed and highly professional exercises that provided important inputs to both RRG and the broader Initiative. The integration of these exercises with either the internal or independent monitoring work supported by RRI was not clear to the IM Team. It is entirely appropriate that someone other than the IM Team conduct RRI evaluation exercises, but the methodological integration of those exercises with ongoing monitoring work is critically important if an integrated strategic cycle is to be achieved.

Effective monitoring exercises are carried out by staff and other stakeholders with general understanding of monitoring methodology and clarity concerning their own organization's monitoring objectives and approach. Perhaps most importantly, they are clear about how their own contribution to the monitoring effort fits into and furthers those larger objectives.

The IM and RRG senior management organized workshops designed to prepare staff for the "rollout" of the internal monitoring system in 2010. These workshops, which were uneven in quality and content, relied on the participating staff to then transmit the information and orientation shared at the workshops to other RRG staff and the country and regional planning teams. The first generation of monitoring reports suggests that this transfer occurred more smoothly in some areas than in others. Systematic follow-up to those workshops was discussed, but never fully implemented due to resource and time constraints. Staff turnover has placed a number of new staff members in key positions related to internal monitoring. These staff members have received orientation to their monitoring responsibilities and, in many cases produced excellent monitoring data, but the IM team is not aware of systematic orientation of key staff in succeeding years.

Another important characteristic of successful monitoring approaches is that they are sustainable, given the resources of the organization in question. The "leanness" of RRG has been a consistent theme through each of the IM exercises. This is seen as positive in that the Initiative has avoided creating a bloated Secretariat with a large staff creating and managing a range of bureaucratic processes implying high transaction costs and eventually becoming an impediment to effective implementation. At the same time, this leanness has meant that, as the operations of the Initiative have become more complex, a lean Secretariat has faced capacity shortages in key areas, such as Contract Administration. Managing the fine line between "leanness" and debilitating lack of administrative/management capacity has become an important part of the art of leading the Initiative.

Fulfilling RRI's monitoring commitments places demands on a variety of stakeholders, especially RRG staff. Many of these demands coincide precisely, in time, with the period of most intense engagement of RRG staff in the network's annual planning calendar. When this workplan overload takes place in the context of even one or two unfilled key positions within the Secretariat (as it did during the current IM exercise), it can result in a situation that appears barely sustainable. This will necessarily affect the quality and the timeliness of the monitoring data produced and, therefore, the ability of the monitoring exercise to fulfill its objectives. It will also, over time, impact the morale of staff and their attitude toward the entire monitoring enterprise. Capacity to manage the internal/independent monitoring work in the context of multiple competing demands on senior management is another, closely related issue.

Finally, in particular for a network with objectives like those of RRI, a strong monitoring system must be able to capture both progress on planned outcomes and important achievements that were not anticipated at the beginning of the planning cycle. For a structure designed to be agile and opportunistic, these unplanned achievements (and the closely related "missed opportunities") can be among the most important data for monitoring efforts to capture. The current monitoring system was designed to be able to capture such unplanned achievements and missed opportunities, but, in a context of scarce resources, the sense of urgency to "demonstrate that we are doing what we said we'd do" has conditioned the practice of monitoring. What was planned is and will remain critically important, but an exclusive focus in this direction can fail to demonstrate some of what is really unique and powerful about RRI.

Because of the nature of its mission, RRI is committed to delivering "tipping point" contributions to complex social and political change processes, rather than more easily measured baskets of goods, training outputs or social services. The changes sought by RRI often involve repositioning of key global actors, such as the FAO, Dfid, the REDD Policy Board, Stora Enso or the ITTO on forest tenure or supply chain issues. Those changes just as often require strategic interventions at the regional or global level designed to reinforce demands for changes in the positioning of national actors such as the Indonesian government on the question of indigenous community forest rights or the government of Bolivia as it debates its National Forest Law. RRI must "think and act globally to achieve change nationally" just as often as it does the reverse.

RRI, therefore, seeks complex changes that are extremely difficult to measure, and it does it at a time when those who provide resources for the work are under extreme pressure to show that their investments are providing tangible "value" for the investor. The difficulty of measuring what RRI achieves is not a rationale for failing to combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to assessing its success. That donors have found resources in increasingly pressurized allocation processes to continue to support RRI—and to increase that support, in some cases—suggests that RRI has found ways to demonstrate that it is, indeed, delivering value for the resources invested in it. The Initiative's successful implementation of internal/independent monitoring exercises has certainly contributed to that effort to successfully tell the RRI story.

With that contribution clearly in mind, the IM team offers the following conclusions concerning RRI's monitoring effort during FP I:

1. RRI's internal and independent monitoring efforts are yielding important information about the Initiative's progress against its strategic intent, and RRI stakeholders, including donors, generally understand and appreciate these results.
2. Monitoring information is being used, to varying degrees, by decision-makers at multiple levels, but always in combination with other sources of information and analysis.
3. While there is close integration between RRI's monitoring work and its complex internal planning process, neither of those "strategic cycle" elements are as well integrated with the evaluation element of the cycle as they might be.
4. The design concept behind RRI's monitoring approach and the connection of each element of that approach to the Initiative's overall mission could be better understood, in some cases, by those being asked to provide critical monitoring inputs.
5. In the context of limited administrative and programmatic capacity at the level of the Secretariat, the timing and the scope of the current monitoring commitment can challenge the sustainability of RRI's monitoring commitments (especially from the perspective of RRG staff).
6. The emphasis of the current monitoring process on tracking progress toward planned outcomes is essential to the success of the monitoring approach, but the ability to capture more fully both unplanned achievements and missed opportunities would add value to the process.
7. The character of the Independent Monitoring role has been generally appropriate for the first Framework period, but the maturation of the entire Initiative and the important new strategic directions it contemplates require a reconsideration of the nature of this role for FP II.

One first-time participant in the RRI governance meetings in January raised a fundamental question about the independent monitoring enterprise to which the IM Team has been dedicated for the past four years. In essence, he asked what it means to monitor progress when RRI has never developed a strategy in the traditional sense of that word. Colleagues pointed the questioner to a variety of documents, (the Institutional Business Arrangements, the Memorandum of Understanding, the Framework Proposal and, of course, the Logical Framework). They had several more to offer, but the new participant was not convinced. He wanted to see a strategy that clarified the problem RRI intended to address, it's notion of how the problem will be resolved, what RRI will contribute to the resolution, what sort of resources it would need to make that contribution, etc.

Like the persistent questioner, the IM Team searched for "a strategy" upon engaging with RRI, but found none. The team reviewed all of the documents referenced above and it found an Initiative guided by the networked pursuit of a number of strategies, rather than a single grand plan. The insistence on the emergence of a single grand plan to be crystallized in an elegant strategy document would have almost certainly scuttled the Initiative before it took flight. Those providing leadership to RRI and many of those providing resources for it realized this, to their great credit.

The cohabitation of different strategies in the “mix” that is RRI is both a great strength of the network and one of its most vexing challenges. This diversity (chaos, actually) can also make the waters extremely muddy at times, but no one will perish from tedium. The Initiative will last as long as the various strategies in play find enough common ground to provide a firm foundation. The coordinated pursuit of multiple strategies creates the dynamism that characterizes RRI, but the coordination of such an entity is an enormous challenge. Traditional management approaches fall short of what is required and the inflexible insistence on the promulgation or the implementation of any single strategy erodes the ground from the feet of the Initiative. To date, the common ground under the Initiative has been sufficient to provide a strong, if shifting, foundation. If this foundation is to endure, those with the power and foresight to drive strategy across the network must do so with care, humility, cunning (yes, cunning) and no small amount of the metaphysical. They must be devoted keepers of the common ground as much as inspired architects of their own edifices.

If traditional management approaches fall short then so, too, do traditional approaches to monitoring and evaluation. Independent monitoring of RRI required an essential reference, a compass to point the way to true progress. The IM Team found that reference in, of all places, a Log-Frame created by a small subset of the actors in RRI and then revised by an even smaller group. From the beginning, the shortcomings of this instrument for determining true north in RRI were evident, but the alternative was not clear. At first, the IM Team threw down the compass as useless, but soon found that did no better at finding its way without it. Like Churchill’s democracy, the Log-Frame was a terribly limited basis for monitoring, but was much better than any other one available at the time.

Having found its reference, however inadequate, the process developed a certain internal logic, leading to instruments for the collection and internal monitoring of much data—by people who had much else to attend to—and the review of claims that progress was, indeed, being made (again, progress according to the Log-Frame definition). All of this was germane and fruitful to the extent that the assumptions that guided the monitoring—those contained in the Log-Frame—represented a true reflection of the real intent of the Initiative. Sometimes, yes, sometimes, decidedly less so...

As the page turns on Framework Proposal Period I, it is time to revisit those guiding assumptions and RRI has, indeed, reconstructed a Logical Framework for FP II. Like the first Log-Frame, this one was constructed very much outside of the network process of RRI and will, therefore, represent, at best, a technically compelling framework for one of the many strategies at work in RRI (the one that guides RRG). Independent Monitoring in FP II may well develop a stronger internal logic than in FP I, and better training of all system users may result in more capacity to assess progress and a better understanding of the reasons for their data-gathering activities. In that case, the monitoring (internal and independent) will better fulfill the purposes for which it occurs. But any notion that monitoring will occur on the basis of the network-wide strategy desired by the questioner at the January meetings is a flight of fancy, which is not to say that it’s bad.

## **XI. RECOMMENDATIONS**

As has been the case in previous IM reports, the report concludes with a small number of recommended interventions by key RRI stakeholders. These recommendations are generally directed toward interventions by RRG senior management, but also include calls for actions by the RRG Board. Those to whom the recommendations are directed review the recommendations and act on them or not, in accordance with their view of the efficacy of such actions. The response to these recommendations is formalized in a subsequent report on follow-up actions taken in response to the IM report.

### **1. Collaborator participation in regional and global program planning**

Partners, Collaborators, RRG and the RRG Board should all be playing planning roles that are appropriate to their role within the Initiative. One of the real strengths of the 2012 planning process was that it recognized the emerging role of Collaborators as drivers of the Initiative's interventions at the country level. Collaborators appreciated this opportunity to participate in discussions at this level, but some observers felt that the planning process—especially regional planning—due to the new arrangements. RRG should conduct a serious review of the innovations contained in the 2012 planning process, facilitate open discussion of the results of the review among all stakeholders and organize 2013 planning in a way that is sustainable from a resource utilization perspective, achieves all planning goals and recognizes the shifting role of RRI Collaborators.

### **2. Long-term leadership development/transition planning**

In close collaboration with senior management, the RRG Board should initiate a process of transition planning that recognizes both the vulnerability created by the high level of dependence of the Initiative on a small number of unique leaders, and the long-term, planned nature of successful leadership development and leadership transitions.

### **3. New Directions exploration**

The “New Directions” identified by RRI during 2012 represent a potentially transformative strategic change agenda for the Initiative. Management of the exploration of these possible changes must be the first priority of senior management, and clear processes and timelines must be established for the exploration of the new directions. Internal communications regarding the New Directions will be instrumental to their success. All key network constituencies must be clear of the status of each proposal at all stages in the change process.

### **4. Comprehensive review of internal coalition relations and functioning**

The environment in which RRI operates has changed dramatically during FPP I, as has the availability of resources to the Initiative. As it worked to maximize its impact in this dynamic

environment, RRI has made both technical and adaptive changes to internal processes in hopes of increasing its effectiveness. The cumulative effect of these adjustments has been gradual shifts in key relationships within the Initiative and the division of labor and responsibility among the Initiative's constituent parts. After five years of mindful tinkering in a dynamic environment, it is appropriate to take stock of emerging structural relationships among key coalition players, to identify the desired roles of key coalition stakeholders and the optimal relationships among those stakeholders and to assess the extent to which current internal processes are supporting the emergence of that "right relationship" among the key components of the coalition.

## **5. DRC program development**

Given the size of the DRC, the immensity of its forest cover and the country's strategic importance to forest tenure reform on the African continent, the development of RRI programs there must be undertaken with even more than the usual level of attention. At the 2012 Africa regional planning meeting, the regional planning team expressed a keen interest in close involvement with this process and future program development must take this desire into full account. The rapid achievement of full staffing in the Africa section of RRG is an extremely important pre-condition to success in this critical program development effort.

## **6. Strategic cycle integration**

Whatever sort of "streamlined" monitoring effort is carried out by RRI during FP II should be more closely integrated with any evaluation exercises undertaken during the same period. This need not require the participation of the IM Team in evaluation activity (or vice-versa). The 2011 Mid-Term Review played the role of a final evaluation carried out (very astutely) in time to inform the Blue Sky strategy review process. This timing is entirely appropriate and much more useful than a final review taking place after the end of the period. But RRG should schedule an actual FP II Mid-Term Review to replace the Independent Monitoring exercise at the end of year two of FP II (2014). This should focus on review of the strategic changes implied by the New Directions. The commitment to a Mid-Term Review and an IM exercise in the same year during FP I was admirable, but was not an optimal use of resources (especially given the lack of integration between the two) and contributed greatly to "assessment fatigue" on the part of the staff. A second evaluative exercise, timed very much like the Mid-Term Review carried out during FP1 (at the end of year four) is also highly advisable. Again, such an exercise could and should substitute for an Independent Monitoring exercise in that year. Finally, occasional, highly-focused, program-level reviews such as the Communications Audit can make important contributions to RRI's overall learning effort.

## **7. Monitoring and Evaluation Training**

Expected adjustments to monitoring and evaluation protocols should be accompanied by a comprehensive effort to provide training to staff, management and key Partners and Collaborators on the content and objectives of the new protocols, as well as the importance of all monitoring inputs to RRI's overall learning strategy. In addition to strengthening the learning character of RRI,

such a training commitment will yield excellent inputs for further refinement of the Initiative's monitoring approach. These inputs must be captured, analyzed and, as appropriate, implemented.

**Appendix One—Individuals Interviewed for 2012 Rights and Resources Initiative  
Independent Monitoring Report**

Name	Institution
Jean Aden	RRG Board of Directors
James Bampton	*RECOFTC
Barth Boika	RRN (DRC)
Francis Colee	Green Advocates (Liberia)
Sally Collins	RRI
Marcedonio Cortave	ACOFOP (Guatemala)
Ganga Ram Dahal	Rights and Resources Group
Penny Davies	Ford Foundation
Paul de Wit	Independent Consultant
Scott Dupree	Samdhana Institute
Bob Harrington	Montana Department of Nat. Res. and Conservation
Jeffrey Hatcher	Rights and Resources Group
John Hudson	RRG Board of Directors
Ivor Jorgensen	Norad
David Kaimowitz	Ford Foundation
Susan Kandel	PRISMA
Arvind Khare	Rights and Resources Group
Carlisle Levine	Independent Consultant
Victor López	Ut'z Che' (Guatemala)
Augusta Molnar	Rights and Resources Group
John Nelson	*Forest People's Program
Margaret Nilsson	SIDA
James Otto	SDI (Liberia)
Bharat Pathak	FECOFUN
Bharat Pojharel	Helvetas Swiss InterCooperation
Peter Riggs	Independent Consultant
Hanna Saarinen	*Land Issues Working Group (Lao/PDR)
Daniel Selener	Independent Consultant
Richard Smith	IBC (Peru)
Leonardo Tamburini	CEJIS (Bolivia)
Julie Weah	Foundation for Community Initiatives (Liberia)
Andy White	Rights and Resources Group

\*Information delivered to Independent Monitor via e-mail.



## APPENDIX TWO

### Independent Monitoring and Evaluation Rights and Resources Initiative 2012

#### Terms of Reference: Kevin Murray Strategic Consulting

##### **Introduction: RRI's Monitoring and Evaluation Approach**

The Rights and Resources Initiative has a core set of funding in place for strategic interventions from 2008-2012 (Framework Proposal I, or FPI) from a group of international donors that has enabled it to carry out its five year program. One of the agreements of FPI is that there be one, integrated system of monitoring, evaluation (M&E) for all donors and for all Partners, for the combined set of programmed activities identified strategically as contributing to achieve a set of desired outcomes that influence RRI's two overarching goals.<sup>16</sup>

RRI has designed and implemented an internal approach to monitoring and evaluation that is integrated into its strategic analysis and planning process and commits its secretariat (RRG) to compile the information necessary to support the ongoing assessment of progress toward the coalition's desired outcomes at all levels. Given the intense demands on its relatively small staff, RRI has carefully chosen internal monitoring methods that balance its commitment to evidence-based assessment with staff capacity. RRI's internal monitoring and evaluation practice also supports the activities of the coalition's Independent Monitor, who is engaged by RRG in order to:

- Provide an external assessment of progress on the coalition's highest level strategic outcomes;
- Identify obstacles to RRI's overall progress and offer RRG's senior management recommendations on actions to overcome those obstacles;
- Selectively validate the RRI's own program-level self-assessments; and
- Prepare an Independent Monitoring Report for RRG, the coalition partners and the RRG Board of Directors.

*Verifying Progress on Strategic Indicators:* RRI has specified a number of indicators, the monitoring and verification of which all is to confirm that it is making progress on the Strategic Outcomes related to its five-year Framework Proposal. With the help of coalition Partners and Collaborators, RRG staff gathers the information necessary to determine the coalition's progress on each Strategic Outcome based on a pre-established set of Strategic Outcomes at the national, regional and global levels.

*Annual Strategic Priorities:* As part of its annual planning process, RRG leadership develops a set of Annual Strategic Priorities that reflect emerging opportunities at the program and thematic level as well as management's sense of what will move the organization toward its identified strategic outcomes.

*Monitoring Progress on Contracted Activities:* Through its internal contracting system, RRG often transfers coalition resources to external actors (primarily Partners and Collaborators in the case of Country and Regional Programs) to enable those actors to carry out actions deemed strategic to the

---

<sup>16</sup> The goals of RRI are: 1) to dramatically reduce poverty in the forested areas of the world; and 2) to substantially increase the forest area under local ownership and administration, with secure rights to use and trade products and services.

accomplishment of the coalition's programmatic goals. As part of its due diligence commitment, RRG has established a system to track the completion of these activities.

*Monitoring Progress on Annual Outcomes at the Program Level:* RRI carries out an elaborate annual participatory planning process that sets annual outcomes, for each country, regional, and global thematic program. The monitoring aspect of this process has been strengthened by building in a more formal step at which the planning team reviews progress on the outcomes it set for the previous year. For each outcome established the previous year, and for the five-year Strategic Outcomes, each planning team discusses the following:

1. A provisional assessment of progress made on the indicator;
2. Any evidence available to support this assessment; and
3. An explanation for the degree of progress achieved.

Based on the input collected from coalition actors during the planning process, each team creates the Annual Program Monitoring Report (APMR). This becomes a critical output of the planning process and an indispensable source of information for the Independent Monitor. Part of the role of the Independent Monitor is then to validate selectively (for identified country, regional and global programs) the findings of the APMR.

Taken together, the following practices amount to a monitoring approach that allows RRI to achieve a better sense of its progress over its complex range of programs:

- The monitoring of progress on global indicators (SO Milestones) based on data gathered by RRG staff
- The incorporation of a more formal monitoring component into the setting of and review of progress on Annual Strategic Priorities
- The due diligence tracking of program implementation
- The monitoring of progress on annual outcomes at the program level; and
- Carefully prioritized monitoring work by an Independent Monitor

### **Summary of Independent Monitoring work to date:**

2009: The Independent Monitor conducted a review of internal and external secondary documentation, in-depth interviews of key actors and external experts, actively observed select Coalition events during site visits, and interviewed program staff in order to develop a set of working findings and a report presented to RRI leadership in 2010, assessing the impact of the Coalition to date and recommending strategic adjustments in RRI's M&E systems.

2010: The Independent Monitor worked with RRG to finish the design and implementation of the M&E system, which entailed supporting RRI in crafting and adjusting overarching goals and indicators that link the program of work to overall targets and establish five year benchmarks for success within FPI (and substituting them in RRI's logical framework) as well as the procedures for the gathering of information to support indicators; completed the design and establishment of internal M&E systems for annual Strategic Outcomes at the country, regional and global program level for activities implemented by RRG, Partners and Collaborators; and conducted independent monitoring of RRI's work in 2010, reporting on progress in each area.

2011: RRI contracted an independent team of experts to conduct a Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the implementation of FPI. The Independent Monitoring exercise complemented the MTE,

assessing how well the M&E system contributed to the organization's strategic analysis and planning process for which it was designed. The Independent Monitor worked to validate the Strategic Objective (SO) milestones set for that year and provided input on how to improve reporting, assessed the status of implementation of the Independent Monitoring system, and assessed the effectiveness of structural changes to integrate thematic elements into RRI's Global Programs work.

To date, 28 out of 42 potential total milestones categorized within the Strategic Objective framework, have been completed. Four additional milestones have been selected for 2012. (It has been decided by RRG Board to forgo completion of the ten remaining milestones for SO1, for which 10 milestones have already been verified. For a progress report of milestones completed to date, see *RRI Logframe 2008-12: Milestones Scorecard*, below.)

### **Proposal of Work for 2012:**

There will be two major tasks undertaken by the Independent Monitor in 2012:

1. Independent Monitoring assessment of activities for 2012, and
2. Review four years of RRI monitoring and evaluation, in order to provide a cumulative and comprehensive assessment of the Coalition's progress during the 2008-12 Framework, in terms of achieving the five Strategic Objectives.

*Specific activities for 2012 will include:*

1. Independent Monitoring assessment:

The consultant will be an independent monitor of the RRI and carry out the yearly independent evaluation of RRI programs in this capacity. Specifically, the consultant will:

- a. Validate the five Strategic Objective milestones selected for 2012. Potential milestones for 2012 include the following, although these are subject to change:
  - i. SO2: Rethinking forest regulations workshop (Montana)
  - ii. SO3: UN-FAO: influence of RRI Tenure Tracking
  - iii. SO4: Working group for tenure reform in Indonesia [or] tenure reform learning group in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)
  - iv. SO5: Guatemala: realizing benefits to forest resources through community enterprises, and
  - v. SO5: Liberia: breakthrough in business environment for pit-sawyers
- b. Validate the internal monitoring of annual and five-year Strategic Outcomes through country visits in coordination with RRG, participation in events and interviews with key actors as agreed with RRG
- c. Monitor RRI's response to the Independent Monitor's past recommendations
- d. Use information gathered by RRI, including APMRs and Strategic Outcome milestone reports to monitor and report on the Coalition's progress towards the strategic priorities for 2012

- e. Identify internal and external obstacles to progress and make recommendations to address those obstacles
  - f. Draft, consult and present the annual Independent Monitoring report that will:
    - i. Inform the Coalition on the progress of program implementation
    - ii. Selectively validate the information generated from internal monitoring reports
    - iii. Collect feedback from relevant actors and constituencies
    - iv. Assess how well RRI provides value addition to ongoing Coalition and Partner initiatives, and to the actions of other development actors in related political spheres
    - v. Evaluate that the Initiative is strategic and synergistic
2. Cumulative and comprehensive assessment of FP1:

The consultant will review four years of independent monitoring, and evaluate on the basis of reporting on 33 milestones, interviews and APMRs, and provide an assessment of:

- a. To what extent did RRI achieve its Project Objectives of FPI?
- b. Did the M&E systems provide sufficient information and leverage to make midcourse corrections, and if so, to what extent?
- c. What are the emerging strengths and weaknesses of RRI Coalition methods of implementation and monitoring?

*Annex: RRI Log-frame 2008-12: Milestones Scorecard*

Strategic Outcomes	Objectively measurable and verifiable indicators	Milestones 2008-2011	Milestones remaining for 2012
1. Complementary global, national, regional and local organizations effectively synergize to achieve significant breakthroughs in tenure reform processes.	Facilitate at least <b>twenty</b> new, value-added joint actions and activities between partners and collaborators w/ a demonstrable effect on the other strategic outcomes.	10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Tenure Champion Platforms in Mali</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Tenure Champion Platforms in Burkina Faso</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Establishing Common Position and Reform Platform in Cameroon</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Yaoundé Conference: Creating a Strategic Platform for Central and West Africa</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Nepal NRM Confederation: Bringing Advocacy Groups Together</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Guatemala Networking</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Bolivia Country Planning Team</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Climate Change Global &amp; Regional Dialogues: Establishing the Centrality of Tenure Reforms</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Africa Community Rights Network (ACRN)</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Indonesia CSO Roadmap Coalition for Tenure Reform</a></li> </ul>	0 (cancelled)
2. A select set of strategic networks are better-informed, more active	At least <b>six</b> existing or new networks increase their	5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">MegaFlorestais: Engaging Forest Agencies for Tenure and Policy Reforms</a></li> </ul>	1

<p>and effective in promoting reform nationally, regionally and/or globally.</p>	<p>capacity to influence policy related to forest tenure at all levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Global Alliance of Community Forestry: Strengthening Rights-holders Platform</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>CSAG-ITTO Network: Civil Society Brings Progressive Reform</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>REFACOF: African Women Establish a Powerful Platform</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Next Generation Forest Agency Leadership</u></a></li> </ul>	
<p>3. Key strategic actors at the global level are committed and engaged in promoting major reforms in existing tenure, regulatory and governance arrangements. (Previous #1)</p>	<p>At least <b>five</b> inter-governmental and multilateral institutions (multilateral banks, ITTO, and other UN institutions) alter their position on forest tenure and actively support tenure and related reforms in their narrative and portfolios.</p>	<p>4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>ITTO (CSAG): Community Forests and Enterprises Recognized</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>UNREDD: Civil Society and Oversight</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>UNFF Adopts Tenure and Community Forestry in Voluntary Agreements</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Bilateral Aid Development</u></a></li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>4. Changes in tenure legislation and regulatory or policy framework in favor of local communities in a subset of countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.</p>	<p>In <b>six</b> countries where RRI is active, structural tenure reforms (legal, regulatory, policy) are adopted/advanced.</p>	<p>5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Nepal: Advocacy for Resource Rights</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Tenure Reforms in Brazil</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Tenure Reforms in China</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Major Legislative Changes in Bolivia</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Liberia Community Rights Law</u></a></li> </ul>	<p>1</p>
<p>5. More equitable forest governance, enterprise and conservation models are identified and disseminated and/or more broadly supported as a viable approach to support social and economic development.</p>	<p>In at least <b>five</b> cases, these models lead to an increase in community access to resources and markets.</p>	<p>3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>China: Research on Tenure Reform and Small Scale Enterprise</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Nepal: Preventing Roll Back and Advocating Community Conservation</u></a></li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Community Forestry and Enterprise in Nepal Increases Household Income</u></a></li> </ul>	<p>2</p>