



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Foto proporcionada por Carleen Yocum, USFS-PFSI

EVALUATION

Enhancing forestry governance in the Peruvian amazon: Mid Term Evaluation of Peru Forest Sector Initiative (PFSI) – AID-527-T-11-00001

April 2014

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by USAID/Peru Evaluations, under contract No. AID-527-C-13-00002 with Partners for Global Research and Development LLC (PGRD).

ENHANCING FORESTRY GOVERNANCE IN THE PERUVIAN AMAZON: Mid-term Evaluation of the Peru Forest Sector Initiative

April 10, 2014

527-T-11-00001

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

- Acronymsi
- Executive Summary..... 1
- Evaluation Purpose & Evaluation Questions.....5
- Project Background7
- Evaluation Methods & Limitations 13
- Findings 17
- Conclusions 40
- Recommendations 44
- Summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations of PFSI Midterm Evaluation 48
- Annex I: Evaluation Statement of Work58
- Annex II: Data Collection Instruments.....75
- Annex Iii: Field work report..... 205
- Annex IV: Independent Opinion Regarding the Forest Management Context and PFSI Contribution.....209

ACRONYMS

AFSI	Amazon Forest Sector Initiative
AIDSEP	Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Jungle
ARA	Regional Environmental Authority
BPP	Permanent Production Forests
CAR	Regional Environmental Commission
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CFM	Community Forest Management
CIAM	Interregional Council of the Amazon
CIEF	Strategic Forest Information Center
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
COFOPRI	Property Formalization Organism
CONAFOR	Peruvian National Forest and Wildlife Commission
CONAP	Peruvian Confederation of Amazonian Nations
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
DGFFS	Forest Direction at the Ministry of Agriculture
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GFI	Governance of Forest Initiative
GI	Intergovernmental Group
GOP	Government of Peru
GRADE	Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo
GTT	Technical Working Group
IDER	Regional Spatial Data Infrastructure
INF	National Forest Inventory
IP	International Programs
IR	Intermediate Result
MDD	Madre de Dios
MEF	Ministry of Economics and Finance
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture
MINAM	Ministry of Environment
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
OSINFOR (OD)	Forest Resources Supervisor (Decentralized Office)
PAPA	Participating Agency Program Agreement
PGMF	Forest Management General Plan
PMP	Performance and Monitoring Plan

PNFSS	Peruvian Forest and Wildlife National Policy
POA	Operative Annual Plan
PPII	Indigenous communities
PRMRFFS	<i>Programa Regional de Manejo de Recursos Forestales y de Fauna Silvestre</i>
PTPA	US-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement
QR	Regional and National Questionnaires
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RENIEC	National Identification Register
RLFFS	Forestry and Wildlife Law regulations
ROF	Regulation for Organization and Functions
SERFOR	Peruvian National Forest Service
SERNANP	Peruvian National Protected Areas Service
SINAFOR	Peruvian National Forest and Wildlife Management System
SNIFF-MC	Forests and Wildlife National Information System, Control Module
SOW	Scope of Work
SUNARP	National Public Register Organism
SUNAT	National Tax Organism
UNALM	National Agrarian University at La Molina
UNAP	Peruvian Amazon National University
UNU	Ucayali National University
USAID	United States of America Agency for International Development
USAID/Peru	United States of America Agency for International Development-Peru Mission
USFS	United States of America Forest Service
USFS/PFSI	Peru Forest Sector Initiative
USG	United States of America Government
USTR	United States of America Trade Representative
WRI	World Resource Institute

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions

The Peru Forest Sector Initiative (USFS/PFSI) has worked for almost five years on improving Peruvian forest governance following the inclusion of a specific Annex on Forest Sector Governance in the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA). This is an external mid-term evaluation that assesses the performance of USFS/PFSI, documents USFS/PFSI progress towards the achievement of its goals, and informs the final evaluation of the program in 2016. This is the first evaluation of the USFS/PFSI since its inception in 2009.

Although Peru still enjoys its reputation as a well-forested, low-deforestation country, illegal logging activities and weak forest management threaten to substantially alter this landscape. This threat has increased rapidly in recent years as a consequence of new roads, weak forest governance institutions, the expansion of the agricultural frontier, and other illegal activities, such as mining. Following the PTPA, the office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), U.S. Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) committed to provide support to Peru to comply with the Annex on Forest Sector Governance.

This evaluation seeks to answer two questions: How is the USFS/PFSI achieving its intermediate results milestones? And, to what extent is USFS/PFSI contributing to improve the level of forest governance and forest management in Peru towards a more integrated territorial approach?

Project Background

The USFS/PFSI objective is to contribute to sustainable forest management in Peru by developing technical capacities, tools and methodologies and by strengthening key actors in the public and private sector in designated priority areas. The program design establishes four results that contribute to achieving the program objective. The different components and activities of the program are organized according to the four results. First, the program should contribute to the conservation and management of forest ecosystems (RESULT 1). Second, the program should strengthen relevant institutions and stakeholders (RESULT 2). Third, natural resources information access should be improved, transparency should be promoted and natural resources management should be participative (RESULT 3). Fourth, the program should focus on capacity building for the sustainable community forest management (RESULT 4).

Evaluation questions, Design, Methods and Limitations

The mid-term performance evaluation of USFS/PFSI will serve as an important input for its final evaluation. Because performance for this complex program is largely process-based, the evaluation relies primarily on qualitative data analysis. The evaluation uses interviews with local partners at different levels and other stakeholders to collect information on their participation, ownership and perceptions of the program.

The evaluation attempts to ascertain progress in meeting project results (milestones) as well as the project's contribution to strengthening forest sector governance. The evaluation focuses on three important aspects of USFS/PFSI's objectives, which are capacity, coordination and transparency. The

Forestry and Wildlife Law and the Peruvian Forest and Wildlife National Policy also identify these dimensions as main principles, highlighting the importance of integrated coordination and cooperation within different sectors, institutions and disciplines as well as informed civil society participation. The capacity dimension contemplates: (i) the capacity of government and official institutions to act autonomously and independently, (ii) the availability of resources (both human and financial), (iii) and the capacity of civil society (particularly NGOs and the media) to analyze forest issues and participate effectively. The coordination dimension refers to the extent to which agencies and actors whose decisions impact upon forests are advancing common objectives. Finally, the transparency dimension refers to the quality, timeliness, availability, and comprehensibility of information, and whether efforts are made to ensure information is used by affected and interested groups.

Evaluators visited the five Amazonian regions where the program is active: Amazonas, Loreto, Madre de Dios, San Martin and Ucayali. Seven interview guides were elaborated to collect information in the regions selected. The guides included a list of questions regarding perceptions on forest governance issues and other closed and open questions to understand respondents' experience with USFS/PFSI. The guides differentiate, when possible, between seven types of respondents, including those representing: the forest or environmental authority; the forest management team; forest inventories and the forest information system; the land use planning team; and the Forest Resources Supervisor; the private sector; and, a civil society organization.

Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The achievement of milestones differs considerably among and within intermediate results. There is less substantial documented activity and progress under several intermediate results, including national forest inventories, community forest management platforms, and the promotion of sustainable forest business in indigenous communities. The evaluation findings focus on the areas of project focus: Permanent Production Forest (BPP) inventories, the creation of regional authorities (ARA), the national wildlife and forest policy and regulations, support for the Peruvian National Forest Service (SERFOR), and development of the Forests and Wildlife National Information System, Control Module (SNIFF-MC).

At the national level, the first Permanent Production Forests (BPP in Spanish) inventories manual was officially approved, providing the framework and methodology for regions to proceed. Progress differs by region. In Loreto, pilot inventory program database is being reviewed, in San Martin 25% of its sampling units are being implemented, in Ucayali, 70%. USFS/PFSI provided technical assistance from USFS experts, study tours to introduce forest inventory and analysis methods, field training, and development of communication plans and strategies for stakeholder outreach. This is an important step forward to improve forest management in Peru since such inventories will provide data on the status of valuable species populations, among other useful information for forest management decisions.

All milestones relating to the National Forest and Wildlife Policy were achieved. While stakeholders completed drafting of the the National Forest and Wildlife Law regulations, they are currently receiving commentaries, leaving the third and last milestones for this activity pending. To support the passing the policy and regulations, USFS/PFSI provided discreet technical assistance through detailers and document review, logistical support for public events and working meetings, and technical assistance related to public policy development process.

The status of the establishment of regional authorities varies substantially by region. USFS/PFSI focuses on supporting the creation or strengthening of the Regional Environmental Authorities (ARA). San Martin, and more recently, Ucayali and Amazonas have implemented their ARA. USFS/PFSI directly and indirectly,

through the Interregional Council of the Amazon (CIAM), provided technical support to the process of elaboration and validation of internal organizational and management instruments.

Initial progress is being made regarding the implementation of the Forests and Wildlife National Information System, Control Module (SNIFF-MC). The planning and process mapping for the system are complete, corresponding to the first two project milestones. The political process will determine whether and how the SNIFF-MC pilot and final version will be undertaken. USFS/PFSI provided continuous support and technical assistance in the design and redesign process, training through study tours, developing and implementing a prototype of the control module, and stakeholder socialization.

The most important external project constraints are limited capacity and budget among public agencies at the regional and national levels. Additional constraints include the incomplete reform of regional institutions; the lack of an adequate public servant policy and/or strategy in the forest sector, especially at the regional level; potential conflicts with other public institutions; and long-term patterns of corruption. USFS/PFSI should increase its articulation with public forest sector strategic planning in order to link US Government investments to public commitments. This would reduce vulnerability to external drivers and ensure that the successful implementation of punctual activities is directly linked to the achievement of project results.

Internally, the definition of the program's results (milestones) in terms of partners' achievements makes the measurement of PFSI performance vulnerable to external factors. The definition of milestones is divorced from the actual reported activities; instead they depend heavily on the performance of the Government of Peru and Regional Governments. As a result, the achievement of milestones does not capture to what extent USFS/PFSI support is producing these achievements. Therefore, effectively measuring and attributing improvements in forest governance to the implementation of program activities is too ambitious for the activities implemented within the current results framework. To better define the project's objectives and performance, USFS/PFSI should incorporate more specific direct expected outcomes from program activities to complement the current indirect milestones. These complementary results would better capture the direct results of the program and strengthen a final analysis of the project's contribution to the high-level outcomes.

The USFS/PFSI Performance and Monitoring Plan states that the sustainability of its activities relies on high quality processes. The quality of these processes can be classified according to USFS/PFSI defined attributes. However, the program is not documenting the quality of processes using indicators of the defined attributes. USFS/PFSI should improve its reporting of its targeted attributes of high quality processes¹.

It is clear the initiative's provision of access to USFS and other agencies' experts is one of the project's most important successes and a unique contribution to the forest sector. Every component involves the accompaniment of highly skilled and experienced experts. Key processes such as BPP inventories and the SNIFF-MC are implemented with sector-leading guidance. Standardization of measures within BPP inventories, and process mapping and the application of new technology in the traceability of forestry products within the SNIFF-MC are the most important activities according to regional respondents.

Results and feedback suggest that technical assistance and knowledge exchange may contribute to improved capacity, which in turn improves forest information, and, consequently, transparency and forest management. USFS/PFSI develops technical assistance in coordination with different stakeholders. This assistance comes with the absence of a capacity-building plan among forest authorities, either internally

¹ USFS/PFSI has a new PMP dated January 30, 2014, which postdates the evaluation period and was not reviewed

for the national forest authority, or externally for forest stakeholders. In general, trainings are demand driven, and while highly valued, they do not form part of a strategic plan for improving forest sector management capacity. USFS/PFSI should tie its capacity building assistance to stakeholders' internal capacity building plans and strategies. This would provide a cooperative framework for continued technical assistance to strengthen the impact of knowledge exchange between the USFS/PFSI and its target groups.

USFS/PFSI should establish more systematic processes for documenting internal and external lessons learned from the successes and failures of the experiences to date². These lessons learned are vital to replicating effective approaches and adapting to a more challenging program environment in different regions and contexts. They will also contribute to the important process of planning for the sustainability of forest management improvements that have been achieved throughout the public system over the project period. The program must also expand its understanding of the external context and its influence on its activities and results. For example, in the case of ARAs creation, USFS/PFSI could draw lessons learned in the ARA formation process that will help it and other actors strengthen regional forest management capacity in general, even in cases such as Loreto, where the ARA model seems less likely to be implemented.

While USFS/PFSI has facilitated a number of coordination initiatives and workgroups, coordination mechanisms are not institutionalized, which raises questions regarding how these stakeholders will sustain the new institutional framework being enhanced by USFS/PFSI when USFS/PFSI leaves. USFS/PFSI should encourage the formalization of coordination mechanisms that it has promoted between stakeholders of the forest sector, including the establishment of multi-stakeholder platforms with strategic planning objectives such as the design, planning and implementation of a new integrated results-based budget for the forestry sector.

² One documented experience has been implemented through a grant to FUNDECOR regarding community forestry management schemes with the Awajun and Wampis native communities from Amazonas (not published).

EVALUATION PURPOSE & EVALUATION QUESTIONS

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an initial performance assessment for the United States Forest Service / Peru Forest Sector Initiative (USFS/PFSI). An external intermediate evaluation provides accountability and shows how USFS/PFSI is working towards the achievement of its goals. The period of performance begins in September 2011 and continues through December 2013. Although the current Participating Agency Program Agreement (PAPA) started in 2011, the evaluation considers the importance of activities implemented by USFS/PFSI since 2009. This external mid-term evaluation is an important input for the Final Evaluation of the program in 2016.

The specific objectives established by the Statement of Work (SOW) (Annex I) for this intermediate evaluation of USFS/PFSI performance are:

- To understand how the intermediate results milestones are being achieved, specifically in terms of the main attributes of USFS/PFSI key processes.
- To identify external performance drivers and constraints and internal advantages and weaknesses.
- To analyze USFS/PFSI relationships and synergies with other relevant interventions.
- To assess how the activities of USFS/PFSI are improving forest governance in Peru.
- To provide recommendations for improvement.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

As specified in the SOW for this Evaluation, the study aims to answer two main questions and several sub-questions established in consultation with the technical staff of USAID/Peru and USFS/PFSI. These evaluation questions and sub-questions are:

QUESTION 1: How is USFS/PFSI achieving its intermediate results milestones?

Sub-questions:

- What are the main external drivers and constraints underlying USFS/PFSI performance?
- What are the internal advantages or weaknesses explaining why or why not USFS/PFSI is in its way of meeting its goals?
- How USFS/PFSI have been adapting to changes in the external context? What are the main lessons learned? How quick is adapting over time?
- How relevant are USFS/PFSI strategies, implementation approach, key processes and focus areas in terms of satisfying target groups' current and future needs (including the PTPA and forest and wildlife regulations and policies)?

QUESTION 2: To what extent is USFS/PFSI, through the establishment of quality processes, contributing to improve the forest governance levels and forest management in Peru towards a more integrated territorial approach?

Sub-questions:

- How is the technical assistance and knowledge exchange between USFS, USFS/PFSI and its target groups supporting forest governance in Peru both at national and regional levels?
- Which are the most important and stronger synergies developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI among national and between national and regional institutions?
- How articulated are USFS/PFSI relationships with other similar interventions or projects (also funded by USAID or implemented by other organization)?
- How are these affecting or supporting USFS/PFSI activities, and ultimately forest governance in Peru?
- Which are the most important milestones achieved and activities developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI to provide relevant and transparent information for the forest sector, with a focus on the SNIFF control module?
- Within all USFS/PFSI activities, which have engendered the greatest changes? How can these be appropriated and maintained in the future?
- Which are the elements identified by USFS/PFSI to secure sustainability especially when the context changes?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

THE PROBLEM ADDRESSED

Although Peru still enjoys a reputation as a highly forested, low-deforestation country, illegal logging activities compounded by weak forest management threaten to substantially alter this landscape. This threat has increased rapidly in recent years as a consequence of new roads, weak forest governance institutions, and the expansion of the agricultural frontier³.

The forest sector faces the serious challenge of illegal logging, which, in Peru, is characterized by strong criminal networks colluding with state representatives⁴. Despite the existence of a legal framework governing the use of forest resources, the impunity with which illegal activity is carried out makes it difficult for legitimate sustainably managed forest enterprises to compete in the marketplace. Annually, Peru is losing approximately US\$200 million due to the illegal extraction of timber, an amount estimated at 70% of total timber extraction.

Peru contains approximately 68 million hectares of rainforest within the Amazon basin, of which a large portion consists of primary forests. The forest sector represents only between 1% and 4% of the national Gross Domestic Product. The forest sector could contribute much more to the Peruvian economy with a clearer legal framework and stronger institutions. DGFFS has evidence that the area of permanent productive forests is decreasing. Other land rights are replacing the forests. These different classifications provide for other activities⁵, many of which include deforestation.

Historically, the legal framework for the forest sector has been rather weak, outdated, and inaccurate. In 2000, a new Forestry and Wildlife Law (N° 27308) was approved to address some of the limitations of the previous law. It improved access to forest resources through the concession model. The government awarded forest concessions through public contests that required the submission of forest management plans. Another Law was approved and quickly repealed in 2009 (N° 1090). Forest governance gained social and political importance after social unrest that led to highly publicized incidents in the Northern Peruvian Amazonia (Bagua) in 2009. Soon after, the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI in Spanish) initiated an open and more transparent participatory process to review the legislative framework for the forest sector law. The creation of the Ministry of Environment (MINAM in Spanish) and Forest Resources Supervisor (OSINFOR in Spanish), the public decentralization process, the climate change debate all form part of a new context to which the new law must respond. In 2011 the new Forestry and Wildlife Law was approved after consultations with indigenous communities. In 2013, legislators approved the corresponding National Forestry and Wildlife Policy. Currently, the Forest Direction at the Ministry of Agriculture (DGFFS in Spanish) is leading participatory processes to approve the Forestry Law regulations and to implement the recently created National Forest Service (SERFOR in Spanish).

The institutional environment of the Peruvian forest sector is complicated by the involvement of several governmental agencies. To address this complication, a major proposed reform of 2011 Law introduces SERFOR as the new national authority for the forest and wildlife sector. A council comprised of twelve representatives appointed from both government and civil society will direct this new authority. This law also created the Peruvian National Forest and Wildlife Management System (SINAFOR) and the Peruvian

³ Most of the text of this section is taken from the SOW for this Mid – Term Evaluation of USFS/PFSI.

⁴ UICN (2012) Una Mirada Integral a los Bosques del Perú, Quito

⁵ DGFFS (2013) Presentation on BPP Inventories (2011-2014) by Renzo Vergara

National Forest and Wildlife Commission (CONAFOR), which integrates different specialists from public institutions and civil society organizations. The law also attempts to clarify roles and functions between national and regional authorities, placing most of the management and control of forest resources with regional authorities.

PERUVIAN FOREST SECTOR INITIATIVE: CONTEXT AND DESIGN

The US-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA) entered into force on February 1, 2009. The agreement included an Annex on Forest Sector Governance that prescribes concrete steps to enhance forest sector governance and promote legal trade in timber products. Inclusion of this Annex is largely attributed to intense pressure by US civil society to address the impact of a free trade agreement on the extraction and commercialization of timber and non-timber forest resources in Peru. The office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), U.S. Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) committed to provide support to Peru to comply with the PTPA and its Annex on Forest Sector Governance.

USFS/PFSI identified several factors that are directly or indirectly relevant to forest sector management in Peru:

- The prevailing international economic crisis could restrict resources for sustainable forest management in Peru.
- Different actors have overlapping concepts, approaches and competencies in terms of forest management in Peru.
- There is a favorable legal framework for sustainable forest management initiatives.
- Regional governments in the Amazon exhibit a positive trend towards pushing public policies and initiatives that favor sustainable forest management.
- Public institutions are more aware of the challenges and of the organizational capacity gaps in their sector.
- There is a need to specify the role of organizations for international cooperation.
- There is a need to increase transparency in public and private management.

Although USAID, USFS and the Government of Peru (GOP) began cooperating before the PTPA negotiations, circa 2004, this collaboration has intensified since 2009. USAID Washington provided the original funding for USFS/PFSI from 2009 through 2011. With this funding, USAID and the USFS provided technical assistance to the GOP to comply with the PTPA, specifically with the Annex on Forest Sector Governance. USFS/PFSI continues this support through the provision of technical assistance to facilitate key processes, a subject explored at length in section IV.

USAID and USFS designed PFSI to respond to the need for important legal reforms, the lack of strong institutions, and the insufficient technical capacities in the forest sector to achieve the goals in the PTPA forest sector annex. Between 2009 and 2010, program and sector stakeholders identified several activities to improve the management and governance of the forest sector in Peru together with a matrix to review the Annex and prioritize the most important activities for implementation. In 2011, these activities were continued under the second and current PAPA.

After the GOP implemented several policy changes in order to fully comply with all the requirements of the PTPA, indigenous populations from the Northern Peruvian Amazon protested what they perceived as a failure to comply with the prior informed consultation process as well as policy changes that posed significant challenges to their natural resource base. USFS/PFSI has grown to include a strategic

collaboration between the United States and Peruvian Governments to address these social and political issues.

USAID, through USFS/PFSI, is focusing its efforts on helping the GOP implement the new groundbreaking forestry legal framework that will move Peru onto a low-emission, high-sequestration development path and address one of the main limitations of the regulatory environment, the large number of authorities with overlapping roles in forest sector. To achieve this, USFS/PFSI focuses on improving forest governance. Effective governance is central to improving forest management and forest outcomes. Several factors influence the effectiveness of forest governance: careful legislation and law enforcement, greater participation by key actors, accountability of decision-makers, better monitoring of forest outcomes, and higher investments in key capacities at local, regional, and national levels⁶.

In 2013, USFS/PFSI elaborated its Results Framework⁷ and the USFS/PFSI Performance Management Plan (PMP)⁸. These documents show how this program is defined, and how its achievements are going to be measured. As stated in the PMP: “USFS fundamentally seeks to bring its experience and expertise to bear to build capacity in the public forest sector. The USFS sees itself as an agent of change, but the real actor is the GOP”. This approach explains why many milestones are achievements of the GOP that go beyond the specific activities of USFS/PFSI.

Milestones, listed in Table 1, are aligned with what the program defined as the “custom indicator 4” regarding processes, stages and attributes. Regarding this indicator the PMP states: “USFS/PFSI does not produce products but assists the GOP to implement processes. The quality of processes it assists is as important to USFS/PFSI as the final and intermediate products themselves, because it believes that high quality process will result in sustainability”. Therefore, Indicator 4 will be measured not only in terms of its completion, but by the degree to which the process and stages have adhered to certain ‘attributes’. An attribute is a measure of the quality of the process and stage. The attributes defined are: consensus/agreement, participation/inclusion, commitment, decentralization, and inter-institutional. Although the program managers clearly defined this indicator and how it will be measured, reports still do not measure the level of attributes, and therefore process quality, achieved.⁹

The USFS/PFSI objective is to contribute to sustainable forest management in Peru by developing technical capacities, tools and methodologies and by strengthening key actors in the public and private sector in the prioritized areas. Four results define how this goal will be achieved, each corresponding to a different component of the program.

- Result 1. The program should contribute to the conservation and management of forest ecosystems
- Result 2. The program should strengthen relevant institutions and stakeholders.
- Result 3. Natural resources information access should be improved, transparency should be promoted and natural resources management should be participative.

⁶ Agrawal, A. et al. (2008) Changing governance of the world’s forests. *Science* 320, 1420

⁷ USFS/PFSI: Marco de resultados y sus resultados intermedios 2012-2016. Junio 2013

⁸ The first PMP revised dated December 2012, and the second dated August 2013. A new version was issued on January 30, 2014, but is not analyzed in this evaluation.

⁹ On February 05, 2014, the evaluation team received a report on Indicator 4, which did not include a measurement of the attributes.

Result 4. The program should focus on capacity building for the sustainable management of forest in communities

In turn, milestones were defined to achieve each of these results (See Table I). These milestones serve as the framework for the analysis of the activities and results reported by USFS/PFSI. The project has not associated any schedule or deadlines for the achievement of the project milestones, a result of the value placed on quality and substance of the targeted processes. The lack of a timetable for the achievement of results limits the conclusions that can be drawn from a mid-term evaluation, as actual achievements cannot be compared with expected results and the completion of pending milestones cannot be analyzed in the context of project timetable.

TABLE I USFS/PFSI's Milestones

RESULT I: Contribute to the conservation and management of forest ecosystems	
IR 1.1.1 Permanent Production Forest (BPP in Spanish) Inventories	<p>Milestone 1: Conceptualization of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments</p> <p>Milestone 2: Planning of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.</p> <p>Milestone 3: Design of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.</p> <p>Milestone 4: Implementation of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.</p> <p>Milestone 5: Processed, analyzed, and systematized information from the BPP inventories contribute the SNIFF-MC</p>
IR 1.1.2 Technical Support for the National Forest Inventory (INF) ¹⁰	<p>Milestone 1: Conceptualization of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Regional Governments in the Amazon</p> <p>Milestone 2: Planning of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Regional Governments in the Amazon.</p> <p>Milestone 3: Design of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Regional Governments in the Amazon.</p>
IR 1.1.3 Population studies	<p>Milestone 1: Design of cedrella possibility of existence map done by MINAM</p> <p>Milestone 2: Collection of DNA samples done by MINAM</p>
IR 1.1.4 CEDRO Project	<p>Milestone 1: Conceptualization of the CEDRO project done by MINAM</p> <p>Milestone 2: Planning of the CEDRO project done by MINAM</p> <p>Milestone 3: Design of the CEDRO project done by MINAM</p> <p>Milestone 4: Planning of the CEDRO project done by MINAM</p> <p>Milestone 5: Implementation of the CEDRO project done by MINAM</p>
IR 1.2.1 Technical Support to Forest Laboratories	<p>Milestone 1: Training on research protocols of forest products</p> <p>Milestone 2: Development of tools for economic evaluation of forest products</p> <p>Milestone 3: Research methodologies and protocols of timber properties</p>
IR 1.2.2 Forest management tools	<p>Milestone 1: Elaboration and reproduction of manuals and field guides</p> <p>Milestone 2: Training on the use of forest field tools.</p>

¹⁰Milestones seem to be confusing BPP inventories with INF, which are independent forest inventories.

RESULT 2: Strengthen relevant institutions and stakeholders	
IR 2.1.1 National Forest and Wildlife Policy (PNFFS in Spanish)	<p>Milestone 1: PNFFS proposal elaborated by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 2: PNFFS proposal validated by the GI</p> <p>Milestone 3: PNFFS proposal receive commentaries and contributions from the general public</p>
IR 2.1.2 Regulations for the National Forest and Wildlife Law (RLFFS in Spanish)	<p>Milestone 1: RLFFS proposal done by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 2: RLFFS proposal validated by the GI</p> <p>Milestone 3: RLFFS proposal receive commentaries and contributions of the general public</p> <p>Milestone 4: Consultation with Indigenous Populations (PPII) on RLFFS proposal</p>
IR 2.1.3 National institutions	<p>Milestone 1: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal done by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 2: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal validated by the GI</p> <p>Milestone 3: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal receive commentaries and contributions from key actors</p>
IR 2.1.4 Regional institutions	<p>Milestone 1: CIAM technical secretary strengthened, promote and assist technically processes of the regional forest reform</p> <p>Milestone 2: ARA proposal done by the technical team in each Amazon Regional Government</p> <p>Milestone 3: ARA proposal validated by the Regional Council in each Amazon Regional Government</p> <p>Milestone 4: ARA proposal receive commentaries and contributions from key actors in each Amazon Regional Government</p> <p>Milestone 5: ARA carrying out functions with instruments and a territorial management approach.</p>
IR 2.2.1 Strengthening at regional and national level of community forest management	<p>Milestone 1: Constitution of Regional Platforms led by the Regional Governments (San Martín, Amazonas, Ucayali and Selva Central) y the Amazon Macroregional Platform of Community Forest Management (CFM), led by MINAGRI, MINAM y CIAM</p> <p>Milestone 2: Concerted proposals from the CFM platforms, with technical assistance of the USFS/PFSI. CMF Regional platforms recognized by regional norms of the Regional Governments (Amazonas, Ucayali y San Martín)</p> <p>Milestone 3: Existence and permanent functional CFM offices at SERFOR and ARAs (San Martín, Ucayali y Amazonas)</p> <p>Milestone 4: CFM programs formulated and presented by Regional Governments or SERFOR (Amazonas y Selva Central)</p> <p>Milestone 5: CFM programs approved by the Regional Governments or SERFOR (Amazonas y Selva Central)</p>

RESULT 3: Natural resources information access should be improved, transparency should be promoted and natural resources management should be participative	
IR 3.1.1 Government of Peru implement the SNIFF-MC	<p>Milestone 1: Workplan elaborated by the GTT and approved by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 2: Process map elaborated and completed by the GTT y officially approved by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 3: Redesign of the complete map presented by the GTT and approved by the DGFFS. Prototype delivered by the USITT to the Government of Peru and implemented at least in one corridor by the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 4: SNIFF-MC Pilot</p> <p>Milestone 5: SNIFF-MC implemented at regional and national level and legal instruments approved to operatize the SNIFF-MC</p>
IR. 3.2.1 Legal framework development for SNIFF-MC and the Amazon Regional Governments implement Geospatial Information Repositories articulated at the national level	<p>Milestone 1: Identified initiative catalogue produced by USFS/PFSI, adopted and socialized by the MINAM (SINIA)</p> <p>Milestone 2: Concept document for the strengthening of the identified initiatives, presented for the approval of the DGFFS</p> <p>Milestone 3: Legal norms that approve the Geospatial Information Repositories. Norms database officially approved DGFFS and published in the website</p> <p>SINIA strategic plan prepared and presented for MINAM approval.</p> <p>Milestone 4: Integration of the most relevant initiatives to the SNIFF-MC through official agreements.</p>
RESULT 4: Capacity building for the sustainable management of forests in communities	
IR 4.4.1 Promotion of sustainable forest business in indigenous communities.	<p>Milestone 1: Forest inventories completed by the communities. PGMF and POAs of community forests approved by the forest authority (Amazonas).</p> <p>Milestone 2: Forest contracts subscribed between communities and buyers to sell POAs. Community Forest Management (CFM) Committees working, with Operation Book updated.</p> <p>Reduced impact forest extraction verified by the Committee.</p> <p>Milestone 3: Document of CFM experiences validated by the actors involved (Amazonas).</p> <p>Milestone 4: Norms, policies, and programs of the Regional Governments and SERFOR for the promotion of CFM include proposals of the experiences (Amazonas and the rest of the Amazon)</p>
IR 4.1.2 Strengthening at community level of indigenous community forest governance	<p>Milestone 1: Strategy to strengthen community forest governance, concerted and validated by the indigenous communities (Selva Central y Amazonas)</p> <p>Milestone 2: Pilot communities with forest zoning approved by the community assembly (Amazonas and Selva Central)</p> <p>Milestone 3: Pilot communities with internal forest use and management rules approved by the community assembly (Amazonas and Selva Central)</p> <p>Milestone 4: Pilot communities with internal rules for the administration, distribution and investment of the forest benefits approved by the community assembly (Amazonas y Selva Central)</p>

Source: USFS/PFSI's Performance and Monitoring Plan (PMP) 2012-2016.

EVALUATION METHODS & LIMITATIONS

The mid-term performance evaluation of USFS/PFSI will serve as an important input for its final evaluation. Since the project design employs qualitative milestones to define project objectives and does not define any quantitative indicators, the evaluation is based on qualitative data analysis. Data gathered in support of question 1 was vital to support the evaluation of question 2, and vice versa.

To address QUESTION 1, the analysis focuses on four intermediate results, namely: BPP inventories, national institutional strengthening, regional ARA creation and SNIFF-MC. Study tours are also an important subject to evaluate. The evaluation is based on information taken from a series of program documents as well as interviews with program managers. Researchers used this data to assess intermediate results milestones and the ‘attributes’ of key processes facilitated by the program. Program documents included the quarterly reports, study tour registers, the program results framework and program monitoring plan, and SNIFF briefs, among others. Researchers held interviews with the four project managers on several occasions at USFS/PFSI offices.

To address QUESTION 2, the research team employed a more complex analysis to populate the key GFI forest governance indicators on Coordination, Capacity and Transparency. The approach analyzed the information gathered during interviews with local partners and stakeholders at different levels regarding their participation, ownership and perceptions of the program.

The measurement of Forest Governance is the concept driving the evaluation design, as most of the activities that USFS/PFSI is carrying out are directly or indirectly related to it. Forest Governance can be understood as a multidimensional concept involving a diversity of actors, rules and practices that are inherently complex and interconnected.

Different frameworks or paradigms have been implemented to understand how forest governance should be evaluated and measured. This evaluation adopts the Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) framework, primarily because it includes a level of detail that lends itself to practical applications, such as this evaluation. Other frameworks, such as the one elaborated by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), were also considered. Dimensions in both frameworks were relatively similar. GFI, a global network of civil society organizations lead by the World Resources Institute, proposes a common definition and conceptual framework for understanding the meaning of good governance of forests across different country contexts. The Framework consists of key “principles” and “components”¹¹ that are used to define the good governance of forests, and a set of governance indicators, including diagnostic questions that assess the quality and adequacy of key aspects of governance.

The evaluation focuses on the three dimensions of forest governance most relevant to USFS/PFSI’s objectives: capacity, coordination and transparency. These dimensions are also main principles of the Forestry and Wildlife Law and the PNFFS, which highlight the importance of informed civil participation, integrated coordination and cooperation across related sectors, institutions and disciplines.

¹¹ The principles are transparency, participation, accountability, coordination and capacity. The thematic areas are forest tenure, land use, forest management, forest revenues, cross-cutting institutions and cross-cutting issues. (http://www.wri.org/sites/default/files/conducting_governance_assessment.pdf)

- *Capacity* refers to the government’s social, educational, technological, legal, and institutional ability to provide the public with access to participation in decision-making, as well as the ability of civil society to make use of such access. This includes the capacity of government and official institutions to act autonomously and independently, the availability of resources (both human and financial) to provide access, and the capacity of civil society (particularly NGOs and the media) to analyze the issues and participate effectively.
- *Coordination* refers to the extent to which various agencies and actors whose decisions impact upon forests are advancing common objectives. There are usually separate government agencies and authorities with oversight for forests, environment, land use, agriculture, infrastructure and general macroeconomic planning, respectively. Too often, there is a lack of coordination between these actors.
- *Transparency* is the process of revealing actions so that outsiders can scrutinize them. Facilitating access to quality information is critical in order to inform and engage public constituents. Attributes of transparency include the quality, timeliness, availability, and comprehensibility of information, and whether efforts are made to ensure information reaches and is used by affected and vulnerable groups, as appropriate.

The evaluation reviewed activities and collected data from a sample of five Amazonian regions: Amazonas, Loreto, Madre de Dios, San Martin and Ucayali. The evaluation team visited all of the regions. The evaluation utilized seven standardized interview guides to collect information in the selected regions. The guides included a list of open and closed questions focusing on: (1) respondent perceptions regarding forest governance issues; and, (2) respondent perceptions regarding their experience with USFS/PFSI. The standardized interview guides allowed evaluators to share the same interpretation of qualitative data on the three forest governance dimensions, in turn allowing for a systematic approximation of the different levels of capacity, coordination and transparency. Whenever appropriate, the guides differentiated between seven different types of respondents, all representatives of: the forest or environmental authority; the forest management team; the forest inventories and information system team; the land use planning team; the OSINFOR; the private sector, or a civil society organization.

Table 2: Interview sample at regional level

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	San Martin	Ucayali
Total	7	5	5	7	4
<i>Forest management in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
<i>Forest inventories in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES
<i>Information systems in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	NO	YES	NO	YES	
<i>Land use planning in Regional Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	YES	YES	NO	NO	
<i>OSINFOR – OD</i>	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=1	n=1
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	YES	NO		YES	YES
<i>Private Sector</i>	n=0	n=0	n=0	n=1	n=0
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities				YES	
<i>CSOs</i>	n=2	n=0	n=1	n=1	n=1
Familiar with USFS/PFSI activities	YES		YES	YES	YES

Four evaluators conducted the fieldwork between early October and the last week of November. The number of respondents in each region is showed in Table 2. The team completed 28 interviews at the regional level. Of these, six respondents had no knowledge of USFS/PFSI activities. Respondents from the forest management, forest inventories and information systems of the Forest Authority are considered direct USFS/PFSI counterparts. The remaining respondents are representatives of the forest sector that provide a better understanding of forest sector governance in Peru. While the latter group may know of USFS/PFSI work, they are not necessarily direct participants in USFS/PFSI activities. Therefore, some of these respondents were not able to provide information regarding USFS/PFSI contributions to sectoral governance. The same was true of some Forest Authority representatives in the Madre de Dios and Amazonas regions.

Managers from USFS/PFSI provided the evaluation team with a list of key actors in the regions. The evaluation team independently contacted and conducted interviews with respondents. No staff from PFSI participated in the interviews. The team first contacted the regional environmental or forest authority. Then, the team identified specific respondents from both governmental and non-governmental institutions to complete the other guides. The selection of respondents was made according to the particular organizational structure of the forestry regional authorities, which varied by region. Because the evaluation team needed to identify key informants during field visits, the evaluation team was not able to secure interviews with all civil society organizations (CSO) and private sector representatives, as they were not always available. In practice, the team was only successful in interviewing one private sector representative. However, the team was able to complete interviews other 'outsiders' from OSINFOR and civil society organizations, and, to further address potential bias, the team collected additional secondary information to complement and balance perspectives on the dimensions of forest governance.

First the evaluation reviews the status of forest governance in order to identify key changes and advances using secondary data sources and interview results. Key informant responses provide data for the measurement of governance in terms of the three dimensions of governance. The analysis is based on both rating scale scores supported by specific narrative data regarding existing levels of capacity, coordination and transparency.

The evaluation then considers the progress in meeting project results, or Milestones. Progress against milestones is presented with summary level information regarding project activities that have been implemented to achieve these milestones. Project documents and key personnel interviews provide the data regarding progress against milestones.

The findings conclude with an assessment of possible project contributions to the current status of forest sector governance in terms of the three dimensions of governance. Interview responses to open-ended questions, repondents' rating scale scores and secondary data provide the basis for this qualitative analysis.

The GFI methodology relies heavily on respondents' perceptions to assess forest governance indicators. Because respondent perceptions can be inaccurate, the evaluation team has used two approaches to control for inaccurate perceptions:

- The team has used complementary secondary information to support findings, whenever possible; and,
- The team has employed data triangulation to seek points of consensus from among a variety of respondents. By applying an extensive interview guides with precise questions to a variety of types of respondents (seven different categories) from a wide variety of sources (five different regions), the evaluation benefits from wide variability in responses. Within this variable set of

responses, the team analyzes the data to identify perceptions that are more widely shared to arrive at the most certain findings.

FINDINGS

This section presents results in two sub-sections. The first one refers to the current situation of forest governance in Peru and its main changes in the last years. The second sub-section presents progress in the achievement of USFS/PFSI milestones and reviews this progress in the context of USFS/PFSI activities and respondent's perceptions of the contribution that the program has made to the enhancement of forest governance in Peru.

The analysis is focused on the achievement of four main intermediate results and their milestones: BPP inventories, institutional strengthening (national level), creation and support of ARAs, and the SNIFF-MC. Across the analysis we embed the strategic role played by the study tours organized by USFS/PFSI.

PERUVIAN FOREST GOVERNANCE

The following presents a brief overview of the national and regional forest authorities, identifying their different organizational structures and functions. This is useful a contextual background and to validate the information based in perceptions used in the analysis of capacity, coordination and transparency. This is followed by a presentation of findings regarding the current status of each dimension of forest governance as well as some perceived changes in status over the last three years.

Currently the National Forest Authority is in transition from the former DGFFS to the recently enacted SERFOR. SERFOR is an autonomous technical institution that is administratively dependent on MINAGRI. Once implemented, SERFOR will become the national authority on forests and wildlife, assuming legislative, administrative, planning and supervising roles to ensure the sustainable use, conservation and protection of forest ecosystems. Among its main tasks are (Capella 2013):

- Establishing a new forest cadaster;
- Integrating with land use planning;
- Developing distinct modalities of access to forest resources;
- Moderning public forest sector management, and;
- Consolidating the transfer of forest management functions to sub-national governments.

Actions of SERFOR are based upon three pillars: *inclusion and engagement* through active participation of stakeholders at different levels, through its Board; *productivity and competitiveness* in support of legal forest activities including timber extraction, non-timber products management, ecosystem services, among others, through various General Directorates, especially the Dirección de Promoción y Competitividad; and *sustainability* through the application of scientific information applied by the Dirección de Gestión del Conocimiento (Schwartz 2013, Capella 2013).

Articles 19, 20 and 21 of the new Forest and Wildlife Law establish the Regional Government as the Regional Forest and Wildlife Authority (ARA). The Law also defines the Forest and Wildlife Management Unit, which is the regional territorial organization that manages and controls forest and wildlife resources within the delimited area under the administration of the Regional Government. Each Regional Government defines the geographical scope or area of these units.

Ultimately, the regional forest authority must conserve, protect and sustainably use and manage the regional forest patrimony. According to the new national regulation, these functions have to be applied through a decentralized system with strengthened regional forest authorities. In the case of the five Amazonian Regions included in this evaluation, forest management functions have been transferred, but

the level of implementation of regional authorities varies, as illustrated in Table 3. Some regions have already taken over forest management functions while others are still reliant on the National Authority.

San Martin has a well-funded and legally institutionalized ARA, and Amazonas and Ucayali established their own ARAs in 2013. In Madre de Dios the forest authority is still under the Regional Government, while Loreto’s forest authority is a special Regional Program, PRMRFFS (*Programa Regional de Manejo de Recursos Forestales y de Fauna Silvestre*). This variation in the level and form of regional governance provides a glimpse of the institutional challenges faced by the national forest authority and other stakeholders engaged on forest management issues.

TABLE 3 Amazonian Regional Forest Authorities

Region	Forest Authority	Creation since
Amazonas	ARA	2013
Loreto	PRMRFFS	2009
Madre de Dios	DRFFS	2012
San Martin	ARA	2010
Ucayali	ARA	2013

Source: fieldwork

The ARA framework allows for the development of decentralized authorities with the autonomy and mandate to perform broad forest management and land-use functions, i.e. establishing an integrated territorial management approach in place of stovepiped vertical management. Over time, they could develop into “Special Technical Offices” which would provide them technical, administrative and financial autonomy. Only San Martin, given its greater management capacity, has advanced significantly towards establishing an ARA of this type. Ucayali has taken a step in this direction with the establishment of its ARA and its work with international cooperation in elaborating proposed regulations and processes. However budget and political challenges have made the Ucayali ARA’s fate uncertain. In Loreto, lack of political support for the ARA model throws in doubt whether an ARA will be established in the near term, and in Madre de Dios instability in the public sector have frustrated efforts to advance regional natural resources management.

Forest Governance Dimension #1: Capacity

For the purposes of this analysis, capacity is understood principally as the degree to which an entity has access to the number and quality of specialists and the resources, such as budget, equipment, required to grant and supervise forest concessions, including field monitoring and control.

According to records, DGFFS had its lowest budget to date in 2013. At one point in the year, budget constraints were so tight that the institution was unable to pay salaries. The DGFFS shares a joint budget with INIA, Environment General Direction at MINAGRI, and Agrorural (as part of a *Programa Presupuestal* --results based budget). The budget lacks a unified strategic foundation, and is instead presented as a sum of initiatives from the four units rather than one integrated proposal. Proposed budget activities are not realistic, reportedly taking the approach that proposing as much as possible will increase the chances of receiving more funding. At the time of this report, the National Authority (DGFFS) was requesting a budget for 2014 that is nearly ten (10) times more than the one officially approved in the national budget

USFS/PFSI, through CIAM, has played a key role in promoting the involvement of regional authorities in a joint participatory budget planning process with CIAM, without visible results. The forest sector is not alone in facing budget ceilings that are far lower than institutional needs dictate, and the ARAs, lacking the status of executive agencies, have very little negotiating power. MINAM and other units have also

participated in the production of an integrated forest sector budget. There is currently a pilot to design and implement a new results-based budget for the fledgling SERFOR.

To date, the decentralization of forest authorities has structural problems in establishing adequate human resources for regional forest authorities. This owes to inadequate funding as well as the lack of an effective public servant policy and/or strategy in the forest sector.

Table 4 compares information regarding the actual and proposed level of resources at the regional forest authorities. Through CIAM, Amazonian Regional Governments have introduced a new budget proposal to address all of their requirements. This information provides a useful comparison between the actual and desired human resources available to regional forest management units and an indication of the gap between the needed and actual budget for these resources.

TABLE 4 Forest management human resources and budget gaps in the Amazonian regions

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
Number of workers at the regional forest unit	10	95	65	28	110
Proposed number (CIAM)	62	184	120	100	118
Total ordinary resources budget 2013	S/.621 600	n.a.	S/. 800 000	S/. 748 000	n.a.
Personnel proposed budget (CIAM)	S/. 785 600	S/. 2 558 000	S/. 1 630 400	S/. 1 344 400	S/. 1 552 000

Data Sources: CIAM forest budget proposal (2013) and GRADE fieldwork (2013)

The personnel deficits are stark in every case but that of the Ucayali authority. Even the oldest of the forest authorities, that of San Martin, would require 72 additional workers to reach full staffing levels, an increase of 250% over current staff level. The most critical case, in Amazonas, would require a greater than 500% increase over its current staff, while Loreto and Madre de Dios would need to almost double their current staff.

Reaching target staffing in the three severely understaffed regions is impossible where given current budget levels. To support only personnel, San Martin would need S/. 1 344 400, which is almost double the total current budget, as is the case in Madre de Dios. The Amazonas unit would need to expend almost its entire budget to reach target staff levels, leaving little for other costs.

Citing the lack of human capacity among regional authorities, the MINAGRI/DGFFS director explained that the decentralization process should not necessarily reduce human resources at the national level. While the regional authorities struggle to establish qualified and well-supported human resources, where there may be only one person working under very poor conditions responsible for a control checkpoint, national level capacity remains important. Since personnel turnover is considerably less at the national than the regional level, with specialists remaining in their positions an average of ten years, the retention of this essential group of forest management personnel could be vital during a period of relatively weak decentralized management.

Table 5 presents the scoring of perceptions regarding different aspects of capacity among members of the regional forest authorities regarding their own institution and unit. 'Human resources' summarizes three issues: quantity, quality and pertinence of the personnel. Values refer to the perception on how satisfactory

these levels are for their region, with one being very unsatisfactory and five very satisfactory. “Improvement distribution” refers to perceived changes in terms of the quantity, quality and relevance of human resources, with a score of one being a distribution much worse than three years ago, and five much better than three years ago. Scores for ‘equipment’, which refers to materials and technologies, and budget, referring to financial resources, measure perceived adequacy of these resources on a scale of one to five scale.

TABLE 5 Perceptions of capacity levels in the regions

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
<i>Forest management in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Human resources (*)	2.7	3	2	4	2.3
Improvement in distribution	3	5	n.a.	4	4
Equipment (**)	2.3	2	1	3	2.7
Budget	1	n.a.	1	3	2
<i>Forest inventories in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Human resources (*)	4	3.3	4	4	4
Improvement in distribution	3	4	4	4	4
Equipment (**)	3	2	1.7	3	2.3
Budget	3	2	2	3	1
<i>Information systems in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Human resources (*)	4.7	3.3	2.3	4	n.a.
Improvement in distribution	3	4	3	3	n.a.
Equipment(**)	1.3	2	2	2.3	n.a.
Budget	2	2	1	1	n.a.
<i>OSINFOR – OD¹²</i>	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=1	n=1
Human resources (*)	3	5	n.a.	3	4.5
Improvement in distribution	4	4	n.a.	4	3
Equipment (**)	4	2.5	n.a.	4	4.3
Budget	4	n.a.	n.a.	4	4

(*) Average perception of quantity, quality and relevance of human resources

(**) Average perception of equipment, information technologies and other technological resources

Source: Fieldwork - structured interviews (2013)

While there are exceptions from region to region, several points of consensus emerge:

- Forest authority respondents generally confirmed that their institutional budget was insufficient, and a majority felt access to equipment is inadequate to achieve their institutional mandate;
- Respondents of the inventory units regarded their units’ human resources capacity as being satisfactory or better;
- Forest Authority and inventory unit representatives perceived their human resources ‘distribution’ as having improved over the last three years;
- With one exception, respondents of information systems’ units also perceived their HR capacity as satisfactory, while holding a neutral opinion regarding improvements over the last three years;
- Respondents from OSINFOR – OD expressed overall satisfaction or better on each of the variables (with the exception of equipment in Loreto);

¹² OSINFOR-OD office in Tarapoto covers Amazonas and San Martin.

- Respondents from San Martin almost universally held satisfactory or better perceptions on all variables despite apparent human resources and budget shortages in the forest authority.

Another element that has great impact on the capacity dimension is perceptions of salary levels. Forest management offices were asked about their perception regarding their salaries. In all cases, respondents perceived salaries as insufficient. Low salaries hinder the recruitment of qualified personnel, exacerbate high turn-over, and more importantly, fail to provide an obstacle to corruption.

Respondents indicate that budget limitations and information technology shortcomings faced by local (regional) forest authorities will not allow full compliance with the forest management system's supervision and monitoring functions. Respondents provided details regarding equipment and budget needs, suggesting that units lack: software for spatial analysis; information technologies for registering data from the forest chain of custody; sufficient budgeting for field visits; and, enforcement mechanisms to prevent illegal activities.

Madre de Dios presents an especially unstable human resources environment with implications for the development of the forest authority and the forest management sector in general. All civil servants are hired as independent contractors, and therefore receive no social benefits. The region is maintaining a debt with some civil servants dating back to 2011. Job turnover is quite high, with personnel remaining in their positions for an average of only three months, changing when their director changes. This has contributed to an uneven acquisition of skills by the forest authority. Madre de Dios has not created its ARA and has not updated its management instruments¹³, and civil servants responded that they did not know how the process is progressing.

In Amazonas, stability and continuity among staff is also a problem. Only the general manager, the three directors and one administrative employee constitute permanent staff. In addition, high turnover is a constant threat to the retention of experienced personnel.

Forest Governance: Coordination

The following findings describe two aspects of the coordination dimension: inter-institutional coordination; and, policy coordination among relevant sector policies and especially between forest and land use planning policies.

At the national level, DGFFS needs to coordinate with institutions and organizations within the forest management sector, from other sectors, and at different territorial levels. Table 6 maps an array of different institutions in the forest sector that interviewees highlighted as their main counterparts in terms of information sharing and coordination. While this is a subset of all the institutions engaged in the sector, the volume and variety of actors prioritized by respondents illustrates the importance of establishing appropriate coordination mechanisms.

¹³ The three management instruments of Madre de Dios DRFFS (Reglamento de Organización y Funciones, Organigrama Estructural y Cuadro de Asignación de Personal) were approved on January 24, 2014.

Table 6: Forest Institutional coordination

<i>National public institutions (forest sector)</i>	<i>National public institutions (other sectors)</i>		<i>National CSO</i>	<i>National Private sector</i>
MINAGRI	MINCETUR	IIAP	SPDA	CFA
MINAM	PRODUCE	SUNAT	DAR	ESAN
OSINFOR	MEF	COFOPRI	WWF	
SERNANP	MINEM	ANP	AIDSESEP	
PNCB	MTC	SBS		
	MP-FN	INEI		
	MI	CEPLAN		
	PCM	CGR		
	DP	CR		
	OEFA	SUNARP		
<i>Regional public institutions (forest sector)</i>	<i>Regional public institutions (other sectors)</i>		<i>Regional CSO</i>	<i>Regional Private sector</i>
Regional government (forest authority) or ATTFS	Regional government (other sectors)		DAR	APROFU
CIAM	Police (FEMA)		SPDA	APROFORU
OSINFOR-OD	Prosecution (<i>Fiscalía</i>)		WWF	ACOFREL
	DICAPI		GIZ	AIMAL
	Universities		ITDG	ADRSAM
			IBC	Oil companies
			APECO	
			AIDER	
			CEDISA	
			CIMA	
			CCNN	
			associations	

Source: Fieldwork: Structured interviews (2013)

SNIFF is opening important spaces for interaction. Currently preparation and implementation is a catalyst, and when it is operational, the system will act as the main repository and provider of forestry relevant information for the sector. To advance the establishment of the SNIFF-MC, an “inter-institutional group” serves as a platform to coordinate SNIFF-MC activities among a large set of organizations engaged in the forest sector chain. Participating organizations include: ARAs, OSINFOR, MINAM/SERNANP/CITES, National Police, FEMA (Fiscalía Especializada en Materia Ambiental), SUNAT, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Defense, and SUNARP, among others.

Strategic budgeting has benefitted from the joint work of DGFFS, MINAGRI, regional forest offices, CIAM, and the Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF). Over the last year, these institutions have collaborated on a joint sector budget to serve as a results-driven and strategically justified proposal for funding forest sector management.

In 2013, the Regulation for Organization and Functions (ROF) of SERFOR provided opportunities to improve coordination mechanisms, but it also has limitations. The Board consists of twelve members representing regional governments, local governments, native communities, peasant communities, private sector, and NGOs. However, the regulation does not establish a specific coordination mechanism between SERFOR and the decentralized (and the few still centralized) regional forest authorities (Capella 2013).

TABLE 7 Perceptions of coordination levels

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
<i>Forest management in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Institutional coordination (*)	4.5	3	4.5	4.5	4
Policy coordination (**)	5	1.7	2.5	5	5
<i>Forest inventories in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Institutional coordination (***)	2.7	4	3.5	3.2	4.7
Policy coordination (**)	1	3	2.5	4.5	4
<i>Information systems in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Institutional coordination (***)	3.2	4	3.7	4	n.a.
Policy coordination (**)	3	3	3	3.5	n.a.
<i>Land use planning in Regional Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Institutional coordination (***)	5	3.7	4	4.2	n.a.
Policy coordination (**)	2	4	5	3	n.a.
<i>OSINFOR – OD</i>	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=1	n=1
Institutional coordination (***)	3.7	4	n.a.	3.7	4.2
Policy coordination (**)	1	3	n.a.	1	5

(*) Average perception of information response and information consolidation

(**) Average perception of participation in policymaking and land use planning

(***) Average perception of coordination mechanisms quality and clarity, information response and information consolidation

Source: Own elaboration from GRADE fieldwork (2013)

Table 7 presents a scoring of respondents' perceptions of the level of coordination among regional forest authorities. "Institutional coordination" refers to the perceived adequacy of coordination within and among regional actors, with level one indicating very inadequate coordination, and five as very adequate. This value is a composite indicator calculated from different coordination variables, including: quality and clarity of mechanisms respondents use to coordinate with other institutions and the speed and quality of response when respondents request information from other institutions.

"Policy coordination" is a composite indicator reflecting respondents' perception of their "participation in policy making" and "participation in land-use plans". Scores indicate the respondent's perceived level of participation: level one indicating very insufficient participation, and five indicating ample participation.

Forest authority and OSINFOR – OD respondents across regions indicated that communication and information exchange are adequate and frequent between institutions. However, their detailed responses indicate that in most cases coordination mechanisms are not sufficiently institutionalized.

Results suggest that OSINFOR is insufficiently involved in policy-making at a regional level. Respondents explained that participation is more frequent for representatives at their central office. Forest authority respondents indicate varied levels of participation in forest policy-making and land-use planning across regions, with Amazonas and Loreto participating less in their policy making and land use planning.

Coordination problems between the agrarian and forestry offices within MINAGRI are longstanding. In San Martin, land use planners coordinate with both and they try to keep both aligned. However, when planners request permission for land use changes (e.g. deforestation for developing a crop) coordination is not consistent. The concept of land use change is used differently in the forest normative framework

than in land use planning. In Ucayali, both offices coordinate more frequently at regional platforms, such as the REDD roundtable, and the technical commission for land use planning. In Madre de Dios, coordination is challenging. The agrarian office does not have the capacity to produce reliable information for the forestry sector. According to representatives from these two institutions, the use of unconsolidated information has led to several conflicts originating from overlapping land-use rights. In Amazonas, the forest office is disconnected from the land-use office. Their coordination is limited to written requests, normally to verify land titles in forestry concessions and protected areas.

In terms of policy coordination, while the creation of SERFOR establishes an entity with the mandate to articulate forest management processes with land-use planners, a territorial approach for land-use planning and decision-making is far from being achieved in most of the regions. There are still sectoral approaches towards land-use planning, despite regional and local participatory zoning efforts. While concepts described in norms and plans are often not shared, there are attempts to match the forest terms for the regional and local zoning process with the other related sectors. The exception is San Martín, where a strong effort by land-users to implement a land management plan (*política territorial*) in coordination with forest authorities may provide lessons for accomplishing the same in other regions.

Forest Governance: Transparency

The evaluation measures transparency in terms of two key issues: (1) the information available for forest management; and, (b) public access to information. As an indicator of the quality of information available, respondents provided their views on data available from BPP inventories. Table 8 presents the perceptions of representatives from the forest authority units in charge of BPP inventories and SNIFF-MC, i.e. Forest Inventories and Information Systems. To measure access to information, principal users of the information systems provided their perception on how complete and accessible the information is as well as the participation level of civil society in forest authority information system. Tables 9 and 10 present these findings. Structured interviews solicited more detailed information from respondents used to complement the tabular findings.

Each table presents values indicating respondents' level of agreement with desirable attributes of the tables' subject, i.e. information regarding forest inventories or public access to information. Values are presented on a rating scale, with a score of one indicating strong disagreement, and five indicating strong agreement.

TABLE 8 Perceptions of Forest inventories by representatives of Forest Authority Units

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
<i>Forest Authority Information Systems</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Inventories updated adequately	2	2	n.a.	2	n.a.
Responsible parties have adequate access to and mastery of IT	3	2	n.a.	3	n.a.
Effective clear methodologies	4	4	n.a.	4	n.a.
Clearly defined objectives	4	4	n.a.	4	n.a.
Mechanisms exist to use inventory data for decision-making	4	4	n.a.	3	n.a.
Inventories elaborated with or by local communities	n.a.	3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
<i>Forest Authority Forest Inventories</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Inventories updated adequately	4	2	5	1	5
Responsible parties have adequate access to and mastery of IT	2	2	1	4	3
Effective clear methodologies	n.a.	4	4	4	5
Clearly defined objectives	4	4	4	4	5
Mechanisms exist to use inventory data for decision-making	4	4	4	1	5
Inventories elaborated with or by local communities	2	3	4	4	5

Source: Fieldwork: Structured Interviews (2013)

Within forest concessions (timber and non-timber forest concessions), the concessionaires themselves undertake forest inventories as a prerequisite to developing their Forestry Management Plan (*Plan General de Manejo Forestal*) and the Annual Logging Plan (*Plan Operativo Anual*). New inventories for permanent production forests are being implemented by DGFFS and the respective Regional Authorities, but are not complete.¹⁴ Regarding these processes, respondents' answers coalesced on several points:

- Both groups across all regions perceive the new inventories as having clear objectives and up-to-date methodologies that are clearly described and well disseminated;
- Representatives from San Martin and Loreto maintain that inventories are not sufficiently updated in their areas;
- Respondents generally agreed that clear mechanisms exist to facilitate the use of forest inventory data in planning and decision-making processes; and,
- Respondents from the forest inventory units indicated that local communities are participating adequately in the design of forest inventories, with the exception of the inventory representative from Amazonas.

Respondents from Madre de Dios indicated several challenges to establishing reliable inventory data for decision support, a problem that is shared in other regions to differing extents. Authorities do not verify inventories carried out by concessionaires, leaving representatives of this office unsure if information regarding location and number of trees is correct. Explaining the low score on IT issues, the Madre de

¹⁴ This process is described in detailed in section Achievement of USFS/PFSI Intermediate Results Milestones.

Dios respondent indicated that concessionaires do not have the equipment required to share detailed inventory information. Finally, inventory information at regional level is not always consistent with data at the national level, a problem that appears to occur in most of the regions.

In Loreto, authorities reported conducting a pilot project to execute the inventory for the permanent productive forest in Ramon Castilla. With the new information, they have developed a proposal for a second round of granting new timber concessions.

TABLE 9 Perceptions of information systems by forest institutional information users

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
<i>Land use planning in Regional Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=0
Complete and reliable forest management information system	n.a.	4	1	3	n.a.
Public has access to systems	4	2	1	1	n.a.
Institution has civil participation and transparency mechanisms	4	4	5	4	n.a.
<i>Forest management in Forest Authority</i>	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1	n=1
Complete and reliable forest management information system	2	2	4	5	2
Public has access to systems	4	4	4	n.a.	3
Institution has civil participation and transparency mechanisms	5	n.a.	2	5	4
<i>OSINFOR – OD</i>	n=1	n=1	n=0	n=1	n=1
Complete and reliable forest management information system	3	4	n.a.	3	3
Public has access to systems	5	4	n.a.	5	5
Institution has civil participation and transparency mechanisms	5	4	n.a.	5	5

Source: Own elaboration from GRADE fieldwork (2013)

Regional representatives from the regional authorities' land use unit, forest management unit and from the decentralized OSINFOR offices provided data regarding the information system completeness, public access and their institution's civil participation mechanisms (Table 9).

Representatives from forest management often had a contrary view to that of their regional colleagues from the land use units, suggesting that information systems may currently be better suited to one unit's use than the other. Given that these respondents have different regional functions, it is not surprising that they would have divergent opinions on the adequacy of regional information systems. Representatives of OSINFOR – OD found the regional information systems met their needs.

Representatives from the land use unit judged public access to land use information as inadequate in Loreto, Madre de Dios and San Martin. In all other cases across all regions, other respondents felt public access to information was at least satisfactory, usually better, suggesting that there is reasonable access to forest management data from a supply-side perspective, but access to forest data for land-use planning lags.

All respondents asserted that their institutions have more than adequate ability to establish and operate citizen participation and transparency mechanisms, with the lone exception of the forest management representative from Madre de Dios.

In Madre de Dios, the region has coordinated directly with DGFFS to operate the Strategic Forest Information Center (CIEF) since about 2002. CIEF operates the database, which registers all data collected at control checkpoints from the timber and non-timber forest products chain of custody. In addition, CIEF provides information to any user that demands it. Representatives indicate that the information system itself is relatively adequate, but that important chain-of-custody processes are not clearly defined.

The representative in charge of the regional information system in San Martin argued that regional authorities do not recognize the information system’s importance. The informant cited numerous issues and made several suggestions for improvement. Among his concerns was the lack of institutional policies and procedures to guarantee that the quality of the forest information will be maintained, reviewed and updated. He also signaled several other challenges: system data must be consolidated from the local to the national level; administrative processes have not been updated in the last three years; and that system documentation was insufficient.

In Ucayali and in San Martin, there is a lack of cartographic datasets. Another problem is the mismatch with some information between the forest sector and the land titling institution (COFOPRI). It is critical that participants begin to work within the same spatial database system.

TABLE 10 Perceptions of information systems by CSOs

	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	SMartin	Ucayali
CSOs	n=2	n=0	n=1	n=1	n=1
Publicly available forestry information is complete	2	n.a.	2	2	2
Available forest inventories are complete and precise	3	n.a.	1	n.a.	2
Appropriate response time to information requests	1	n.a.	3	2	2
Information is available from local branch offices	1	n.a.	4	1	2

Source: Own elaboration from GRADE fieldwork (2013)

Contrary to their public counterparts, respondents from civil society organizations hold a more negative opinion regarding the transparency of forest information. Table 10 presents data from CSO respondents from four of the five regions. In general, respondents felt that publically available forestry and forest inventory information is not complete or adequate. And, while, the respondent from Madre de Dios indicated that local offices did provide information and respond in a timely manner, respondents from other regions found response times to be excessive and asserted that information is only available from central offices, not local public offices.

One key informant held that that civil society is relatively unfamiliar with the work carried by the SNIFF technical team, as there have been relatively few presentations made on the topic. There is a lack of public information regarding the level of investment made in its development and what it will cost to implement the system. Nor has it been made public how the system will integrate with regional governments and their information management and control policies. To date it is unclear whether the system can be implemented under the current schedule given the uncertainty regarding whether the existing system will be of use in the final iteration of SNIFF.

THE ROLE OF USFS/PFSI IN PERUVIAN FOREST GOVERNANCE

This section presents the current status of USFS/PFSI milestones and the steps that USFS/PFSI has taken to improve current forest governance situation in Peru, including its main contributions and potential shortcomings. The section first presents a review of the status of the project’s Intermediate Results Milestones. These milestones (listed in section II) were defined by USFS/PFSI in the project Performance and Monitoring Plan (PMP) 2012-2016. Following the milestone status review, the section presents an analysis of the role of USFS/PFSI has played in improving forest governance according to the forest governance dimensions, capacity, coordination and transparency, at different territorial levels.

Achievement of USFS/PFSIs’ Intermediate Results Milestones

The review of USFS/PFSI Intermediate Results Milestones summarizes information available in the PFSI Performance Monitoring Plan, program annual reports, and information collected from interviews with the program managers and the various project counterparts. Tables 11 – 14 each summarize the status of milestones for one select intermediate result. The third column shows the level of achievement, which could be “none achieved”, “in progress” or “complete”. In some cases milestones require completion in all five regions. In these cases, where some progress is observed, “in progress” and “complete” means that the milestone is in progress or complete in a subset of targeted regions, with these regions specified whenever possible.

IR 1.1.1 Permanent Production Forest (BPP) Inventories

TABLE 11 Progress on IR 1.1.1 Milestones: BPP Inventories progress

Intermediate Results	Milestones	Level of Achievement
IR 1.1.1 Permanent Production Forest (BPP in Spanish) Inventories	Milestone 1: conceptualization of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments	<i>Complete:</i> Loreto, San Martin & Ucayali <i>In Progress:</i> M.de Dios
	Milestone 2: planning of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.	<i>Complete:</i> Loreto, San Martin & Ucayali <i>In Progress:</i> M.de Dios
	Milestone 3: design of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.	<i>Complete:</i> Loreto, San Martin & Ucayali <i>In Progress:</i> M.de Dios
	Milestone 4: implementation of BPP inventories done by the DGFFS and Amazonian Regional Governments.	<i>In progress:</i> Loreto, San Martin & Ucayali
	Milestone 5: processed, analyzed, and systematized information from the BPP inventories contribute the SNIFF-MC	<i>In progress:</i> Loreto

The implementation of BPP inventories began as an initiative between the Regional Government of Loreto and DGFFS, with continuous support from USFS/PFSI. In 2010, DGFFS organized several USFS/PFSI-supported meetings and workshops with regional governments and other relevant actors to plan and discuss inventory field methodologies. In 2011, the project supported DGFFS to elaborate a first draft of a new inventory methodology manual before implementing a pilot inventory with the Regional Forest Program of Loreto. The pilot encompassed BPP zones 7 and 8, two highly vulnerable forests with extensive borders along the Amazon River. In addition to validating the new inventory manual, the Loreto pilot

tested the effectiveness of new information gathering equipment. The workshops and pilot concluded in the approval of the first manual for the Planning and Execution of Forest Inventories, by Ministerial Resolution AG 0172-2012. This manual represents a major advancement towards completion of Milestones 1 to 3, including the conceptualization, planning and design of the BPP inventory, and for Loreto, it signaled the completion of these milestones.

After the Loreto experience, the San Martin and Ucayali authorities expressed their interest in implementing productive forest inventories in their regions. This interest is the main reason these regions were selected for intervention. At the end of 2013, Madre de Dios authorities also expressed interest in implementing forest inventories for their BPP.

None of these regions have finished applying the BPP inventory. Loreto is about to complete the database for the pilot program. San Martin and Ucayali are working on inventory implementation. Both regions have worked on their methodologies, including inventory planning, design and implementation, all of which are found in preliminary documents that have not been officially approved yet. In 2013, Ucayali gathered data from 70% of their sample units and San Martin gathered data from 25%. Ucayali and San Martin adapted the Manual to their specific needs. Ucayali is including new variables related with wildlife and forest carbon sequestration. San Martin has also added these variables as well as landscape aesthetics. DGFFS is planning to adapt the Manual to include these new variables based on a multipurpose approach, rather than only focusing on timber concessions.

USFS/PFSI most important activities supporting these advances have included: support for the completion and approval of the first inventory manual; completing the Loreto pilot inventory; the provision of technical assistance by USFS experts; support for a study tour to introduce forest inventory and analysis methods and field training; and, development of communication plans and strategies for stakeholder outreach.

An important external factor influencing the inventory process has been the difficulty and importance of ensuring social acceptance of the BPP inventory process given the diverse interests at play. To facilitate broad consensus and buy-in, USFS/PFSI is supporting the development of communication plans from the beginning of each process.

IR 1.1.2 Technical Support for the National Forest Inventory (INF)

USFS/PFSI is a member of the Technical Support Group for the national inventory, which is led by MINAGRI and MINAM with substantial support from FAO/Finland. The USFS/PFSI local team assisted in the planning and design of the national forest inventory (INF). In June 2013 the INF project published a preliminary version of its proposed methodology.¹⁵ USFS/PFSI also supported the participation of international experts in inventory design workshops and meetings. In 2013, USFS/PFSI organized a data processing workshop led by USFS and FAO inventory specialists, which consolidated existing data from previous inventories in Ucayali and Loreto. Finally, USFS/PFSI has been collaborating on the standardization of methodologies for collecting forest carbon data. The Milestones for this result are all related to the BPP inventories, and are therefore unrelated to the result itself.

¹⁵ DGFFS has included in its webpage of the National Forest Inventory (INF) a Manual for the Design and planning of Inventories dated June 2013 that acknowledges PFSI support.
(<http://www.inf.gob.pe/index.php/recursos/documentos-generados/viewcategory/76-metodologia>)

IR 1.1.3 Population studies

In 2011, USFS/PFSI provided technical assistance for the development of tools to support learning more about the distribution and frequency of CITES species in the Peruvian forests. Experts from the USFS Remote Sensing and Application Center (RSAC) and the Northern Research Station provided hands-on technical assistance and assisted in the assessment and preliminary planning for tool development with functionaries from MINAM, UNALM and the DGFFS. This collaboration produced a needs assessment, a general plan, and the delivery of training on methodologies and specific data assessment tools. In the following years, USFS/PFSI did not report activities on this topic. As no activities are ongoing, it is not clear whether the milestones will be achieved.

IR 1.2.1 Technical Support to Forest Laboratories

In 2013, USFS/PFSI supported an exchange on research methods and quality standards with the Center for Wood Technology Innovation (CITE Madera- Ministry of Production) and national universities (UNALM, UNU, UNAP) as part of an effort to promote biodiversity conservation and strengthen the wood products sector in Peru. In addition, the project supported a two-month apprenticeship at the FPL for a CITE Madera lab technician and organized a study tour for CITE Madera and Peruvian universities lab specialists. Milestone 1, “Training on research protocols of forest products” has been achieved, but 2, “Development of tools for economic evaluation of forest products” and 3, “Research methodologies and protocols of timber properties” are pending.

IR 2.1.1 National Forest and Wildlife Policy; IR 2.1.2 Regulations for the National Forest and Wildlife Law; and, IR 2.1.3 National institutions

TABLE 12 Progress on IR 2.1.1 – 2.1.3 Milestones: PNFFS, RLFFS and National Institutions

Intermediate results	Milestones	Level of achievement
IR 2.1.1 National Forest and Wildlife Policy (PNFFS in Spanish)	Milestone 1: PNFFS proposal elaborated by the DGFFS	<i>Complete</i>
	Milestone 2: PNFFS proposal validated by the GI	<i>Complete</i>
	Milestone 3: PNFFS proposal receive commentaries and contributions from the general public	<i>Complete</i>
IR 2.1.2 Regulations for the National Forest and Wildlife Law (RLFFS in Spanish)	Milestone 1: RLFFS proposal done by the DGFFS	<i>Complete</i>
	Milestone 2: RLFFS proposal validated by the GI	<i>Complete</i>
	Milestone 3: RLFFS proposal receive commentaries and contributions of the general public	<i>In progress</i>
	Milestone 4: Consultation with PPII on RLFFS proposal	–
IR 2.1.3 National institutions	Milestone 1: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal done by the DGFFS	<i>In progress:</i> SERFOR
	Milestone 2: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal validated by the GI	<i>In progress:</i> SERFOR
	Milestone 3: SERFOR/CONAFOR/SINAFOR proposal receive commentaries and contributions from key actors	<i>In progress:</i> SERFOR

USFS/PFSI’s counterparts have made significant progress completing Peru’s complex reforms of the forestry sector, as highlighted by the Ministry of Agriculture’s approval and publishing of the first National

Forestry and Wildlife Policy; the approval and publishing of the first public draft of the National Forest and Wildlife Law regulations; the design and implementation of a web-based public participation input system; and the creation of SERFOR. USFS/PFSI support to this reform includes:

- Discreet technical assistance provided through international experts, local team members
- Local consultants providing trainings, direct technical assistance and document review in areas of natural resource management;
- Logistical support for public events and working meetings;
- Technical assistance related to public policy development process; and
- Technical and operational functions that provide a forum for the development and consolidation of macro-regional environmental strategies among the Amazonian regional governments.

All of the USFS/PFSI National Forest and Wildlife Policy milestones have been met. Between 2009 and 2010, the DGFFS made a strong effort to elaborate a PNFFS proposal. Between November and December 2012, the DGFFS and the Intergovernmental Group¹⁶ completed and validated the proposal. DGFFS registered all of PNFFS workshops and meetings as well as the related contributions received from USFS/PFSI. In 2013, the proposal received commentaries and contributions from the general public (e.g., AIDSESP, CONAP), and was presented in Ucayali, Piura, Arequipa, Madre de Dios and Satipo¹⁷. The ministerial council approved the policy in August 2013.

The proposal for National Forest and Wildlife regulations was officially published in September 2013. Publishing of the regulations followed a consensus building and proposal strengthening process that included several macro-regional workshops and working group meetings on timber concessions where members of the GI validated the proposal. The proposal is still in the public commentary period. Regional workshops and trainings play the role of boosting public understanding about the law and regulations while serving as a conduit for contributions to improve them. Milestones 1 and 2 have been met, while milestone 3 is in progress.

SERFOR, SINAFOR and CONAFOR were created with the approval of the new National Forest and Wildlife Law N° 29763 in 2011. In July 2013, the Council of Ministers approved and published the Regulation for Organization and Functions (ROF) of SERFOR. Since these institutions, and their regulations, need the approval of the National Forest and Wildlife regulations to initiate operations, completion of the Milestones remains pending. Despite the pending approvals, the new national forestry law, policy and regulations are three key policy and governance instruments that enhance forestry governance as articulated in the USFS/PFSI strategy.

¹⁶ The Intergovernmental Group (GI) is lead by DGFFS and includes MINAM, MINCETUR, MINCULT, PRODUCE, OSINFOR and the Regional Governments.

¹⁷ These workshops were supported by Peru Bosques. In Ucayali, the meeting used the space of the Community Forest Managemnet (CFM) Regional Platform.

IR 2.1.4 Regional institutions

TABLE 13 Progress on IR 2.1.4 Milestones: Regional Institutions

Intermediate results	Milestones	Level of achievement
IR 2.1.4 Regional institutions	Milestone 1: CIAM technical secretary strengthened, promote and technically assist regional forest reform processes	<i>In progress</i>
	Milestone 2: ARA proposal done by the technical team in each Amazon Regional Government	<i>Complete:</i> Amazonas, San Martin, Ucayali and Madre de Dios
	Milestone 3: ARA proposal validated by the Regional Council in each Amazon Regional Government	<i>Complete:</i> Amazonas, San Martin and Ucayali <i>In progress:</i> Madre de Dios
	Milestone 4: ARA proposal receives commentaries and contributions from key actors in each Amazon Regional Government	<i>Complete:</i> Amazonas, San Martin and Ucayali
	Milestone 5: ARA with instruments with a territorial management approach to operate its functions.	<i>In progress:</i> San Martin, Amazonas, and Ucayali

USFS/PFSI provided funding for the operations of the Interregional Council of the Amazon (CIAM) Secretariat to support a range of activities headlined by technical assistance for the creation and strengthening of Regional Environmental Authorities (ARAs) as Specialized Technical Organizations within the framework of decentralization. This support included the development and implementation of an ARA workshop for the Amazonian regional governments held in San Martin. USFS/PFSI continues to support CIAM in facilitating the development of autonomous territorial ARAs. To achieve this, CIAM has created a work group with the regional natural resource management authorities to promote the formulation of ARAs with similar institutional arrangements as that of San Martin.¹⁸ The project's strategic approach to completing Milestone 1 includes:

- The creation of the Regional Spatial Data Infrastructure (IDER) in five regions for regional – level information management (this also supports SNIFF, which is led by DGFFS);
- Promoting an understanding of community forest management as a viable option for sustaining forests through one national and five regional forums and the design of the local forest and concession model under the forestry law regulation framework;
- Prioritization of a forest resource planning initiative as a key instrument for natural resource management and a complement to the permanent productive forest inventories led by DGFFS;
- Coordinating the participation of regional governments in the Intergovernmental Group and the thematically organized technical working groups in order to strengthen the forest sector reform process within the framework of the draft forest and wildlife law regulations.

Amazonas, San Martin and Ucayali have achieved milestones 2, 3 and 4, while milestone 5 is in process. Madre de Dios has established the technical team and working group to create the ARA. The team has completed the proposal but the working group has not yet approved it. Therefore, Milestone 2 has been achieved and milestone 3 and 4 are pending.

¹⁸ Amazonia. Vale un Peru – Working Document. CIAM, 2012

The creation of or strengthening the ARAs was a focus of USFS/PFSI support, and aside from its support to CIAM, the project has directly supported some of the regional efforts. The Amazonas and Ucayali ARAs were established in 2013. In Ucayali, the technical team formed to create the ARA proposed a structural change in the ARA organization. The regional council validated the proposal and international cooperative organizations provided commentaries, paving the way for the approval of a regional norm creating the ARA (OR N° 001-2013-GRU-CR) in February 2013. USFS/PFSI provided technical assistance in the elaboration and validation of three internal management instruments for the ARA in Ucayali: Regulations for Organization and Functions, Organization and Functions Manual and Personnel Budget. These instruments are currently in a final review stage.

USFS/PFSI is providing ongoing technical assistance for the creation of the ARA in Madre de Dios. In 2013, Madre de Dios installed a regional working group and a technical team to work on the proposal for the creation and implementation of the ARA. The Natural Resources Manager from the Regional Government promotes the initiative, but the Forest Director does not. A consultant has delivered an ARA proposal, but it remains under revision by the regional working group.

IR 2.2.1 Strengthening at regional and national level of Community Forest Management (CFM)

USFS/PFSI continued to provide support and facilitation to the National CFM Platform and the four Regional CFM Platforms in San Martín, Selva Central, Ucayali and Amazonas. In 2013 the regional governments of Ucayali and Amazonas passed legislation governing the creation and functioning of their regional platforms. With the passage of this legislation, it would appear that Milestone 1 was achieved. However, project documents do not confirm whether this is the case. There is no information regarding any concerted proposals produced by the CFM platforms, however in Amazonas FUNDECOR produced two proposals regarding CFM leaders' development and forest monitoring. USFS/PFSI continued to provide technical support to the CFM offices in DGFFS and the regional governments of Ucayali and San Martín, and the program collaborated in the creation of a CFM office in Amazonas.

IR 3.1.1 The Government of Peru implements the SNIFF-MC

TABLE 14 Progress on IR 3.1.1 Milestones: The Government of Peru implements the SNIFF-MC

Intermediate result	Milestones	Level of achievement
IR 3.1.1 Government of Peru implement the SNIFF-MC	Milestone 1: Work Plan elaborated by the Technical Working Group (GTT) and approved by the DGFFS	Complete
	Milestone 2: Process map elaborated and completed by the GTT and officially approved by the DGFFS	Complete
	Milestone 3: Redesign of the complete map presented by the GTT and approved by the DGFFS. Prototype delivered to the Government of Peru and implemented at least in one corridor by the DGFFS	In progress
	Milestone 4: SNIFF-MC Pilot	--
	Milestone 5: SNIFF-MC implemented at regional and national level and legal instruments approved to operatize the SNIFF-MC	--

The SNIFF is a natural resources information platform that has complete support from all of the forest management stakeholders concerned about illegal logging, from the public and private sectors and from national and international institutions. Despite this overwhelming concensus and high levels of technical and financial assistance over the last few years, the sector has not succeeded in producing a functioning

system capable of generating transparent information for its users or guarantee the legality of forest products being used nationally and exported abroad.

DGFFS has made advancements in the design and development of a national forestry information system, including completion of milestones 1-2, but the initiative has not advanced into the implementation stages. DGFFS, in collaboration with the Technical Working Group (GTT), has published a conceptual document including an implementation and working plan for the construction and monitoring of the control module (SNIFF-MC). Between 2010 and 2011, the GTT elaborated and validated a process map identifying the current forest and wildlife control mechanisms. DGFFS published the process map whose final version includes 9 stages, 1,725 activities, 47 independent processes and 60 roles. Since then, the working group has completed a re-design of the process map that has received the consensus of the inter-institutional working group (GTI), a collection of representatives from 18 institutions relevant to the forest sector, including national and regional forest authorities. While the redesigned process map remains to be published, DGFFS has published a record of all the meetings organized to present and validate the redesign results for each stage.

USFS/PFSI played an active role in the SNIFF-MC design and redesign process. USFS/PFSI support for SNIFF-MC also resulted in designing, developing and implementing a prototype of the control module to validate the information system concept, validate processes in the field and acquire consistent feedback in a real-world environment: the timber corridor from Loreto to Lima, one of Peru's most complicated. USFS/PFSI supported training through study tours and socialization among stakeholders.

IR 4.4.1 Promotion of sustainable forest business in indigenous communities, and IR 4.1.2 Strengthening at community level of indigenous community forest governance

USFS/PFSI supported systematization of the project "Improving the Sustainability of Forests and Livelihoods of Amazon Communities through the Strengthening of Natural Resource Enterprises and Community Forest Management Capacities", implemented by FUNDECOR. The systematization document is a useful tool that highlights the key lessons learned and recommendations resulting from this experience. Likewise, as a result of the project "Sharing Knowledge to Strengthen CFM in Selva Central", implemented by local NGO Sociedad Peruana de Ecodesarrollo (SPDE) in cooperation with the Peruvian Confederation of Amazonian Nations (CONAP), new conceptual and methodological instruments for capacity-building and promotion of community forest governance are available. A result of this project was the elaboration of a strategy in Selva Central to improve CFM governance.

Milestones achievement mainly focuses on the Amazonas region, where FUNDECOR has worked with 3 indigenous communities. USFS/PFSI has initiated funding for a new project with the Regional Government of Amazonas and the ARA implemented by *Soluciones Prácticas*. The project will continue work on community forest management in the province of Condorcanqui. The main goal of this project is formulate public policies regarding CFM, establish a CFM program within the unit of the ARA in Condorcanqui, and strengthen the CFM Platform in Amazonas.

Contribution of USFS/PFSI in Peruvian Forest Governance

The following paragraphs present respondents' responses regarding the role and contribution of USFS/PFSI in advancing the capacity, coordination and transparency dimensions of forest governance.

Perceptions regarding contributions to Capacity Building

Respondents identified study tours as the single most important USFS/PFSI activity contributing to building capacity among their institutions. The project has completed a total of fifteen (15) study tours to date. Table 15 presents the date, location and subject of each tour.

Table 15 USFS/PFSI Study Tours Topics and Destinations

Study tour	Location, Year
1. Information systems	Minneapolis, 2011
2. Indigenous representatives	Washington DC, 2011
3. CIAM	Washington DC, 2011
4. CITE Madera	Madison, 2012
5. BPP Inventories	Knoxville, 2012
6. Indigeneous Forest Management	Washington DC, Wisconsin, 2012
7. Community Forest Management	Panamá, Guatemala, 2012
8. SNIFF Pilot	Washington DC, 2012
9. SNIFF-MC Prototype	Washington DC, 2012
10. Forest Inventories and Analysis	Baltimore, 2012
11. Improvement of SNIFF-MC Prototype	Washington DC, 2013
12. Use and processing of Forest Inventories Information	Saint Paul, Minnesota, 2013
13. Forest Products Laboratory	Madison, 2013
14. Forest Management	Wisconsin, 2013
15. Wildlife Management	Massachusetts, 2013

Source: USFS/PFSI project documents (2013)

At the national level, 16 professionals from MINAGRI and DGFFS participated in 8 of the 15 study tours organized by USFS/PFSI. These study tours focused on SNIFF-MC and BPP inventories. USFS/PFSI worked with participating organizations to define study tour topics. USFS/PFSI prepared ideal participant profiles and selected applicants that best match the profile. The National Forest Authority representatives value these study tours and believe that, while some personnel are lost to turn-over, the knowledge and skills developed by the study tours contributed to making these professionals more effective in the public sector and the private sector. USFS/PFSI also included professionals from MINAM and CITEMadera, who participated on various Tours on information systems, community forest management, wildlife management and forest products laboratories.

Table 16 Participants from the forest sectors in USFS/PFSI study tours

	Number of participants	Number of study tours
MINAGRI-DGFFS	16	8
R.G. Loreto	13	9
R.G. San Martin	9	6
R.G. Ucayali	9	8
CIAM	5	4
R.G. Amazonas	5	3
R.G. Madre de Dios	2	1
Indigenous representatives (individuals, CCNN, associations, etc.)	20	4
CITEMadera	10	2
Public Universities	8	3
NGOs	6	2
MINAM-Perú-Bosques-IIAP	5	3
FAO	1	1
TOTAL	108	15

Source: Data summarized from USFS/PFSI project documents (2013)

USFS/PFSI is recognized as playing an active role in capacity building by respondents from Loreto, San Martin and Ucayali. Study tours and other activities played a much smaller role in Amazonas and Madre de Dios, and respondents did not recognize or assign a value to the contribution of USFS/PFSI on capacity building.

Respondents from forest inventory teams claimed that USFS/PFSI activities have contributed to their skill sets. The team representatives claim to have learned the most from USFS/PFSI interventions on the topics of inventory design, planning, and variable selection as well as evaluation methodologies.

A total of 13 professionals from the regional government of Loreto participated in study tours on SNIFF-MC and forest inventories. Moreover, respondents named various activities as being of high capacity building value, including: internships to Moyobamba (San Martin) to learn about the functioning of the ARA in that region; training on administrative issues when these functions were transferred from the national to the Regional Government; SNIFF process mapping; and, the new methodologies for the pilot inventory work in Ramon Castilla. They also expressed high regard for a high-level USFS/PFSI expert with whom they interacted. However, they identified ongoing problems establishing adequate access to equipment, which they felt would limit the application of new skills and knowledge of new methodologies.

From the regional government of San Martin, nine representatives attended six different study tours on diverse topics. The forest inventories team participated in a study tour in Minnesota on data processing for forest inventories. This team also indicated they had received strengthening of skills for developing general planning (of forest inventories) and forest management. Responses from the information system team and document review made it clear that the team members have not participated in any proper trainings or study tours. From San Martin, only ARA directors participated in one general study tour on information systems. The information systems team did, however, participate in workshops regarding SNIFF, where they were able to interact with other regional representatives. In general, representatives from San Martin indicated that the most relevant PFSI-supported trainings dealt with community forest management, decision-making and data processing. The forest authority representatives stated that the topics he found most relevant and instructive were from experts addressing new technologies and decision-making processes. Respondents in San Martin reported that, although trainings on community

forest management have been carried out, the Community Forest Management office has not been created.

From the regional government of Ucayali, nine representatives attended eight different study tours on forest inventories, the SNIFF-MC prototype, and others. Personnel in charge of forest inventories indicated that a study tour regarding forest inventory data processing and use had strengthened their technical capacities in forest inventories. Besides this tour, the three most relevant trainings were related to historic deforestation mapping in Ucayali, the regulations for the National Forest and Wildlife Law, and land-use planning. Respondents also reported learning a great deal through interactions with experts on forest information, control, and traceability. In Ucayali, respondents confirmed that they had received training from experts on the topic of community forest management, and that they had found this useful to create a platform to strengthen CFM.

In Amazonas, although employees participated in study tours, they were not able to identify the contribution of USFS/PFSI in the capacity building within the ARA. They stated that they did not receive any training and only interacted with USFS/PFSI through planning meetings. The respondents listed planning and decision-making skills and processes as the most important thing they have learned from expert technical assistance.

In San Martin and Ucayali, OSINFOR representatives explained that they are under the impression that they are receiving trainings from USFS/PFSI through the budget of the OSINFOR central office, when the funding presumably comes from USFS/PFSI.

Respondents varied in their perception of how they shared new skills and knowledge with their teams and in their institutions. In San Martin and Ucayali, trainees reported using mechanisms to share new knowledge with the rest of their team. In Madre de Dios, the director (who has since been replaced) did not share information and skills received from trainings with team members, resulting in the USFS/PFSI experiences ending with the director. An international conservation NGO representative explained that USFS/PFSI could coordinate trainings with other directors, but the (now former) director was simply not interested.

While the capacity building through study tours and trainings are highly valued by their participants, it is impossible to determine the degree that these have contributed to the capacity of their corresponding institutions and organizations with available information, nor how they contribute to the project milestones and improvements in forest governance.

Perceptions regarding contributions to Coordination

The diversity and breadth of institutions and stakeholders that participate in natural resource management makes the creation and promotion of coordination spaces and mechanisms a high priority. This is all the more true in the current context of decentralization, during which sector governance is expected to transform into integrated territorial natural resource management.

An important advancement towards achieving forest inventories is the “Saint Paul Declaration”, an agreement to standardize and systematize methodologies for the design and implementation of inventories and data processing. The participants from the national authority and the representatives from the regions of Loreto, San Martin and Ucayali signed this declaration after a study tour in Minnesota. Respondents from San Martin and Ucayali validated the importance of this agreement and valued highly the USFS/PFSI-promoted articulation of different actors for the standardization of criteria for the measurement of commercial tree species.

USFS/PFSI facilitated the coordination and participation of the regional and national forest authorities in establishing the processes for undertaking new forest inventories. Regional authorities expressed understanding of the important role of inventories in making information available for decision-making and implementing adequate information systems and identified USFS/PFSI technical and logistical support as important contributors to this process. The creation of the regional technical group was important for planning the execution of the inventories, given that a single institution is not able to plan and coordinate all activities.

Although an FAO representative has participated in one USFS/PFSI study tour, in general, inventory activities implemented and/or promoted by USFS/PFSI, like the pilot BPP in Loreto, are weakly articulated with national initiatives like the National Forest Inventory project funded by FAO-Finland.

At the national level, USFS/PFSI has facilitated coordination between relevant authorities (MEF, MINAGRI, MINAM, CIAM, and Regional Governments) to work jointly towards the formulation of a forest sector budget, a goal that has not yet been achieved.

At the regional level, as with the capacity dimension, respondents of Loreto, San Martin and Ucayali named and assigned more value to the contribution of USFS/PFSI towards coordination than respondents from other regions. Authorities in Amazonas and Madre de Dios claimed little knowledge of USFS/PFSI activities in their respective regions.

In Loreto, USFS/PFSI is facilitating the joint field inspections with OSINFOR and DGFFS. The land-use planning representative recognizes the role of USFS/PFSI in establishing the inter-institutional exchange for the consolidation of the Regional Spatial Data Infrastructure.

In San Martin, the information system respondent credited USFS/PFSI support as improving coordination of the SNIFF processes mapping. The same respondent commented that the most successful experience with USFS/PFSI was the interaction with other regions to solve problems regarding the legal understanding of different processes.

In Ucayali, respondents recognized and valued USFS/PFSI facilitation of spaces for inter-institutional exchange. This has helped authorities to make decisions and commitments, such as the establishment of Ucayali's ARA. In addition, respondents indicated that general recognition of the value of this inter-institutional coordination had raised the possibility of securing additional institutional resources to increase personnel travel to the field (and to other regions).

Perceptions regarding contributions to Transparency

OSINFOR respondents highlighted the role of USFS/PFSI in strengthening the forest normative process by supporting the creation of a website that will collect comments and opinions regarding the National Forest and Wildlife Law regulations. Respondents from OSINFOR-Ucayali did value USFS/PFSI support for the SNIFF process.

Regional technical teams recognize that USFS/PFSI has collaborated with them on the important task of maintaining community awareness of the forest inventory process. USFS/PFSI supported efforts to improve social acceptance of forest inventories through communications activities cultivating a welcoming environment for local communities' participation in socialization and other public events.

Some regional respondents did not perceive USFS/PFSI as contributing towards more transparent forest institutions. The respondents clearly associated transparency with the SNIFF process but consider transparency as insufficient because the SNIFF is not yet implemented. Respondents viewed the application of new technology in tracing forestry products as the most important SNIFF process. After having participated in the SNIFF-MC redesign process and work planning, respondents are anxious regarding delays in reaching a political decision to fully support implementation and they are concerned about the amount of time the implementation of the system will take. Some respondents valued the role of USFS/PFSI in opening spaces to interact with other regions and exchange knowledge about the process to build the SNIFF.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions are presented with the evaluation questions.

ACHIEVEMENT OF USFS/PFSI' INTERMEDIATE RESULTS MILESTONES

USFS/PFSI is working closely with the national and regional forest authorities on a variety of processes to consolidate forest governance in Peru. Available information indicates that the achievement of milestones differs considerably among and within intermediate results. There is less substantial documented activity and progress under several intermediate results, including: national forest inventories, community forest management platforms, and the promotion of sustainable forest business in indigenous communities. The evaluation findings document work and milestone status for the results where the project concentrated its efforts: BPP inventories, ARA creation, PNFFS, SERFOR, and SNIFF-MC.

Project documentation does not provide a strong basis for determining whether advances in meeting project milestones are meeting expectations. The achievement of milestones is not associated with deadlines, prohibiting a discussion of whether progress is running behind expectations or whether the project is in a position to achieve remaining milestones over the remaining implementation period. Regional milestones are highly dependent on the policy and political environment as well as their individual capacities. Finally, milestones linked to political processes and the establishment of institutions do not have a defined implementation period.

Highlights of USFS/PFSI achievements are the successful adaptation of new methodologies for inventories (the BPP in the Loreto Region) taking into consideration specific problems at the local level, the new “process map” for the design and implementation of SNIFF (strengthening inter regional and inter institutional coordination) and the establishment of ARAs in three of the Amazonian Regions, including a revised description of functions and regulations

What are the main external drivers and constraints underlying USFS/PFSI performance?

The lack of capacity described by respondents at regional and national levels represents the most important external constraint on the project's success. Despite some improvements over the last three years, human resources, available equipment and budget are all insufficient in quantity and quality, especially among regional authorities expected to lead forest management into the future. Budget constraints and personnel turnover are underlying factors that explain persistent low capacity among regional forest authorities.

The program's strong focus on building capacity through trainings and study tours is particularly vulnerable to the high turnover rates and lack of supporting resources at the regional authorities. There is no capacity building plan, either internally for the national forest authority, or externally for forest stakeholders. Trainings are demand driven, and are highly valued, but they do not form part of a strategic plan for improving forest sector capacity levels. The lack of a strategic capacity building plan exacerbates the weakness in linking project activities with results. On the surface, this challenges the measurement of results, but the program effect is more profound. Given the project's reliance on working through others to build their capacity, the lack of strategic capacity building planning leaves the project without an important tool for ensuring that capacity building activities are planned and carried out with the stakeholder commitments and resources required to achieve targeted capacity gains and results.

Other external constraints will limit the institutional capacity strengthening process, including: the ambiguous implementation of the decentralization process; the contested implementation of the prior

informed consent act; and the institutional limitations of public agencies to face illegal economic activities in the Amazon.

What are the internal advantages or weaknesses explaining why or why not USFS/PFSI is in its way of meeting its goals?

The definition of the program's results in terms of partners' achievements presents a profound challenge to the measurement of PFSI performance. The project's results framework is defined in terms of milestones and processes that reflect the nature of the program, i.e. the project as an agent of change while GOP counterparts are the actor. The achievement of milestones relies so heavily on the performance of the Government of Peru and Regional Governments that their relative performance can easily overwhelm the effect of project initiatives. As a result, the definition of milestones is largely divorced from the actual reported activities, i.e. many of the activities reported do not necessarily have a causal relationship with the achievement of the milestones. Simply measuring the achievement of milestones cannot capture to what extent USFS/PFSI support is producing these achievements: milestones can be achieved without any intervention of USFS/PFSI, and milestones could fail to be achieved despite the successful implementation of related project activities.

USFS/PFSI project documents state that the sustainability of the program depends on the quality of the milestones and the processes that will be supported, and that this quality can be measured in terms of the five attributes identified by USFS/PFSI. However the program's reporting process fails to include information on the level to which these attributes have been achieved among the various processes.

How USFS/PFSI have been adapting to changes in the external context? What are the main lessons learned? How quickly is the project adapting over time?

USFS/PFSI faces the challenge of how to register lessons learned and apply these in new and changing contexts to strengthen its engagement across regions. USFS/PFSI is working with a heterogeneous group of regional governments and stakeholders at different stages of a variety of processes. While USFS/PFSI has produced some products documenting select events and the lessons learned from them, these are seemingly isolated products. USFS/PFSI is a process-based program intent on building system capacity, systematizing its experience to improve future results and inform other actors could play a critical role in that approach. Program reports did not systematically draw lessons learned from USFS/PFSI experiences in the regions where activities are being implemented, that, if applied to future activities, would increase the probability of success in the rest of the Amazonian regions that offer more challenging program environments. For instance, in regions where the formation of ARAs is a pending milestone, USFS/PFSI could systematize its experience and how it will adapt its lessons learned and strengthen its approach to establishing ARA in other regions that may pose different and potentially greater challenges, e.g. in Loreto where it is less likely that the ARA model will be implemented.

How relevant are USFS/PFSI strategies, implementation approach, key processes and focus areas in terms of satisfying target groups' current and future needs (including the PTPA and forest and wildlife regulations and policies)?

The USFS/PFSI focus areas are universally recognized as the critical components of the targeted stronger forest management system, i.e. forest inventories, SNIFF-MC, facilitating the transition of policies, regulations and institutions to a decentralized territorial management approach, and strengthening community forest management. The project approach targets processes critical to its targeted results. However, the articulation of its activities suffer from the lack of a concerted strategy that would optimize and leverage its 'minority share' in the investments being made in the overall sector as well as firmly

establish the relevance of these activities in the context of the overall processes. The lack of a causal framework linking project activities to its very high level targeted results makes it very difficult to determine the relevance of its activities to these results.

Where respondents placed value on the capacity strengthening of the project, they equated this capacity building with the study tours, trainings and technical assistance activities. Respondents and informants perceive that trainings are imparting knowledge and lessons to specialists and decision-makers that benefit the forest sector and project objectives in the short term. To the degree that these specialists remain within the forest sector, they may well contribute to overall national forest sector capacity in the medium and long-term as well.

USFS/PFSI has supported increased counterpart participation in forest management processes as key to enhancing sector coordination. Respondents affirmed that project support was vital to providing the logistic and economic means for their participation in national and local workshops and meetings. Such travel enables coordination to take place and creates spaces for decision and policy making. By participating in these meetings and workshops, representatives of forest management institutions feel that their opinions and requests are being considered, which in turn increases a sense of ownership among the representatives. In the short-run, this helps ensure buy-in and continuity for USFS/PFSI supported-activities and processes in a budget-restricted environment where such travel would otherwise not be possible. In the long-run this support represents an unsustainable subsidy of operating expenses that should be assumed by government counterparts.

THE ROLE OF USFS/PFSI IN PERUVIAN FOREST GOVERNANCE

How is the technical assistance and knowledge exchange between USFS, USFS/PFSI and its target groups supporting forest governance in Peru both at national and regional levels?

Findings from activity review and counterpart responses across project results areas indicate that the project's provision of access to USFS and other agencies' experts is an important and well-regarded contribution to the forest sector. Every component involves the accompaniment of experts with extensive experience and knowledge. Counterparts develop key processes, such as BPP inventories and SNIFF-MC, with top-level guidance, which has contributed to the confidence with which counterparts have been able to proceed and, according to respondents, to the quality of the products.

Which are the most important and stronger synergies developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI among national and between national and regional institutions

USFS/PFSI has facilitated the establishment of three important coordination initiatives. First, the CIAM secretariat has been strengthened by USFS/PFSI and has coordinated with different stakeholders to achieve several milestones. Second the project has facilitated the creation of the technical SNIFF-MC team, which brings together 18 different institutions related with the timber chain of custody. Finally, support for the budget coordination process at the national level has brought together MINAGRI, MINAM, MEF, CIAM and the Regional Governments.

Coordination mechanisms supported by USFS/PFSI have not been institutionalized, which raises questions regarding how these stakeholders will sustain the new institutional framework being enhanced by USFS/PFSI when USFS/PFSI leaves. For all these changes, there is an external high risk that the processes are not maintained in the future.

Policy coordination to establish consistency between land-use planning and forest management policies and regulations varies across regions and stakeholders. Lack of coordination affects the process of establishing a territorial rather than a sector forest and environmental management approach. There is ample room to improve collaboration between land-use planners and forest authorities. Stakeholders and informants expect the activation of SERFOR to improve inter-sector coordination and close this gap.

In practice, the program does support counterparts in securing sufficient resources through a process-based activity. USFS/PFSI has facilitated coordination between relevant authorities (MEF, MINAGRI, MINAM, CIAM, and Regional Governments) to jointly work towards the ongoing formulation of a results-based forest sector budget. This support does not fit within the current results framework, but, if counterparts succeed in leveraging a sharp increase in funding through the use of a strategic sector-wide budget proposal, it would represent an important US Government contribution towards the strengthening of Peruvian forest management.

How articulated are USFS/PFSI relationships with other similar interventions or projects (also funded by USAID or implemented by other organization)? How are these affecting or supporting USFS/PFSI activities, and ultimately forest governance in Peru?

The US Government supports various programs supporting the activities of Peruvian forest and natural resource management institutions and organizations. These often interface with the same actors at the regional level. This has generated the impression of a duplication of efforts and US-cooperation financed personnel, which generates false expectations and / or inaccurate expectations among stakeholders. The various implementing partners have not established a collective image or clearly defined roles with their counterparts. Not surprisingly, respondents and other informants did not have clear ideas regarding the role of USFS/PFSI, or its relationship with USAID's Peru Bosques or other donor projects.

Which are the most important milestones achieved and activities developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI to provide relevant and transparent information for the forest sector, with a focus on the SNIFF control module?

The milestones achieved within the BPP inventories and SNIFF-MC processes are important steps towards improving transparency levels and are highly valued by national and regional counterparts. Regional respondents identified the standardization of measures within BPP inventories and process mapping and the application of new technology in the traceability of products within the SNIFF-MC as the most valuable activities contributing to these successes. However, stakeholders remain concerned that technical advances towards SNIFF implementation are vulnerable to a lack of political will and budget shortfalls.

USFS/PFSI has implemented a series of activities that all contribute to this progress. USFS specialists have advised system technicians and stakeholders. Project study tours have also made it possible for DGGFS officials to learn from existing information systems abroad. Throughout the process, the project has facilitated national level coordination meetings with various authorities to share plans, solicit feedback and build consensus. The project also facilitated technical workshops to advance design and planning for the SNIFF components.

Within all USFS/PFSI activities, which have engendered the greatest changes?

The USFS/PFSI project recognizes the need for basic information regarding forests and the processes constituting the entire value chain and has organized its main activities to achieve capacity building and the inter-institutional articulation of the processes to implement BPP forest inventories, SNIFF and the establishment of the institutional framework to sustain these at the national and regional levels.

Highlights of USFS/PFSI achievements are the successful adaptation of new methodologies for inventories (the BPP in the Loreto Region) taking into consideration specific problems at the local level, the new “process map” for the design and implementation of SNIFF (strengthening inter regional and inter institutional coordination) and the establishment of ARAs in three of the Amazonian Regions, including a revised description of functions and regulations. USFS/PFSI is working closely with the national and regional forest authorities on a variety of processes to consolidate forest governance in Peru.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations address reformulated versions of the evaluation questions. The evaluation offers several recommendations to strengthen the project’s articulation with the sector, permit an effective final evaluation of program results, and leverage project successes into the future. The design and implementation of the USFS/PFSI, based upon quality processes, would benefit from closer linkages to counterpart strategic planning and requires an improved monitoring system that includes information allowing for the measurement of direct project results. Complementing strategic linkages with sector programming, the project should pursue the expanded use and formalization of coordination mechanisms that have led to its greatest successes to date.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF USFS/PFSIS INTERMEDIATE RESULTS MILESTONES

USFS/PFSI has a wide range of milestones that lack a defined and direct causal relationship with their underlying activities and have no scheduled completion date. The project design should incorporate concrete outputs and expected results that have a defined causal relationship with project activities, as well as a timeline to achieve these. Given the nature of the project, the inclusion of milestones that depend largely on counterpart progress is appropriate, but these should relate back to project activities. This will strengthen the strategic underpinning of the project as well as enable an analysis of the projects results and its hypothesis upon completion.

How can the project address the main external constraints underlying USFS/PFSI performance?

USFS/PFSI should consider articulating its programming to annual planning for the forest sector and its specific counterparts. By linking support to counterpart programming, the project may control for the impact of external factors by articulating their role in achieving milestones jointly with project activities. This would also provide a roadmap for assessing implementation progress with counterparts. Through technical assistance to counterpart’s strategic planning processes, the project could tie (possibly conditioning) support activities to the counterpart’s implementation of activities that contribute to IR 1 through IR 4. With this approach, the project can optimize the targeting of its activities and engage more strategically in the strategies of its target groups, especially the SERFOR results-based budget planning.

The project should strategically address sector capacity weaknesses that threaten the effectiveness and value of its interventions. To achieve this, the project would benefit by tying its capacity building activities to the internal strategic capacity building plans of its stakeholders. In doing so, USFS/PFSI can establish clear expected results for investments in capacity building and training as well as define the roles and commitments of counterparts in achieving these results. Given the critical role that SERFOR will play in the sector, support and integration of project capacity building to the SERFOR strategic capacity building plan offers an important collaborative opportunity.

The project could support the clarification and advancement of the sector framework and strategic planning through support for:

- Culmination of the political approval of the regulations for the National Forest and Wildlife law through support for the pending participatory and multi-stakeholder feedback process.
- Stakeholders to establish clear and measurable forest sector management objectives for the National Forest Policy;
- The formation of technical teams with delimited periods to develop feasible programs and activities responding to the five components of the National Forest Policy, with implementation plans and clear chronograms.

As a policy and capacity support project, the USFS/PFSI may leverage its investment by targeting more support to coordination activities and mechanisms that have specific measurable effects on capacity that, in turn, impact on project milestones, such as:

- Continue support for the decentralization process by helping partners strengthen the forest management and control structure as well as simplify the administrative processes and gain access to additional information technology and communication resources.
- Continue promoting the formalization of mechanisms that strengthen ties between national and regional forest authorities, with the objective of establishing shared strategic planning and budgeting for productive forest management, managing sector commitments to benefit Peruvian society, and complying with Peru's international commitments vis-à-vis the PTPA and other formal agreements.
- Continue support to regional authorities in establishing and participating in inter-institutional technical teams that have clear mandates, objectives and norms, and national representation.

How can USFS/PFSI address internal advantages or weaknesses explaining why or why not USFS/PFSI is in its way of meeting its goals?

In tandem with joint strategic planning, it is important that the project revise its milestones to better capture the direct impact of the program. The project needs separate milestones related to the outcomes or results of USFS/PFSI activities to enable the monitoring and evaluation of project performance that is separate from results that depend on GOP partner performance. Specific indicators should be defined for these intermediate results. This will help in identifying, isolating and planning for the management of external drivers that could inhibit the achievement of milestones, especially the political and institutional uncertainties surrounding the decentralization process and the roles of sub-national authorities in land-use planning policies.

USFS/PFSI should improve its monitoring system and reporting to systematically capture data regarding the attributes that define the quality of targeted processes and the punctual activities that the project carries out to ensure quality processes. Given the importance ascribed to these attributes in terms of measuring project performance and sustainability, improvements in USFS/PFSI monitoring efforts to measure changes in these attributes for targeted processes will enhance the final evaluation of the project and should contribute to the documentation of lessons learned for the forest management sector in general.

How can USFS/PFSI make its strategies, implementation approach, key processes and focus areas more relevant to in terms of satisfying target groups' current and future needs (including the PTPA and forest and wildlife regulations and policies)?

Within the context of a joint strategic plan, project results may benefit from a more even distribution of interventions among the target regions. Given the importance that respondents and stakeholders ascribed to project study tours, trainings and technical assistance, the project can anticipate that variations in the intensity of activities implemented in different regions may be reflected in variations in the results in different regions.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ROLE OF USFS/PFSI IN PERUVIAN FOREST GOVERNANCE

How can USFS/PFSI develop more important and stronger synergies among national and between national and regional institutions?

USFS/PFSI should continue encouraging the formalization of coordination mechanisms between stakeholders of the forest sector, especially those that establish collaboration between forest management and land-use stakeholders, and promote the establishment of formal multi stakeholders' platforms, including the design, planning and implementation of a new integrated results based budget for the sector. Support for the development of a joint budget that appeals to the government's recent focus on results-based budgets offers the project's most effective activity to directly address the greatest external threat to the implementation of the forest inventory and SNIFF-MC systems: lack of funding. USFS/PFSI should continue and enhance its facilitation of a technical dialogue platform for forest inventory methodologies. The major project advances confirmed by this evaluation highlight the fact that working on improving coordination mechanisms could be the most cost-effective activity for achieving a more integrated territorial approach.

How could USFS/PFSI improve or benefit from improved articulation with other similar interventions or projects (also funded by USAID or implemented by other organization)?

Perceptions on the issue of project coordination suggest that forest management and natural resource management projects would benefit from increased coordination and clarification of roles, at least at the level of stakeholder perceptions. The project may benefit from a clearer understanding among stakeholders regarding its mission and mandate on behalf of the US Government and within the context of other USAID and other donor projects.

Improved articulation of project activities with other interventions in the sector (both USAID and non-USAID funded) could help to sustain and enhance the changes that have been fomented by this project. These include the adaptation of inventory methodologies and work carried out to establish the ARAs.

How can USFS/PFSI support the development of relevant and transparent information for the forest sector, with a focus on the SNIFF control module?

The role that USFS/PFSI might play in further development of the SNIFF depends on the pending decisions by the forest authority regarding its implementation. If development of the SNIFF is delegated to the private sector, the project could directly support its development with technical assistance to forest authorities to prepare for this reality. USFS/PFSI could also create collaborative spaces between the public and private sectors and native communities to reach consensus and understanding regarding the needed role and functioning of the system. If the forest authority decides to implement the SNIFF itself, the

project should adopt a strategic and cooperative support model that transparently defines each party's contribution to the system development as well as framework for monitoring deliverables against an established schedule and expected results.

How can the changes engendered by the project be appropriated and maintained in the future? How can USFS/PFSI adapt to future changes in the external context?

USFS/PFSI would benefit project implementation and forest management in general by more systematically documenting, disseminating and applying lessons learned from the successes and failures of the experiences to date. These lessons learned are vital to replicating effective approaches and adapting to a more challenging program environment in different regions and contexts. They could also contribute to the important process of planning for the sustainability of forest management improvements that have been achieved throughout the public system over the project period and extend understanding of the sector context and its influence on ongoing processes. Scenarios and mechanisms for adaptation could be used for these recommended improvements. For example, in the case of ARAs creation, USFS/PFSI could draw lessons learned in the process in such a way to strengthen Regional Forest Management capacity in general in the five Regions, even in cases like Loreto where the ARA model itself seems less likely to be implemented.

How can USFS/PFSI secure sustainability in a changing context?

As with any USAID institutional support initiative, sustainability requires that institutional counterparts fully commit to their own development. To succeed across the forest management sector, USFS/PFSI requires political commitment and involvement at levels high enough to ensure that partners do not simply focus on immediate and basic needs, but commit to long-term capacity building objectives and assign the resources required to achieve them. These commitments must be based on a strategy, tied to the National Forest Policy that defines the objectives, priorities and processes that the government will carry out to improve forest management governance.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PFSI MIDTERM EVALUATION

Questions an Sub questions	Findings	Conclusions	Recommendations
<p>QUESTION 1: How is USFS/PFSI achieving its intermediate results milestones?</p>	<p>The review of USFS/PFSI Intermediate Results Milestones summarizes information available in the PFSI Performance Monitoring Plan, program annual reports, and information collected from interviews with the program managers and the various project counterparts. Tables 11 – 14 each summarize the status of milestones for one select intermediate result. (pages 28-34)</p> <p>The project has not associated any schedule or deadlines for the achievement of the project milestones, a result of the value placed on quality and substance of the targeted processes. The lack of a timetable for the achievement of results limits the conclusions that can be drawn from a mid-term evaluation, as actual achievements cannot be compared with expected results and the completion of pending milestones cannot be analyzed in the context of project timetable. (page 10)</p>	<p>Available information indicates that the achievement of milestones differs considerably among and within intermediate results. There is less substantial documented activity and progress under several intermediate results, including: national forest inventories, community forest management platforms, and the promotion of sustainable forest business in indigenous communities. The evaluation findings document work and milestone status for the results where the project concentrated its efforts: BPP inventories, ARA creation, PNFFS, SERFOR, and SNIFF-MC.</p> <p>Project documentation does not provide a strong basis for determining whether advances in meeting project milestones are meeting expectations. The achievement of milestones is not associated with deadlines, prohibiting a discussion of whether progress is running behind expectations or whether the project is in a position to achieve remaining milestones over the remaining implementation period.</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI has a wide range of milestones that lack a defined and direct causal relationship with their underlying activities and have no scheduled completion date. The project design should establish a strategic framework that articulates the causal relationship between activities, concrete outputs and expected results, as well as a timeline to achieve these. Given the nature of the project, the inclusion of milestones that depend largely on counterpart progress is appropriate, but these should relate back to project activities. This will strengthen the strategic underpinning and planning of the project as well as enable an analysis of the projects results and its hypothesis upon completion.</p>
<p>I. What are the main external drivers and constraints underlying USFS/PFSI performance?</p>	<p>To date, the decentralization of forest authorities has structural problems in establishing adequate human resources for regional forest authorities. This owes to inadequate funding as well as the lack of an effective public servant policy and/or strategy in the forest sector.</p> <p>Table 4 compares information regarding the actual and proposed level of resources at the regional forest authorities. This information provides a useful comparison between the actual and desired human resources available</p>	<p>The lack of capacity described by respondents at regional and national levels represents the most important external constraint on the project's success. Despite some improvements over the last three years, human resources, available equipment and budget are all insufficient in quantity and quality, especially among regional authorities expected to lead forest management into the future.</p> <p>The program's strong focus on building capacity through trainings and study tours is particularly vulnerable to the high turnover rates and lack of</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI should consider articulating its programming to annual planning for the forest sector and its specific counterparts. By linking support to counterpart programming, the project may control for the impact of external factors by articulating their role in achieving milestones jointly with project activities. This would also provide a roadmap for assessing implementation progress with counterparts.</p>

	<p>to regional forest management units and an indication of the gap between the needed and actual budget for these resources. (page 19). Forest authority respondents generally confirmed that their institutional budget was insufficient, and a majority felt access to equipment is inadequate to achieve their institutional mandate; (page 20)</p>	<p>supporting resources at the regional authorities. There is no capacity building plan, either internally for the national forest authority, or externally for forest stakeholders. Trainings are demand driven, and are highly valued, but they do not form part of a strategic plan for improving forest sector capacity levels.</p>	<p>The project should strategically address sector capacity weaknesses that threaten the effectiveness and value of its interventions. To achieve this, the project should tie its capacity building activities to the internal strategic capacity building plans of its stakeholders. Given the critical role that SERFOR will play in the sector, support and integration of project capacity building to the SERFOR strategic capacity building plan offers an important collaborative opportunity.</p>
<p>2. What are the internal advantages or weaknesses explaining why or why not USFS/PFSI is in its way of meeting its goals?</p>	<p>As stated in the PMP: “USFS fundamentally seeks to bring its experience and expertise to bear to build capacity in the public forest sector. The USFS sees itself as an agent of change, but the real actor is the GOP”. This approach explains why many milestones are achievements of the GOP that go beyond the specific activities of USFS/PFSI. Milestones, listed in Table 1, are aligned with what the program defined as the “custom indicator 4” regarding processes, stages and attributes. Regarding this indicator the PMP states: “USFS/PFSI does not produce products but assists the GOP to implement processes. The quality of processes it assists is as important to USFS/PFSI as the final and intermediate products themselves, because it believes that high quality process will result in sustainability”. Therefore, Indicator 4 will be measured not only in terms of its completion, but by the degree to which the process and stages have adhered to certain ‘attributes’. (page 9)</p>	<p>The definition of the program’s results in terms of partners’ achievements presents a profound challenge to the measurement of PFSI performance. The project’s results framework is defined in terms of milestones and processes that reflect the nature of the program, i.e. the project as an agent of change while GOP counterparts are the actor. The achievement of milestones relies so heavily on the performance of the Government of Peru and Regional Governments that their relative performance can easily overwhelm the effect of project initiatives. Simply measuring the achievement of milestones cannot capture to what extent USFS/PFSI support is producing these achievements: milestones can be achieved without any intervention of USFS/PFSI, and milestones could fail to be achieved despite the successful implementation of related project activities. USFS/PFSI project documents state that the sustainability of the program depends on the quality of the milestones and the processes that will be supported, and that this quality can be measured in terms of the five attributes identified by USFS/PFSI. However the program’s reporting process fails to include information on the level</p>	<p>In tandem with joint strategic planning, it is important that the project revise its milestones to better capture the direct impact of the program. The project needs separate milestones related to the outcomes or results of USFS/PFSI activities to enable the monitoring and evaluation of project performance that is separate from results that depend on GOP partner performance. Specific indicators should be defined for these intermediate results. This will help in identifying, isolating and planning for the management of external drivers that could inhibit the achievement of milestones, especially the political and institutional uncertainties surrounding the decentralization process and the roles of sub-national authorities in land-use planning policies. USFS/PFSI should improve its monitoring system and reporting to systematically capture data regarding the attributes that define the quality of targeted processes and the punctual</p>

		to which these attributes have been achieved among the various processes.	activities that the project carries out to ensure quality processes. Given the importance ascribed to these attributes in terms of measuring project performance and sustainability, improvements in USFS/PFSI monitoring efforts to measure changes in these attributes for targeted processes will enhance the final evaluation of the project and should contribute to the documentation of lessons learned for the forest management sector in general.
3. How USFS/PFSI have been adapting to changes in the external context? What are the main lessons learned? How quick is adapting over time?	N/A	USFS/PFSI faces the challenge of how to register lessons learned and apply these in new and changing contexts to strengthen its engagement across regions. USFS/PFSI is working with a heterogeneous group of regional governments and stakeholders at different stages of a variety of processes. While USFS/PFSI has produced some products documenting select events and the lessons learned from them, these are seemingly isolated products. USFS/PFSI is a process-based program intent on building system capacity, systematizing its experience to improve future results and inform other actors could play a critical role in that approach. Program reports did not systematically draw lessons learned from USFS/PFSI experiences in the regions where activities are being implemented, that, if applied to future activities, would increase the probability of success in the rest of the Amazonian regions that offer more challenging program environments.	USFS/PFSI would benefit project implementation and forest management in general by more systematically documenting, disseminating and applying lessons learned from the successes and failures of the experiences to date. These lessons learned are vital to replicating effective approaches and adapting to a more challenging program environment in different regions and contexts. <i>(This recommendation is presented with recommendations for question 2.6 in the narrative.)</i>
4. How relevant are USFS/PFSI strategies, implementation approach, key processes and focus areas in terms of satisfying target groups' current and future	While the capacity building through study tours and trainings are highly valued by their participants, it is impossible to determine the degree that these have contributed to the capacity of their corresponding institutions and organizations with available information,	The USFS/PFSI focus areas are universally recognized as the critical components of the targeted stronger forest management system, i.e. forest inventories, SNIFF-MC, facilitating the transition of policies, regulations and institutions to a decentralized territorial management	The recommended joint strategic plan and programming (see previous recommendations under question 1 and sub-questions) will help orient and tie project activities to overall sector efforts. This will reinforce the

<p>needs (including the PTPA and forest and wildlife regulations and policies)?</p>	<p>nor how they contribute to the project milestones and improvements in forest governance. (page 31)</p> <p>Respondents identified study tours as the single most important USFS/PFSI activity contributing to building capacity among their institutions. (page 35)</p> <p>USFS/PFSI is recognized as playing an active role in capacity building by respondents from Loreto, San Martin and Ucayali. Study tours and other activities played a much smaller role in Amazonas and Madre de Dios, and respondents did not recognize or assign a value to the contribution of USFS/PFSI on capacity building. (page 36)</p> <p>Respondents from forest inventory teams claimed that USFS/PFSI activities have contributed to their skill sets. The team representatives claim to have learned the most from USFS/PFSI interventions on the topics of inventory design, planning, and variable selection as well as evaluation methodologies. (page 36)</p> <p>Regional authorities expressed understanding of the important role of inventories in making information available for decision-making and implementing adequate information systems and identified USFS/PFSI technical and logistical support as important contributors to this process. (page 38)</p> <p>Regional technical teams recognize that USFS/PFSI has collaborated with them on the important task of maintaining community awareness of the forest inventory process. (page 38)</p>	<p>approach, and strengthening community forest management. The project approach targets processes critical to its targeted results. However, the articulation of its activities suffer from the lack of a concerted strategy that would optimize and leverage its 'minority share' in the investments being made in the overall sector as well as firmly establish the relevance of these activities in the context of the overall processes. The lack of a causal framework linking project activities to its very high level targeted results makes it very difficult to determine the relevance of its activities to these results. Where respondents placed value on the capacity strengthening of the project, they equated this capacity building with the study tours, trainings and technical assistance activities. Respondents and informants perceive that trainings are imparting knowledge and lessons to specialists and decision-makers that benefit the forest sector and project objectives in the short term. To the degree that these specialists remain within the forest sector, they may well contribute to overall national forest sector capacity in the medium and long-term as well. USFS/PFSI has supported increased counterpart participation in forest management processes as key to enhancing sector coordination. Respondents affirmed that project support was vital to providing the logistic and economic means for their participation in national and local workshops and meetings. Such travel enables coordination to take place and creates spaces for decision and policy making. By participating in these meetings and workshops, representatives of forest management institutions feel that their opinions and requests are being considered, which in turn increases a sense of ownership among the representatives. In the short-run, this helps ensure buy-in and continuity for USFS/PFSI</p>	<p>relevance of activities and provide the framework for continually assessing implementation against plans. It could also provide the context for making some assistance conditional on the execution of complementary activities by sector stakeholders.</p> <p>In addition to joint strategic planning, project results may benefit from a more even distribution of interventions among the target regions. Given the importance that respondents and stakeholders ascribed to project study tours, trainings and technical assistance, the project can anticipate that variations in the intensity of activities implemented in different regions may be reflected in variations in the results in different regions.</p>
---	--	--	--

		supported-activities and processes in a budget-restricted environment where such travel would otherwise not be possible. In the long-run this support represents an unsustainable subsidy of operating expenses that should be assumed by government counterparts.	
<p>QUESTION 2: To what extent is USFS/PFSI, through the establishment of quality processes, contributing to improve the forest governance levels and forest management in Peru towards a more integrated territorial approach?</p>			
<p>I. How is the technical assistance and knowledge exchange between USFS, USFS/PFSI and its target groups supporting forest governance in Peru both at national and regional levels?</p>	<p>Among other findings: A total of 13 professionals from the regional government of Loreto participated in study tours on SNIFF-MC and forest inventories. Moreover, respondents named various activities as being of high capacity building value, including: internships to Moyobamba (San Martin) to learn about the functioning of the ARA in that region; training on administrative issues when these functions were transferred from the national to the Regional Government; SNIFF process mapping; and, the new methodologies for the pilot inventory work in Ramon Castilla. (page 36)</p> <p>From the regional government of San Martin, nine representatives attended six different study tours on diverse topics. The forest inventories team participated in a study tour in Minnesota on data processing for forest inventories. This team also indicated they had received strengthening of skills for developing general planning (of forest inventories) and forest management. In general, representatives from San Martin indicated that the most relevant PFSI-supported trainings dealt with community forest management, decision-making and data processing. The forest authority representatives stated that the topics he found most relevant and instructive were</p>	<p>Findings from activity review and counterpart responses across project results areas indicate that the project's provision of access to USFS and other agencies' experts is an important and well-regarded contribution to the forest sector. Every component involves the accompaniment of experts with extensive experience and knowledge. Counterparts develop key processes, such as BPP inventories and SNIFF-MC, with top-level guidance, which has contributed to the confidence with which counterparts have been able to proceed and, according to respondents, to the quality of the products.</p>	<p>The results from this technical assistance will be reinforced, and perhaps better focused, through the integration of PFSI activities into a joint strategic programming (see related Question 1 recommendations). This linkage should establish the basis for defining the nature of the TA as well as the ideal counterpart recipients and participants.</p>

	<p>from experts addressing new technologies and decision-making processes. (page 36)</p>		
<p>2. Which are the most important and stronger synergies developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI among national and between national and regional institutions?</p>	<p>To advance the establishment of the SNIFF-MC, an “inter-institutional group” serves as a platform to coordinate SNIFF-MC activities among a large set of organizations engaged in the forest sector chain. Participating organizations include: ARAs, OSINFOR, MINAM/SERNANP/CITES, National Police, FEMA (Fiscalía Especializada en Materia Ambiental), SUNAT, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Defense, and SUNARP, among others. (page 22)</p> <p>Strategic budgeting has benefitted from the joint work of DGFFS, MINAGRI, regional forest offices, CIAM, and the Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF). Over the last year, these institutions have collaborated on a joint sector budget to serve as a results-driven and strategically justified proposal for funding forest sector management. (page 22)</p> <p>Coordination problems between the agrarian and forestry offices within MINAGRI are longstanding. In San Martin, land use planners coordinate with both and they try to keep both aligned. However, when planners request permission for land use changes (e.g. deforestation for developing a crop) coordination is not consistent. The concept of land use change is used differently in the forest normative framework than in land use planning. (page 23)</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI has facilitated the establishment of three important coordination initiatives. First, the CIAM secretariat has been strengthened by USFS/PFSI and has coordinated with different stakeholders to achieve several milestones. Second the project has facilitated the creation of the technical SNIFF-MC team, which brings together 18 different institutions related with the timber chain of custody. Finally, support for the budget coordination process at the national level has brought together MINAGRI, MINAM, MEF, CIAM and the Regional Governments. Coordination mechanisms supported by USFS/PFSI have not been institutionalized, which raises questions regarding how these stakeholders will sustain the new institutional framework being enhanced by USFS/PFSI when USFS/PFSI leaves. For all these changes, there is an external high risk that the processes are not maintained in the future.</p> <p>Policy coordination to establish consistency between land-use planning and forest management policies and regulations varies across regions and stakeholders. Lack of coordination affects the process of establishing a territorial rather than a sector forest and environmental management approach. There is ample room to improve collaboration between land-use planners and forest authorities. Stakeholders and informants expect the activation of SERFOR to improve inter-sector coordination and close this gap.</p> <p>In practice, the program does support counterparts in securing sufficient resources through a process-based activity. USFS/PFSI has facilitated coordination between relevant authorities (MEF, MINAGRI, MINAM, CIAM, and Regional Governments) to jointly work towards</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI should continue encouraging the formalization of coordination mechanisms between stakeholders of the forest sector, especially those that establish collaboration between forest management and land-use stakeholders, and promote the establishment of formal multi stakeholders’ platforms, including the design, planning and implementation of a new integrated results based budget for the sector. Support for the development of a joint budget that appeals to the government’s recent focus on results-based budgets offers the project’s most effective activity to directly address the greatest external threat to the implementation of the forest inventory and SNIFF-MC systems: lack of funding. USFS/PFSI should continue and enhance its facilitation of a technical dialogue platform for forest inventory methodologies. The major project advances confirmed by this evaluation highlight the fact that working on improving coordination mechanisms could be the most cost-effective activity for achieving a more integrated territorial approach.</p>

		the ongoing formulation of a results-based forest sector budget. This support does not fit within the current results framework, but, if counterparts succeed in leveraging a sharp increase in funding through the use of a strategic sector-wide budget proposal, it would represent an important US Government contribution towards the strengthening of Peruvian forest management.	
3 & 4. How articulated are USFS/PFSI relationships with other similar interventions or projects (also funded by USAID or implemented by other organization)? How are these affecting or supporting USFS/PFSI activities, and ultimately forest governance in Peru?	In general, inventory activities implemented and/or promoted by USFS/PFSI, like the pilot BPP in Loreto, are weakly articulated with national initiatives like the National Forest Inventory project funded by FAO-Finland.(page 30)	The US Government supports various programs supporting the activities of Peruvian forest and natural resource management institutions and organizations. These often interface with the same actors at the regional level. This has generated the impression of a duplication of efforts and US-cooperation financed personnel, which generates false expectations and / or inaccurate expectations among stakeholders. The various implementing partners have not established a collective image or clearly defined roles with their counterparts. Not surprisingly, respondents and other informants did not have clear ideas regarding the role of USFS/PFSI, or its relationship with USAID's Peru Bosques or other donor projects.	Perceptions on the issue of project coordination suggest that forest management and natural resource management projects would benefit from increased coordination and clarification of roles, at least at the level of stakeholder perceptions. The project may benefit from a clearer understanding among stakeholders regarding its mission and mandate on behalf of the US Government and within the context of other USAID and other donor projects. Improved articulation of project activities with other interventions in the sector (both USAID and non-USAID funded) could help to sustain and enhance the changes that have been fomented by this project. These include the adaptation of inventory methodologies and work carried out to establish the ARAs.
5. Which are the most important milestones achieved and activities developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI to provide relevant and transparent information for the forest sector, with a focus on the SNIFF control module?	DGFFS has made advancements in the design and development of a national forestry information system, including completion of milestones 1-2, but the initiative has not advanced into the implementation stages. DGFFS, in collaboration with the Technical Working Group (GTT), has published a conceptual document including an implementation and working plan for the	The milestones achieved within the BPP inventories and SNIFF-MC processes are important steps towards improving transparency levels and are highly valued by national and regional counterparts. Regional respondents identified the standardization of measures within BPP inventories and process mapping and the application of new technology in the traceability of products within the SNIFF-MC as the most	The role that USFS/PFSI might play in further development of the SNIFF depends on the pending decisions by the forest authority regarding its implementation. If development of the SNIFF is delegated to the private sector, the project could directly support its development with technical assistance to forest

	<p>construction and monitoring of the control module (SNIFF-MC). Between 2010 and 2011, the GTT elaborated and validated a process map identifying the current forest and wildlife control mechanisms. DGFFS published the process map whose final version includes 9 stages, 1,725 activities, 47 independent processes and 60 roles. Since then, the working group has completed a re-design of the process map that has received the consensus of the inter-institutional working group (GTI). (page 34)</p> <p>USFS/PFSI played an active role in the SNIFF-MC design and redesign process. USFS/PFSI support for SNIFF-MC also resulted in designing, developing and implementing a prototype of the control module to validate the information system concept, validate processes in the field and acquire consistent feedback in a real-world environment: the timber corridor from Loreto to Lima, one of Peru's most complicated. USFS/PFSI supported training through study tours and socialization among stakeholders. (page 34)</p>	<p>valuable activities contributing to these successes. However, stakeholders remain concerned that technical advances towards SNIFF implementation are vulnerable to a lack of political will and budget shortfalls.</p> <p>USFS/PFSI has implemented a series of activities that all contribute to this progress. USFS specialists have advised system technicians and stakeholders. Project study tours have also made it possible for DGGFS officials to learn from existing information systems abroad. Throughout the process, the project has facilitated national level coordination meetings with various authorities to share plans, solicit feedback and build consensus. The project also facilitated technical workshops to advance design and planning for the SNIFF components.</p>	<p>authorities to prepare for this reality. USFS/PFSI could also create collaborative spaces between the public and private sectors and native communities to reach consensus and understanding regarding the needed role and functioning of the system. If the forest authority decides to implement the SNIFF itself, the project should adopt a strategic and cooperative support model that transparently defines each party's contribution to the system development as well as framework for monitoring deliverables against an established schedule and expected results.</p>
<p>6. Within all USFS/PFSI activities, which are the main changes implemented? How can be appropriated and maintained in the future?</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI's most important activities supporting these advances (BPP inventory) have included: support for the completion and approval of the first inventory manual; completing the Loreto pilot inventory; the provision of technical assistance by USFS experts; support for a study tour to introduce forest inventory and analysis methods and field training; and, development of communication plans and strategies for stakeholder outreach. (page 29)</p> <p>USFS/PFSI is a member of the Technical Support Group for the national inventory, which is led by MINAGRI and MINAM with substantial support from FAO/Finland. The</p>	<p>The USFS/PFSI project recognizes the need for basic information regarding forests and the processes constituting the entire value chain and has organized its main activities to achieve capacity building and the inter-institutional articulation of the processes to implement BPP forest inventories, SNIFF and the establishment of the institutional framework to sustain these at the national and regional levels.</p> <p>Highlights of USFS/PFSI achievements are the successful adaptation of new methodologies for inventories (the BPP in the Loreto Region) taking into consideration specific problems at the local level, the new "process map" for the design and implementation of SNIFF (strengthening inter</p>	<p>USFS/PFSI would benefit project implementation and forest management in general by more systematically documenting, disseminating and applying lessons learned from the successes and failures of the experiences to date. These lessons learned are vital to replicating effective approaches and adapting to a more challenging program environment in different regions and contexts. They could also contribute to the important process of planning for the sustainability of forest management improvements that</p>

	<p>USFS/PFSI local team assisted in the planning and design of the national forest inventory (INF). In June 2013 the INF project published a preliminary version of its proposed methodology. USFS/PFSI also supported the participation of international experts in inventory design workshops and meetings.(page 29)</p> <p>All of the USFS/PFSI National Forest and Wildlife Policy milestones have been met. Between 2009 and 2010, the DGFFS made a strong effort to elaborate a PNFFS proposal. Between November and December 2012, the DGFFS and the Intergovernmental Group completed and validated the proposal. DGFFS registered all of PNFFS workshops and meetings as well as the related contributions received from USFS/PFSI. In 2013, the proposal received commentaries and contributions from the general public (e.g., AIDSESP, CONAP), and was presented in Ucayali, Piura, Arequipa, Madre de Dios and Satipo . The ministerial council approved the policy in August 2013.</p> <p>The proposal for National Forest and Wildlife regulations was officially published in September 2013. Publishing of the regulations followed a consensus building and proposal strengthening process that included several macro-regional workshops and working group meetings on timber concessions where members of the GI validated the proposal. The proposal is still in the public commentary period. (page 31)</p> <p>USFS/PFSI provided funding for the operations of the Interregional Council of the Amazon (CIAM) Secretariat to support a range of activities headlined by technical assistance for the creation and strengthening</p>	<p>regional and inter institutional coordination) and the establishment of ARAs in three of the Amazonian Regions, including a revised description of functions and regulations. USFS/PFSI is working closely with the national and regional forest authorities on a variety of processes to consolidate forest governance in Peru.</p>	<p>have been achieved throughout the public system over the project period and extend understanding of the sector context and its influence on ongoing processes. Scenarios and mechanisms for adaptation could be used for these recommended improvements. For example, in the case of ARAs creation, USFS/PFSI could draw lessons learned in the process in such a way to strengthen Regional Forest Management capacity in general in the five Regions, even in cases like Loreto where the ARA model itself seems less likely to be implemented.</p>
--	--	---	--

	of Regional Environmental Authorities (ARAs) as Specialized Technical Organizations within the framework of decentralization. (page 32)		
<p>7. Which are the elements identified by USFS/PFSI to secure sustainability especially when the context changes? <i>(This question is addressed under other questions in the narrative. These are paraphrased here to provide a quick reference).</i></p>	<p>The three main project components represent the critical areas required to secure sustainable improvements in the Peruvian forest sector: establishing reliable and complete forest inventories coupled with transparent access to information through SNIFF-MC; facilitating the transition of policies, regulations and institutions to a decentralized territorial management approach; and, strengthening community forest management. Underlying all of these elements is are ongoing budget and institutional capacity constraints.</p>	<p>Sustainability of all of these elements requires the systematization of the mechanisms and processes that are currently contributing to progress on each front. USFS-PFSI has contributed to these mechanisms and processes, but systematization lags behind.</p> <p>The documentation and application of successes and lessons learned during the regional processes could contribute to more efficient progress into the future as well as the systematization of current informal collaboration and cooperation.</p> <p>Success in establishing sufficient budgets and decentralized institutional capacity will be a key determinant of the pace of progress and of the sustainability of any advances. USFS-PFSI has facilitated some initial collaborative planning and budgeting to date, but this has not generated significant results as of yet.</p>	<p>As with any USAID institutional support initiative, sustainability requires that institutional counterparts fully commit to their own development. To succeed across the forest management sector, USFS/PFSI requires political commitment and involvement at levels high enough to ensure that partners do not simply focus on immediate and basic needs, but commit to long-term capacity building objectives and assign the resources required to achieve them. These commitments must be based on a strategy, tied to the National Forest Policy that defines the objectives, priorities and processes that the government will carry out to improve forest management governance.</p>

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

PROGRAM TO BE EVALUATED

Identifying Information

There is a long history of close development cooperation between U.S. Government (USG) and the Government of Peru (GOP). During the five decades that the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has provided development assistance, Peru has made tremendous progress. The challenge is to consolidate and sustain Peru's development progress through targeted cooperation, leading to repositioning USAID's role within the next ten years.

The current USAID's Country Development Cooperation Strategy states the development objectives for the period 2012-2016. One of the three development objectives defined is the following: Natural resources sustainably managed in the Amazon Basin and glacier highlands (Development objective 3). In turn, one of the intermediate results to achieve this objective is: Capacity for environmental governance and natural resource management improved. Within this line of intervention is that the program Peru Forest Sector Initiative is operating. This design corresponds to a mid-term performance evaluation of Peru Forest Sector Initiative (USFS/PFSI).

USFS/PFSI was originally funded, between 2009 and 2011, through AID's headquarters in Washington D.C. and implemented by USAID and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) to offer technical assistance to the GOP to comply with the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA), specifically with the Annex on Forest Sector Governance.

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) is USAID partner, not only to implement projects and activities, but also to provide technical advice on institutional strengthening, law enforcement, concession management, chain of custody and legal verification, forest inventory, and community and indigenous management. This collaboration follows a long history of USAID and USFS support for forest activities abroad as part of USFS International Programs (IP, See: <http://www.fs.fed.us/international/>). USFS IPs' objective is to globally promote a sustainable forest management and conservation of biodiversity. It is working in 93 countries providing over 100 years of its experience to local partners. This experience includes management and use of forest products and services, research, policy, regulation and assistance to states.

To continue with the technical cooperation between USFS and USAID/Peru a Participating Agency Program Agreement (PAPA) was established. The total estimated USAID amount for the PAPA reached US\$25 million and started in September 2011 and will finish in August 2016. The entire PAPA is called the Amazon Forest Sector Initiative (AFSI). The AFSI covers bilateral activities, including USFS/PFSI, and regional activities. AFSI's regional activities in its first year include support to the Brazil Sustainable Landscapes program. Both USFS/PFSI and Brazil Sustainable Landscapes are ongoing programs and will be maintained under the AFSI umbrella. This evaluation will concentrate only on the Peru-based bilateral activities within USFS/PFSI.

Development Context

Peru owns approximately 68 million of hectares of rainforest within the Amazon basin, where still remain a large portion of primary forests. The forest sector represents only between 1% and 4% of the national PIB. The forest sector could contribute much more to the Peruvian economy with a clearer legal framework and stronger institutions.

The legal framework for the forest sector has been rather weak, obsolete, and inaccurate. In 2000, a new Forestry and Wildlife Law (N° 27308) was approved to address some of the limitations of the previous one. It improved the access to forest resources through the concession model. The forest concessions were given in public contests and which required the submission of management plans.

Another Law was approved and quickly repealed in 2009 (N°1090). Forest governance gained social and political importance after the social unrest that led to the incidents in the Northern Peruvian Amazonia (Bagua) in 2009. Since then the Ministry of Agriculture started an open and more transparent participatory process to review the current legal framework for the forest sector law. The creation of the Ministry of Environment and Forest Resources Supervisor (OSINFOR), the decentralization process, the climate change debate, are part of a new context that a new law should incorporate. In 2011 the new Forestry and Wildlife Law was approved after its consultation with indigenous communities. Currently, the Ministry of Agriculture is leading other participatory processes to elaborate the Forestry Law regulations, the national forestry and wildlife policy and to create the national forest service.

Peruvian forest sector involves several governmental agencies making the institutional environment rather complex. To address this problem one of the main reforms proposed is the creation of the National Forest Service (SERFOR) as the new national authority in the forest and wildlife sector. It will be directed by a new council integrated by twelve representatives, not only from the government but also from the civil society. The Forest and Wildlife Management National System will be one of the new environments of coordination created with this new law. In terms of the decentralization process, this new Law will also help to clarify the functions between the national and regional authorities, where most of the management and control of the forest resources will go down to regional authorities.

Another problem is the illegal logging. Despite the legal framework governing the use of forest resources, the impunity with which illegal activity is often carried out makes it very difficult for legitimate, sustainably managed forest enterprises to compete in the marketplace. Peru is losing annually approximately US\$200 million due to the illegal extraction of timber that is estimated to reach 70% of total timber extraction. Illegal timber extraction in Peru is characterized by strong criminal networks colluded with state representatives¹.

This situation was the main concern of US civil society during PTPA negotiations between the GOP and USG. This agreement entered into force on February 1, 2009 and included an Annex on Forest Sector Governance, which provides concrete steps to enhance forest sector governance and promote legal trade in timber products. This Annex is considered the result of US civil society intense pressure to address the impact of a free trade agreement on the extraction and commercialization of timber and non-timber forest resources in Peru. The office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), U.S. Department of State, USAID, and the USFS committed to provide support to Peru to comply with the PTPA: Annex on Forest Sector Governance.

USFS/PFSI has identified several tendencies that are related directly or indirectly with the forest sector in Peru:

- Current international economic crisis might restrict resources for the sustainable forest management in Peru.
- Different actors have overlapping concepts, approaches and competences in terms of forest management in Peru.
- There is a favorable legal framework for sustainable forest management initiatives.
- Regional governments in the Amazon show a positive trend to impulse public policies and initiatives to favor sustainable forest management.
- Public institutions are more aware of the challenges and of the organizational capacity gaps in their sector.
- There is a need to specify the role of organizations for international cooperation.
- There is a challenge to increase the transparency in public and private management.

¹ UICN (2012) Una Mirada Integral a los Bosques del Perú, Quito.

Although the cooperation between USAID, USFS and the GOP started even before the PTPA, negotiations, around 2004, it is intensified since 2009. USFS/PFSI provided technical assistance to facilitate key processes such as:

- Prior Consultation with indigenous peoples for the approval of the 2011 forest law.
- Strengthening the Interregional Council of the Amazon (CIAM) technical secretariat.
- Programmatic collaboration with the national information systems for the forest sector.
- Design and implementation of the pilot project for the forest inventory in production forests.
- Creation of a national and regional platforms for the community based forest management
- Technical advice to indigenous communities for sustainable forest management and commercialization of timber products.
- Technical advice for the new regional and national institutions
- Regulation of the forest law
- Technical and logistical support for Forestry & Wildlife National Policy
- Facilitate the process and promote the work between national and regional levels

In this sense, USFS/PFSI has been a key player in helping major stakeholders engaged in the debate surrounding the approval of the pending regulations of the Forestry and Wildlife Law, and many of the results of the program need to be assessed under this social and political framework.

Problem or Opportunity Addressed

Although Peru still enjoys a reputation as a highly forested, low-deforestation country, illegal logging activities compounded by weak forest management threaten to substantially alter this landscape. This threat has increased rapidly in recent years as a consequence of new roads, weak forest governance institutions, and the expansion of the agricultural frontier.

USFS/PFSI focuses on improving forest governance. Effective governance is central to improve forest management and forest outcomes. Several factors influence the effectiveness of forest governance: careful legislation and law enforcement, greater participation by key actors, accountability of decision-makers, better monitoring of forest outcomes and higher investments in capacities at local, regional, and national levels².

The lack of strong institutions, the need for important legal reforms and the insufficient technical capacities in the sector to achieve the goals in the PTPA: Annex on Forest Sector Governance, were the main reasons why this technical cooperation between USAID and USFS was developed. Between 2009 and 2010 several activities were identified to improve the management and governance of the forest sector in Peru together with the most relevant stakeholders in the topic. A matrix was developed to review the Annex and prioritize the most important activities to be done. This second PAPA was established to continue these activities.

As stated above, after the GOP implemented several policy changes in order to fully comply with all the requirements of the PTPA, there was a social unrest in the Northern Peruvian Amazon, when indigenous peoples perceived that these policy changes not only failed to comply with the prior informed consultation process, but also meant significant challenges for the natural resources base. USFS/PFSI is becoming a strategic collaboration between the United States and Peruvian Governments in order to tackle these

²Agrawal, A. et al. (2008) Changing governance of the world's forests. Science 320, 1420.

social and political challenges, and this evaluation will need to have this fact as an underlying institutional context.

USAID, through USFS/PFSI, is focusing its efforts on helping the GOP implement the new groundbreaking forestry law that will move Peru to a low-emission, high-sequestration development path and address one of the main limitations, the large number of authorities with overlapping roles in forest sector.

Target Areas and Groups

In Peru the forest sector involves several stakeholders: government representatives, native communities, forest concessionaries, exporters, and different organizations from the civil society. Target groups can be of two classes. Local partners for the different activities USFS/PFSI are carrying out. The most relevant ones being the Forest Direction at the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG-DGFFS), Ministry of Environment (MINAM), Forest Resources Supervisor (OSINFOR), regional and local governments in the Amazon (Amazonas, Loreto, San Martin, Ucayali and Madre de Dios), Interregional Council of the Amazon (CIAM), among others. They are receiving different benefits in terms of capacity building and technical cooperation. The second group will be the long-term beneficiaries of the intervention, basically native communities, and forest concessionaries (and future ones). They are the target group to increase, through coordination and access to quality information, their sustainable management skills.

Intended results

USFS/PFSI objective is to contribute to the sustainable forest management in Peru by developing technical capacities, tools and methodologies and by strengthening key actors in the public and private sector in the prioritized areas. To achieve this goal four results were established. The results are divided according to the different components and activities of the program. First, the program should contribute to the conservation and management of forest ecosystems (RESULT 1). Second, the program should strengthen relevant institutions and stakeholders (RESULT 2). Third, natural resources information access should be improved, transparency should be promoted and natural resources management should be participative (RESULT 3). Fourth, the program should focus on capacity building for the sustainable management of forest in communities (RESULT 4).

In turn, these results will be accomplished by working towards several intermediate results. For RESULT 1, two intermediate results are described. First, Peru counts with forest inventories, designed and implemented coordinately with Regional Governments in the Amazon and with the National Forest Authority. Second, public and private research institutions improve their technical capacity, the quality of technological services, and their training services for an advanced forest management and forest products development.

The first intermediate result regarding forest inventories involves: Permanent Production Forest (BPP) inventories, National Forest Inventory, population studies and CEDRO project implemented by MINAM (which identifies several species of cedrela). Several goals and activities are set for each of these lines.

The second intermediate result of strengthening public and private research institutions also includes two main lines of action: forest product laboratories and forest management tools. Several goals and activities are set for each of these lines.

For RESULT 2, again two intermediate results must be achieved. First, the GOP at national and regional levels must develop and strengthen their institutions and mechanisms for a sustainable forest management. This includes the national policy for forests and wildlife (PNFFS) and regulations (RLFFS). Second, sustainable forest management experiences must be developed and shared between key actors.

For RESULT 3, two other intermediate results are included. One of the most ambitious projects is called National Information System of Forest and Wildlife (SNIFF). USFS/PFSI will focus on the design and implementation of the control module. The second one states that relevant legal framework will be

developed and regional geospatial information repositories will be implemented and articulated with the national level.

For RESULT 4, the intermediate result search for validation and sharing of sustainable forest management experiences between key actors from native communities.

For these final and intermediate results a list of stages were defined with the most important milestones to be achieved.

Approach and Implementation

In the forest sector, the CDCS states that USAID/Peru assistance will support the implementation of the Environmental Chapter of the PTPA and its Annex on Forest Sector Governance by building GOP capacity to enact and enforce environmental laws and prosecute environmental crimes. Additionally, USAID will strengthen environmental governance by supporting science and applied environmental research and training, which are essential to effective environmental and natural resources policy and regulatory decisions.

USAID and USFS/PFSI activities are meant to directly support GOP strategies and priorities for environmental and natural resource management, including the National Environmental Policy; the National Environmental Action Plan (2011-2021); the PTPA Environmental Chapter and Annex on Forest Sector Governance; the Peru Forestry Law; among others. Furthermore, the activities are designed to build Peru's capacity to take ownership and professionally administer environmental management programs while promoting good governance in targeted institutions at both national and sub-national levels.

USFS/PFSI does not produce products but assists the GOP to implement processes. The quality of processes it assists is as important to the USFS/PFSI as the product itself, because it believes that high quality process will result in sustainability. High quality processes will so enroot laws, regulations and procedures in the operations of the institutions that USFS/PFSI assists that they will continue after the program ends. The attributes for measuring the quality of the processes assisted by USFS/PFSI are shown in the following table:

Table 1: Attributes for measuring quality of processes assisted by USFS/PFSI

Name	Description	Illustrative Verification Documents
<i>Consensus/agreement</i>	<i>Actors have agreed on the process and its results;</i>	<i>Signed agreements</i>
<i>Participation/inclusion</i>	<i>Actors and key stakeholders involved in the processes</i>	<i>Records of attendance & participation</i>
<i>Commitment</i>	<i>Key actors have agreed to implement the processes</i>	<i>Signed agreements, approved meeting minutes, official designation of responsibilities</i>
<i>Decentralization</i>	<i>Regional and local institutions involved in the processes</i>	<i>Attendance records</i>
<i>Inter-institutional</i>	<i>A variety of key institutions collaborate in the processes</i>	<i>Records of meetings</i>

USFS/PFSI emphasizes its role as a technical partner that facilitates processes, under an approach of adaptability, opportunity, and shared knowledge building together with local partners. USFS/PFSI facilitation process is guided by the following criteria:

- Key actors in Peru have the initiative and the responsibility to agree and define the objectives, agenda and activities. USFS/PFSI collaborates with some discussion, priorities, and concerted decision-making processes.

- USFS/PFSI respects forest public policy and every normative and frameworks part of the national legislation. Opportunities to promote gender, social inclusion and intercultural issues would demand special attention.
- Participation of a wide range of key representatives of the government and civil society and their collaborative work are emphasized. Tensions within the sector always exist, but USFS/PFSI supports dialogue to identify common places and shared benefits.

Reforms in the forest sector involve new agendas, responsibilities, competencies and functions for state, civil society and market actors in Peru. This is a process of changes and continuous learning, and requires capacity building. To implement the activities for capacity building USFS/PFSI uses these criteria:

- Work closely with local key actors to define training objectives, content, methodologies, specialist requirement, materials, and criteria to evaluate the demanded initiatives.
- Highlight contributions and responsibilities of local partners and USFS/PFSI and work together with other organizations for international cooperation to avoid overlapping of training initiatives.
- Improve not only individual performance but also at institutional level through technical and management capacity development. Technical capacities refer to forest management, while management capacities allow institutions to conduct their planning and execution processes, and operative and strategic evaluations.
- Experiences should be systematized to highlight and replicate best practices and find lessons learned.

In Peru the forest sector is quite complex and it has been changing over the years. The decentralization process, the highly dynamic sector in terms of institutions and norms, the evolution of new forest use initiatives, such as environmental services, and the opportunities and challenges that the PTPA Annex on Forest Sector Governance has brought are past and current trends that are affecting the implementation of the program. The implementation uses a process approach to pursue real sustainable changes that can last longer in this complex context; together with an ecosystem approach to analyze landscapes as an interaction between the natural and socio-cultural systems.

Existing Data

Documents from the mission and the program, already available, that will be used for the evaluation are:

- USAID/Perú Country Development Cooperation Strategy (2012-2016)
- U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA): Annex on Forest Sector Governance
- Program Contract (PAPA)
- USFS/PFSI annual work plans (from 2009 to 2013)
- USFS/PFSI Strategic Plan (2012-2016)
- Program Monitoring Plan
- Results Framework updated

The program does not count with a baseline. Although the present evaluation is not considered a baseline it will be used as an input for the final external evaluation of the program.

Additional external information considered relevant comprises:

- Secondary literature on forest governance indicators
- Forest management technical manuals
- Reports on forest inventories and quality improvements
- Secondary literature on deforestation process and its main drivers in Peru
- Training and workshop reports
- Reviewed norms, policies and regulations

- Official documents regarding the roles, positions and competencies between the different institutions relevant in the forest sector
- Secondary literature on illegal extraction of timber
- Official documents regarding the chain of custody and how it has evolved (key processes for CITES species)
- Public perceptions of the forestry sector (Equipo Uno)
- Sistematization of Condocanqui project, USFS/PFSI support to CIAM/regional Government of Amazonas project
- National Forest and Wildlife Law
- Forestry & Wildlife National Policy
- National Environmental Policy
- Agreements generated by Round Tables with indigenous communities (# 2 and 4)
- SPDA report on prior consultation process (for the LFFS)
- Decentralization Law
- Environmental Cooperation Work Program 2011 – 2014 (within framework of the PTPA and the Annex on Forest Sector Governance)
- Priorities of the GOP for cooperation under the PTPA, December 2012

EVALUATION RATIONALE

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the performance of USFS/PFSI, which, since its inception in 2009, has not been subject to an evaluation. An external intermediate evaluation will provide accountability and will show how USFS/PFSI is working towards achieving its goals. The evaluation period will be between FY12, USFS/PFSI's current PAPA starting year, up to now. USFS/PFSI first phase, from 2009 till FY11 will be considered part of the background of the program.

This external mid-term evaluation will be an important input for the final evaluation of the program in 2016.

The specific objectives of the evaluation of USFS/PFSI performance are:

- To understand how the intermediate results milestones are being achieved, specifically in terms of the main attributes of USFS/PFSI key processes.
- To identify external performance drivers and constraints and internal advantages and weaknesses.
- To analyze USFS/PFSI relationships and synergies with other relevant interventions.
- To assess how the activities of USFS/PFSI are improving forest governance in Peru.
- To provide recommendations for improvement.

Audience and Intended Uses

The main audience identified for using the results of this evaluation comprises is USFS/PFSI. Secondary actors that might be also interested are:

- USAID/Peru and auditors
- USAID (Washington D.C.)
- USFS

The main use of the results of this evaluation is to identify learning opportunities for enhancement and improvement of USFS/PFSI model, by assessing its design, suggesting whether the program should continue its strategies and implementation approach or whether it should be reoriented.

The performance results will also be used as a reference for the final external evaluation of USFS/PFSI.

This intermediate evaluation will provide first insights about this unique program in terms of its contribution with USAID/Peru general intervention for forest governance improvement and sustainable forest management, in the context of the free trade agreement.

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation aims to answer two main questions:

QUESTION 1: How is USFS/PFSI achieving its intermediate results milestones?

Sub-questions:

- What are the main external drivers and constraints underlying USFS/PFSI performance?
- What are the internal advantages or weaknesses explaining why or why not USFS/PFSI is in its way of meeting its goals?
- How USFS/PFSI have been adapting to changes in the external context? What are the main lessons learned? How quick is adapting over time?
- How relevant are USFS/PFSI strategies, implementation approach, key processes and focus areas in terms of satisfying target groups' current and future needs (including the PTPA and forest and wildlife regulations and policies)?

QUESTION 2: To what extent is USFS/PFSI, through the establishment of quality processes, contributing to improve the forest governance levels and forest management in Peru towards a more integrated territorial approach?

Sub-questions:

- How is the technical assistance and knowledge exchange between USFS, PFSI and its target groups supporting forest governance in Peru both at national and regional levels?
- Which are the most important and stronger synergies developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI among national and between national and regional institutions?
- How articulated are USFS/PFSI relationships with other similar interventions or projects (also funded by USAID or implemented by other organization)?
- How are these affecting or supporting USFS/PFSI activities, and ultimately forest governance in Peru?
- Which are the most important milestones achieved and activities developed and facilitated by USFS/PFSI to provide relevant and transparent information for the forest sector, with a focus on the SNIFF control module?
- Within all USFS/PFSI activities, which are the main changes implemented? How can be appropriated and maintained in the future?
- Which are the elements identified by USFS/PFSI to secure sustainability especially when the context changes?

EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design and methodology aims to connect the evaluation questions with the evaluation processes of collecting and analyzing data, and reporting the main results. The answers for the evaluation questions raised above are expected to be mainly descriptive and normative. The evaluation design will consider both descriptive and normative approaches. A descriptive design for this type of performance assessment refers to a non-experimental design, at one point in time, without a comparison group, assessing different outcomes. Hence, the evaluation does not look for a causal relationship or for a change

over time. A normative design also includes certain criteria for assessment. In this case it will be program goals, intermediate targets and key forest governance indicators.

The type of evaluation at this stage for USFS/PFSI is a qualitative intermediate performance evaluation that will be used as an important input for its final evaluation. Performance for this complex program is rather process-biased. Qualitative data analysis will be the main analysis method for this type of evaluation. Quantitative data analysis will complement the analysis whenever is possible.

To address QUESTION 1 a review of official documents from the program together with interviews with program managers will be done. Criteria for assessment will be intermediate results milestones and the attributes for key processes (see sub-section I.6).

To address QUESTION 2 a more complex analysis will be done. Interviews with local partners at different levels and other stakeholders will be made to collect information on their participation, ownership and perceptions of the program. Criteria for assessment will be key forest governance indicators.

Information collected for one question will be also useful for the other one, and viceversa.

Forest governance is a key concept for the evaluation design, as most of the activities that USFS/PFSI is carrying out are directly or indirectly related to it. Forest Governance can be understood as a multidimensional concept involving a diversity of actors, rules and practices which are inherently complex and interconnected.

Different initiatives have been implemented to understand how forest governance should be evaluated and measured. One of these is the Governance of Forests Initiative (GFI) which is a global network of civil society organizations led by the World Resources Institute³. GFI proposed a common definition and conceptual framework for understanding the meaning of good governance of forests across different country contexts. The Framework consists of key “principles” and “components” that are used to define good governance of forests, and a set of governance “indicators”, or diagnostic questions that assess the quality and adequacy of a particular aspect of governance⁴.

It is not the purpose of this evaluation to analyze every dimension of forest governance. The evaluation will focus on the three most relevant for USFS/PFSI’s objectives, which are: capacity, coordination and transparency. These dimensions are also found as main principles in the Forestry and Wildlife Law and the PNFSS, which highlight the importance of an integrated coordination and cooperation within different sectors, institutions and disciplines and an informed participation.

- Capacity refers to the government’s social, educational, technological, legal, and institutional ability to provide public access to decision-making, as well as the ability of civil society to make use of such access. This includes the capacity of government and official institutions to act autonomously and independently, the availability of resources (both human and financial) to provide access, and the capacity of civil society (particularly NGOs and the media) to analyze the issues and participate effectively.
- Coordination refers to the extent to which various agencies and actors whose decisions impact upon forests are advancing common objectives. There are usually separate government agencies and authorities with oversight for forests, environment, land use, agriculture, infrastructure and

³ See more information <http://www.wri.org/project/governance-of-forests-initiative>

⁴ A framework developed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations was also reviewed, and complements the one from WRI.

general macroeconomic planning, respectively. Too often, there is a lack of coordination between these actors.

- Transparency is the process of revealing actions so that outsiders can scrutinize them. Facilitating access to quality information is critical in order to inform and engage public constituents. Attributes of transparency include the quality, timeliness, availability, comprehensibility of information, and whether efforts are made to make sure information reaches and is used by affected and vulnerable groups as appropriate.

The idea is to propose a set of indicators that will be useful to evaluate to what extent USFS/PFSI activities are strengthening forest governance, based on these principles. The proposed indicators are:

CAPACITY

1. Expertise of forest management agencies

We define ‘forest management agencies’ as the various public institutions responsible for undertaking at least one task related to the administration and implementation of rules relating to forest management. In order to achieve national, interregional, regional and local objectives for forest management, agencies need to have the capacities, and particularly relevant expertise, to effectively execute their responsibilities. *This indicator should be applied once for each of the relevant agencies.*

2. Capacity of law enforcement agencies

Illegal activities are one of the biggest threats to sustainable forest management. Generally speaking, enforcement agencies are those empowered to enforce the various legal instruments governing the forest sector. Depending on the type of law involved, enforcement may be carried out by the staff of government administrative agencies (such as the forest agency), the police, military, communities or even private companies or civil society organizations under government contract. The remoteness of many forested areas creates significant challenges for enforcement. *This indicator should be applied once for each relevant law enforcement agency.*

3. Capacity to conduct land use planning

Land use planning is an intensive process that requires expertise in environmental, social and economic issues in order to identify and resolve conflicts between competing land uses, between the needs of individuals and of the community, and between the needs of present and future generations. The process should be iterative and continuous, which requires continual access to adequate technology for producing timely and reliable analysis of changing social, economic or other conditions. Land use planning can be conducted at the national, regional or local level. *The indicator can be applied to an agency conducting land use planning at any of these levels.*

4. Local community participation in forest management

Involving communities in forest management is typically thought to lead to improved environmental outcomes in forests. In a small but growing number of cases, communities are given formal ownership or management rights over forests. In these cases, communities may require some external support to improve their capacity to manage forests effectively and comply with relevant legal requirements. Meaningful two-way communication between communities and other local stakeholders, such as the government or private companies can also support the management process. In cases where community ownership or use rights are not explicitly acknowledged, community participation in local forest management decisions should still be encouraged, especially where those decisions have impacts on communities. Access to relevant information is critical to ensuring that communities have meaningful participation in those decisions. *To implement this indicator, select one community or geographical area as a case study*

COORDINATION

1. Coordination and cooperation within and among forest agencies (including national law enforcement agencies), at national and regional level

It is important to know the extent, appropriateness, and adequacy of coordination and cooperation between national and regional agencies on forest-related activities. This information is crucial in order to know if the program has a wide and complete perspective of the forest management and its implementation in the different agencies and regions that composed the national territory. The cooperation within and among the different national forest agencies, such as the relationship between different ministries that work with forest resources, the relationship between the different regional agencies and the relationship between the central offices and the regional ones, need proper channels to cooperate and coordinate and it is important to know how they are doing it. A proper decentralization process works if the national and regional levels work together in order to have the most effective exchange of information and capacities, the national level should have the tools to support and empower the regional agencies of the sector.

2. Coordination and cooperation between forest agencies and other stakeholders from the forest sector

It is important to know the extent, appropriateness, and adequacy of coordination and cooperation between forest agencies and other stakeholders from the forest sector, and how mutually supportive they are. Many decisions related to the forest sector need a clear and effective coordination between the stakeholders, these inter-institutional activities should have proper channels in order to create and elaborate the different technical tools and programs that need to be done in the Peruvian forest sector. The stakeholders are different institutions classified by the program in: Institutions from the Peruvian Government, Institutions from US Government, Congress' commissions, Regional Governments, Indigenous organizations, Private sector, Universities, International Financial Institutions, NGOs, National Experts.

3. Coordination of policy- and law-making across sectors

Policies and laws in other sectors of the economy can have significant impacts on forest management and may distort forest policies. They may include incentives for agricultural expansion, energy policies that increase dependence on fuelwood, settlement policies that assign property rights for clearing land, and macroeconomic policies that distort exchange rates or cause under-valuation. A better understanding of the linkages between different sectors and a coherent, multi-sector approach to policy and law making can reduce uncertainty and maximize synergies. Strong political will is required to facilitate better intersectoral coordination. *To apply this indicator, pick one recent policy or law process from another sector that had potential direct or indirect impacts on forest management.*

4. Forest laws and policies require coordination with land use plans

Land use plans should act as a foundation for forest management planning in order to promote consistency and coherence in activities throughout the forest sector. Forest laws and policies should provide explicit linkages with relevant national, regional and local land use plans.

5. Institutional coordination for land use planning

The national land use planning process is usually led by one governmental institution, but should involve the participation of different agencies across many sectors. Further, land use planning also happens at the sub-national level, involving district and local actors. All these governmental actors must act in a coordinated fashion to ensure consistency and efficiency in land use planning across all levels.

TRANSPARENCY

1. Information system as an institution for forest management

Information systems can enable effective implementation of policies, inform decision making, guide forest management, and provide a powerful tool for monitoring and enforcement. These systems must be very well designed, with accurate effective processes and comprehensive and accessible quality information,

and users of the system must have adequate capacity and political will to make use of the information and data within. The various types of information that may be included in a forest management information system include: a comprehensive forest inventory, showing how much forest there is, what types of forest it is, its location and assessment of its value; control mechanisms covering the whole supply chain; spatial information (i.e. maps) on all current and planned forest uses (e.g. protection, community, commercial, etc), and land uses that affect forests (e.g. conversion); information about forest tenure, including the who holds certain rights (e.g. rights of ownership, use, etc) and the spatial extent of those rights; information on permits and licenses, including administrative processes involved with their distribution; information on compliance with the terms of permits and licenses (e.g. monitoring and enforcement information); and, information on forest revenues collected.

2. Public access to information about forest management

For decision makers and society in general, the wide availability of accurate and current information about forests and forest uses is a fundamental element for good forest governance. A significant level of transparency of forest information means information is both available and accessible.

3. Forest inventories

Inventories of forest resources are a basic element of planning and efficient investing in the forest sector. Forest inventories typically show how much forest there is, what types of forest it is, its location and assessment of its health and value. *To apply this indicator assesses the most recent forest inventory in your country.*

4. Comprehensive and accurate information about forest tenure

Collecting and maintaining comprehensive and accurate information about the nature and spatial extent of tenure rights in forests is an important responsibility of the government, although there is a growing trend for the government to outsource information collection and management activities to private companies. This indicator can be applied to either arrangement. The main types of relevant information include who possess rights and what those rights are (e.g. a register) and the spatial extent of those rights (e.g. a cadastre). With regard to forests, these might include private and collective land ownership rights, and rights of individuals, communities, or private companies to utilize or manage forest resources on public lands through contracts (e.g. permits, licenses, concessions, etc).

5. Transparent and accessible administration of forest licenses and permits

Forest licenses and permits cover a wide range of short- to long-term forest rights, including the right to harvest timber, fuel-wood, non-timber forest products, or to transport or process forest products. Although there is no formal distinction between licenses and permits, permits are usually non-exclusive and involve less formal administrative procedures than licenses. It is not uncommon for governments to use both licenses and permits for the same forests. For example, a company or community may hold a license to manage a particular area of forest for 25 years, but is still required to apply for permits for specific activities such as road building or timber harvesting. The forest agency is usually responsible for the administration of licenses and permits, which includes activities such as processing requests for and awarding licenses and permits. Administrative services should be widely accessible (in terms of time, cost and location) and available to all types of forest users.

Data Collection Methods

Methods of data collection to answer QUESTION 1 include program documents compilation and specific interviews with program managers. The aim of this question is to assess how the activities are being conducted, and how effective are the key processes in terms of their attributes. It is important to remark that the results for both questions can feedback each other. The perspective of the target groups is quite important to validate how things are being done by the program.

The main data collection method to answer QUESTION 2 is the use of semi structured interviews. The semi structured interviews will help to collect different kinds of information: facts, which can be verified by interviewing different actors, perspectives, their own analysis of the activities and what the program has learned, suggestions, and even reactions to the evaluator's statements. Key respondents are the ones considered program target groups, basically local partners at national and regional levels.

The following procedure will be carried out

I. Planning interviews

a. Identifying respondents

Key informants have a good understanding of the problem to be explored and have participated directly in the program. For each question the relevant respondents (actors or institutions) will be listed and at least one representative will be selected. USFS/PFSI will provide a list of potential respondents. The Evaluation Team will confirm the selection of them by approaching each of the relevant national and regional institutions.

b. Number of interviews

It is hard to determine the exact number of interviews that have to be done for a complete evaluation. Given that semi-structured interviews are the main source of information, significant number of interviews should be conducted. There at least three types of semi structured interviews (for key respondents at national, interregional and regional level) that include questions for the different program components. Data saturation is a fundamental criterion to recognize that the number of interviews is enough for the evaluation.

c. Preparing interviews

Even though semi-structured interviews are flexible, they require rigorous preparation. It is essential that the Evaluation Team defines their objectives, devise an interview plan and agree on the format and protocol for its conduction. Questions should be determined after an exhaustive revision, basically they will be linked to the indicators presented above. For each indicator a combination of elements and questions will be included for its final score. Each element and question can involve yes/no and ranked answers to help assessing the indicator. Key respondents should be contacted and an appointment should be scheduled. The place of the interview is quite important, it should be as neutral, confidential, comfortable, and easily accessible as possible.

2. Interviewing respondents

a. Duration

Semi-structured interviews should last from 60 to 90 minutes. Sixty-minute interviews are perfectly acceptable and ensure that neither the interviewer nor the respondent lose their concentration.

b. Initiating interviews

An easy way to start an interview is by an introduction of the interviewer and then by reminding the respondent of the goals of the interview, projected length and the topics to be discussed. It is important to tell the respondent that he/she will be interviewed as a representative of a national or regional institution. If the interview is to be recorded, the respondent must be asked for his/her written or verbal consent and reminded that his/her statements will be kept confidential at all times.

c. Conducting interviews

The interview should start with an open-ended question. Whenever is appropriate relate answers with statements previously interviewed for validating information. All the topics

included in the interview plan should be covered. Ask more questions if additional information can be obtained. Questions must be asked as clearly and direct as possible.

d. Concluding interviews

Since semi-structured interviews do not consist of closed questions, it may be hard to end them. When interviewers feel that all topics have been discussed and that the time set aside for the interview is up, they can ask the respondent if he/she has anything to add. Interviewers must then thank the respondent for participating, explain how the rest of the safety diagnosis project will proceed and mention that the results will be sent to him/her once the diagnosis is complete.

First drafts of the semi structured interview tool are enclosed to this document. After their application the collected data will be prepared and validated, described and analyzed.

Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis methodology includes the following steps:

1. Data preparation: reporting all the interviews, validating and verifying consistency within the answers.
2. Descriptive analysis: explaining and illustrating the results of the activities in terms of the program key processes' attributes and the results of the proposed indicators.
3. Synthesis analysis: after the data has been collected, prepared and described, it will be used to answer both questions, and its corresponding sub-questions.

Methodological Strengths and Limitations

For a descriptive analysis a non-experimental design is one of the strongest methods. However, this type of design has certain limitations in terms of internal and external validity, because the evaluation does not assess any cause-effect relationships between the program and its results.

Qualitative data approaches allow evaluators to deepen into different issues, to understand the program context and provide rich and informative data. Implementing interviews are relatively time and cost effective, and easy to be use. It is an appropriate tool because there are a limited number of key respondents, in comparison with beneficiaries at household level which can be hundreds. It is quite important to pick up stakeholders perceptions and opinions. However, the main disadvantage of this approach and specifically this tool refers to the representativeness of the respondent, particularly to target groups and beneficiaries. Qualitative evaluation does not involve random sampling from a previously defined population. It is quite challenging to select a sample group that is representative to a population. Broad conclusions should be made with caution.

Forest governance, as stated before, is a multidimensional concept, and the indicators proposed refer to the most relevant dimensions of forest governance. This methodology do not intend to evaluate exhaustively how good is forest governance because of USFS/PFSI activities, but to what extent the program is contributing. The indicators are qualitative and the way to obtain the final scores can contain certain degree of subjectivity and biases.

EVALUATION PRODUCTS

Deliverables

The five deliverables are described in the following table

Table 2: Contents and schedule of deliverables

Deliverables	Contents	Due date
1	Final design, including final indicators, identification of key respondents, and sources of key quantitative data.	1st week after start
2	Tools and protocols for data collection	1st week after start
3	Interviews report	7th week after start
4	Presentation of preliminary findings	11th week after start
5	Final report including USAID/Peru revision	16th week after start

Reporting Guidelines

USAID's Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report

- The evaluation report should represent a thoughtful, well-researched and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what worked in the project, what did not and why.
- Evaluation reports shall address all evaluation questions included in the scope of work.
- The evaluation report should include the scope of work as an annex. All modifications to the scope of work, whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology or timeline need to be agreed upon in writing by the technical officer.
- Evaluation methodology shall be explained in detail and all tools used in conducting the evaluation such as questionnaires, checklists and discussion guides will be included in an Annex in the final report.
- Evaluation findings will assess outcomes and impact on males and females.
- Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between comparator groups, etc.).
- Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence and data and not based on anecdotes, hearsay or the compilation of people's opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- Sources of information need to be properly identified and listed in an annex.
- Recommendations need to be supported by a specific set of findings.
- Recommendations should be action-oriented, practical and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

TEAM COMPOSITION

Project staff will work with the subcontractor Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE) to complete the design of the evaluation, which includes the identification of the key respondents and the design of the data collection tools. The evaluation team will also work with USFS/PFSI's and USAID's monitoring teams, in drafting a final tool for data collection.

After the approval of the SOW, the evaluation team will be led by GRADE and the project field team and headquarters staff will guide the implementation and reporting as agreed upon during the design process. GRADE must design a senior researcher as responsible for operating the project who will report about the advances in the activities and results of the evaluation. He will work with a field leader and a data processing specialist. The elaboration of the report will be led by the senior researcher, with the collaboration of specialists in forestry economics and local governments.

EVALUATION MANAGEMENT

Scheduling

A timeline for review is presented below:

Table 3: Timeline for Evaluation Implementation

		Aug					Sep					Oct					Nov				
Tasks		5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20				
1	Preparation of activities																				
	SOW sent for approval	■																			
2	Start-up																				
	Final design	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Tools and protocols for data collection	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Identification of keyrespondents	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Collection of secondaryinformation	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
3	Fieldwork																				
	National officials and other stakeholders		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	USFS/PFSI managers		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Regional officials and other stakeholders			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Interviews report			■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
4	Data analysis																				
	Data preparation										■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Draft of descriptive and statistical report										■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Draft of analysisreport											■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Discussion of results												■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
	Presentation of preliminaryfindings													■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
5	Final report																				
	Final draft including feedback from presentation														■	■	■	■	■	■	
	USAID/Perureview															■	■	■	■	■	
	Final report																■	■	■	■	

ANNEX II: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Guides for Interviewing Informants at Regional Level

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ARAs (Autoridad Regional Ambiental)

Gestión Forestal

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: de ----- de 201-----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

III. Dimensión: CAPACIDAD

1. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Evaluación del(a) entrevistado(a)	N° de especialistas		1	2	3	4	5
	Hombres	Mujeres	Muy insatisfactoria	Algo insatisfactoria	Ni satisfactoria ni insatisfactoria	Algo satisfactoria	Muy satisfactoria
Número de especialistas que trabajan en su institución en la región							
Calidad de las habilidades de los especialistas							
Pertinencia de la experiencia de los especialistas y las funciones de sus respectivos cargos							

2. En los últimos tres años, ¿Cree usted que la distribución ha mejorado? Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga sus elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Un gran empeoramiento	Un empeoramiento	Ni un mejora ni un empeoramiento	Una mejora
Distribución					

3. Describa cómo la oficina de gestión forestal comunitaria y el personal específico han sido creados e implementados.

¿Cómo han sido creados e implementados?

4. Por favor califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la contribución de PFSI/ USFS para definir una estrategia general (nacional o regional) de desarrollo de capacidades y a mejorar la calidad/capacidad de los recursos humanos de su unidad. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Contribución de PFSI/ USFS	1	2	3	4	5
	Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
En la definición de una estrategia general (nacional o regional) de desarrollo de capacidades					
En la mejora de la calidad/capacidad de los recursos humanos de su unidad					

5. Por favor califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su satisfacción con respecto a los salarios ofrecidos tomando en cuenta si estos son adecuados (comparados con el mercado profesional) para atraer un personal con los conocimientos requeridos. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
Salarios					

6. Por favor califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su percepción acerca del desempeño institucional de las siguientes instituciones en el sector (explique su calificación):

Institución / Dirección	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
ARA en Inventarios Forestales	Desempeño					
ARA en Ordenamiento Territorial						
ARA en Sistemas de Información						
OSINFOR - Oficinas Desconcentradas (ODs)						
CIAM (Consejo Interregional Amazónico)						

7. Indique la frecuencia de las siguientes actividades considerando los últimos tres años. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde 5 es el mayor valor) la calidad de las capacitaciones. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Evaluación de las capacitaciones	Nº de capacitaciones	Calificación				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Capacitaciones vinculadas a actividades directamente con la actividad profesional de su personal						
Capacitaciones sobre el marco regulatorio forestal en las que el personal ha participado						

8. ¿Cuántas de las capacitaciones anteriores se llevaron a cabo en tu región? ¿Estas fueron diseñadas solo por profesionales que trabajan en la región o fueron cursos de capacitación nacionales con tu región como anfitriona?

--

9. Describa las tres capacitaciones más relevantes y sus respectivos objetivos:

Capacitaciones más relevantes	Objetivo	Descripción
Capacitación 1		
Capacitación 2		
Capacitación 3		

10. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre la utilidad y relevancia (para las necesidades de su región) de las capacitaciones y viajes de estudio proporcionados por PFSI. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Capacitaciones	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					
Viajes de estudio	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

11. De acuerdo a su opinión, ¿Qué es lo que su institución ha aprendido de los expertos de la agencia US ForestServices y PFSI (por ejemplo, soporte técnico en la formulación de políticas forestales, proceso de diseño de la institucionalidad forestal, gestión forestal comunitaria, sistemas de información)?
12. ¿Cómo planea intercambiar sus conocimientos y experiencias para fortalecer las habilidades de su unidad? Explique.

--

13. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre si su institución tiene equipamiento adecuado y tecnologías de información (ej. Computadoras, programas informáticos apropiados, GPS, GIS) y otros recursos financieros y tecnológicos para poder cumplir con sus responsabilidades. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada adecuado	Poco adecuado	Regular	Adecuado	Muy adecuado
Equipamiento					
Tecnologías de información					
Recursos financieros					
Recursos tecnológicos					

14. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre cuánto PFSI/ USFS ha fortalecido las capacidades de su institución en el manejo de sus recursos de tecnologías de la información. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Cuánto PFSI ha fortalecido las capacidades de su institución en el manejo de sus recursos de tecnologías de la información					

15. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cómo son sus herramientas en comparación a las de otras regiones. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada actualizadas	Poco actualizadas	Regulares	Actualizadas	Muy actualizadas
Cómo son sus herramientas en comparación a las de otras regiones					

IV. Dimensión: COORDINACIÓN

16. Enumere y nombre otras instituciones forestales y de ordenamiento territorial, organizaciones de sociedad civil, empresas madereras con las cuales tu institución coordina:

Nº	Nombre de la Institución/ organización/ empresa
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

17. Describa los mecanismos de intercambio de información entre instituciones en el sector forestal y el sector agrícola.

18. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán frecuente es su respuesta hacia otras instituciones o demandas internas de información. Indique en la casilla en blanco a que frecuencia exacta se refiere con su elección. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Respuesta a otras instituciones y demandas internas por información					

19. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán frecuente reúne y consolida información de autoridades/ instituciones locales y centrales. Indique en la casilla en blanco a que frecuencia exacta se refiere con su elección. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Reunión y consolidación de información de autoridades/ instituciones locales y centrales					

20. Participación en formulación de políticas sectoriales y en los planes de uso del suelo (ordenamiento territorial): Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde el número 5 representa el valor más alto) y marque con una X en la casilla que corresponda a su elección. Mencionar los tres procesos de formulación de políticas sectoriales y las tres actividades vinculadas a los Planes de Ordenamiento Territorial más relevantes y cómo influyen al sector forestal. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Evaluación de su institución	1	2	3	4	5
	Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
Su institución participa normalmente en procesos de formulación de políticas					
Su institución participa normalmente en el desarrollo de planes de ordenamiento territorial					

	Nombre	¿Cómo influencia al sector forestal?
Procesos de formulación de políticas más relevantes		
Planes de ordenamiento territorial		

21. ¿Qué planes e instrumentos relacionados con los bosques y el suelo son considerados (por ejemplo, planes del uso del suelo) en la elaboración de leyes y políticas forestales? Explique.

Planes e Instrumentos

22. Las políticas y el marco normativo del sector forestal, al referirse a los temas vinculados con los cambios de uso de suelo y ordenamiento territorial, ¿usan definiciones y provisiones que son consistentes con las usadas en los procesos de ZEE y OT?

23. Describa los esfuerzos hechos para determinar cómo las leyes y políticas van a impactar en los bosques y bosques comunitarios (por ejemplo, los tomadores de decisiones consultan a los expertos relevantes, análisis de impacto de las conductas, participación de las comunidades).

24. ¿Cómo PFSI ha apoyado todas estas mejoras de coordinación?(por ejemplo, facilitando la participación de los gobiernos regionales en el proceso de formulación de políticas forestales, plataformas de gestión forestal comunitario, gobernanza forestal comunitaria, secretaría del CIAM). Explique.

25. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la utilidad y relevancia de las actividades de coordinación provistas por PFSI/USFS. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Actividades de coordinación provistas por PFSI/USFS	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

V. Dimensión: TRANSPARENCIA

26. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde el número 5 representa el valor más alto) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Evaluación de los sistemas de información y participación	1	2	3	4	5
	Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
Existencia de un sistema de información completo y fiable que sirva de base para la supervisión y fiscalización forestal					
Acceso del público a información acerca de la supervisión y fiscalización forestal					
Habilidad de su institución para establecer y operar mecanismos para la participación ciudadana y transparencia					

27. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la utilidad y relevancia de las mejoras en los sistemas de información y acceso público a información sobre supervisión y fiscalización forestal por PFSI/USFS. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Mejoras en los sistemas de información y acceso público a la información sobre supervisión y fiscalización forestal provista por PFSI/ USFS	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

28. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán completo es el inventario forestal e información de crecimiento (todo lo que usted necesite para su aplicación), cuán actualizado (de acuerdo a los ciclos aceptados), y usado en la toma de decisiones y planificación por la institución. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
El inventario forestal e información de crecimiento	Es completo					
	Actualizado					
	Usado en la toma de decisiones y planificación					

29. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde el número 5 representa el valor más alto) la importancia del rol de PFSI con respecto a los inventarios forestales. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada importante	Poco importante	Ni importante ni poco importante	Importante	Muy importante
Rol de PFSI/ USFS con respecto a los inventarios forestales					

30. Explique las experiencias más exitosas en su trabajo con PSFI.

Experiencias más exitosas

31. ¿Cuál es el más importante proceso del sistema de información con respecto a los procedimientos en la cadena de suministros forestales, guiado como resultado de la colaboración con PFSI/USFS?

Más importante proceso del sistema de información

32. Describa los principales problemas y obstáculos encontrados en ese proceso. ¿Cómo puede usted lidiar con problemas similares en el futuro?

Principales problemas y obstáculos	¿Cómo lidiar con ellos en el futuro?

¡Muchas gracias por su colaboración!

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ARAs
(Autoridad Regional Ambiental)

Inventarios Forestales

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: de ----- de 201-----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ARAs
(Autoridad Regional Ambiental)

Ordenamiento territorial

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre:

Sexo: H M

Área:

Cargo:

Día de la entrevista: de de 201.....

Lugar de la entrevista:

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ARAs
(Autoridad Regional Ambiental)

Sistemas de Información

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre:

Sexo: H M

Área:

Cargo:

Día de la entrevista: de de 201.....

Lugar de la entrevista:

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON EMPRESAS MADERERAS

Gestión Forestal

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: ----- de ----- de 201 -----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ODS
(Oficinas Desconcentradas - OSINFOR)

Supervisión y Fiscalización de Bosques

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: ----- de ----- de 201-----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USF? sí NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON ORGANIZACIONES DE SOCIEDAD CIVIL

Gestión Forestal

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: ----- de ----- de 201-----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

Guides for Interviewing Informants at National Level

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON DGFFS (Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre)

Gestión Forestal

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: ----- de ----- de 201-----

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

III. Dimensión: CAPACIDAD

1. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Evaluación del(a) entrevistado(a)	Nº de especialistas		1	2	3	4	5
	Hombres	Mujeres	Muy inadecuado	Algo inadecuado	Ni adecuado ni inadecuado	Algo adecuado	Muy adecuado
Número de especialistas que trabajan en su institución							
Calidad de las habilidades de los especialistas							
Pertinencia de la experiencia de los especialistas y las funciones de sus respectivos cargos							

2. En los últimos tres años, ¿Cree usted que la distribución ha mejorado? Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga sus elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Un gran empeoramiento	Un empeoramiento	Ni un mejora ni un empeoramiento	Una mejora
Distribución					

3. Describa cómo las Oficinas de Manejo forestal Comunitario en las Regiones, con personal especializado, han sido creadas e implementadas. Explique

4. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la contribución del PFSI para definir una estrategia general (nacional y regional) de desarrollo de capacidades y para mejorar la habilidad de los recursos humanos de su institución. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Contribución de PFSI/ USFS	1	2	3	4	5
	Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
En la definición de una estrategia general (nacional o regional) de desarrollo de capacidades					
En la mejora de la calidad/capacidad de los recursos humanos de su unidad					

5. Por favor califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su satisfacción con respecto a los salarios ofrecidos tomando en cuenta si estos son adecuados (comparados con el mercado profesional) para atraer un personal con los conocimientos requeridos. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
Salarios					

6. Por favor califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su percepción acerca del desempeño institucional de las siguientes instituciones en el sector (explique su calificación):

Institución / Dirección	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Desempeño nada satisfactorio	Desempeño poco satisfactorio	Desempeño regular	Desempeño satisfactorio	Desempeño muy satisfactorio
DGFF en Inventarios Forestales	Desempeño					
DGFF en Sistemas de Información						
MINAM						
OSINFOR						
ARAs						

7. Indique la frecuencia de las siguientes actividades considerando los últimos tres años. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde 5 es el mayor valor) la calidad de las capacitaciones. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Evaluación de las capacitaciones	Nº de capacitaciones	Calificación				
		1	2	3	4	5
		Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Capacitaciones vinculadas a actividades directamente con la actividad profesional de su personal						
Capacitaciones en gestión forestal comunitaria						

8. Describa las tres capacitaciones más relevantes y sus respectivos objetivos:

Capacitaciones más relevantes	Objetivo	Descripción
Capacitación 1		
Capacitación 2		
Capacitación 3		

9. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre la utilidad y relevancia (para las necesidades de su región) de las capacitaciones y viajes de estudio proporcionados por PFSI. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Capacitaciones	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					
Viajes de estudio	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

10. De acuerdo a su opinión, ¿Qué es lo que su institución ha aprendido de los expertos de la agencia US Forest Services y PFSI (por ejemplo, soporte técnico en la formulación de políticas forestales, proceso de diseño de la institucionalidad forestal, gestión forestal comunitaria, sistemas de información)?

11. ¿Cómo planea intercambiar este conocimiento y experiencias para fortalecer la capacidad de su institución?

12. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre si su institución tiene equipamiento adecuado y tecnologías de información (ej. Computadoras, programas informáticos apropiados, GPS, GIS) y otros recursos financieros y tecnológicos para poder cumplir con sus responsabilidades. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección:

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada adecuad o	Poco adecuad o	Regular	Adecuad o	Muy adecuad o
Equipamiento					
Tecnologías de información					
Recursos financieros					
Recursos tecnológicos					

13. Califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) su valoración sobre cuánto PFSI/ USFS ha fortalecido las capacidades de su institución en el manejo de sus recursos de tecnologías de la información. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Cuánto PFSI ha fortalecido las capacidades de su institución en el manejo de sus recursos de tecnologías de la información					

IV. Dimensión: COORDINACIÓN

14. Enumere y nombre otras instituciones forestales y de planificación del uso de suelos, organizaciones de sociedad civil, empresas madereras y otras organizaciones relevantes dentro de la cadena de valor de los bosques, con las cuales su institución coordina:

Nº	Nombre de la Institución/ organización/ empresa
1	
2	
3	
4	

15. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la calidad y claridad de los mecanismos establecidos entre las instituciones/organizaciones/empresas indicadas en la pregunta nº 14, en los últimos 3 años, para apoyar y fomentar la coordinación y líneas de comunicación sobre la cadena de valor de los bosques. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Muy inadecuada	Algo inadecuada	Ni adecuada, ni inadecuada	Algo adecuada	Muy adecuada
Mecanismos	Calidad					
	Claridad					

16. Describa el mecanismo para intercambiar información entre instituciones en el sector forestal y el sector responsable de los planes de ordenamiento territorial.

--

17. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán frecuente es su respuesta hacia otras instituciones o demandas internas de información. Indique en la casilla en blanco a que frecuencia exacta se refiere con su elección. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Respuesta a otras instituciones y demandas internas por información					

18. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán frecuente reúne y consolida información de autoridades/ instituciones locales y centrales. Indique en la casilla en blanco a que frecuencia exacta se refiere con su elección. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nunca	Pocas veces	Algunas veces	Muy frecuente	Siempre
Reunión y consolidación de información de autoridades/ instituciones locales y centrales					

19. Participación en formulación de políticas sectoriales y en los planes de uso del suelo (ordenamiento territorial): Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X en la casilla que corresponda a su elección. Mencionar los tres procesos de formulación de políticas sectoriales y las tres actividades vinculadas a los Planes de Ordenamiento Territorial más relevantes y cómo influyen al sector forestal. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Evaluación de su institución	1	2	3	4	5
	Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
1. Su institución participa normalmente en procesos de formulación de políticas					
2. Su institución participa normalmente en el desarrollo de planes de ordenamiento territorial					

	Nombre	¿Cómo influencia al sector forestal?
Procesos de formulación de políticas más relevantes		
Planes de ordenamiento territorial		

20. ¿Qué planes o instrumentos relacionados con el bosque o con el territorio son considerados (por ejemplo, planes de uso del suelo) cuando se formulan las políticas y leyes forestales? Explique.

21. Las leyes forestales y políticas que lidian con el ordenamiento territorial forestal usan definiciones y provisiones que son consistentes con las usadas por los planes nacionales de ordenamiento territorial.

22. Describa los esfuerzos hechos para determinar cómo las leyes y políticas van a impactar en los bosques y bosques comunitarios (por ejemplo, los tomadores de decisiones consultan a los expertos relevantes, análisis de impacto de las conductas, participación de las comunidades).

23. ¿Cómo PFSI ha apoyado todas estas mejoras de coordinación?(por ejemplo, facilitando la participación de los gobiernos regionales en el proceso de formulación de políticas forestales, plataformas de gestión forestal comunitario, gobernanza forestal comunitaria, secretaría del CIAM). Explique.

--

24. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la utilidad y relevancia de las actividades de coordinación provistas por PFSI/USFS. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Actividades de coordinación provistas por PFSI/USFS	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

V. Dimensión: TRANSPARENCIA

25. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) y marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Evaluación de los sistemas de información y participación	1	2	3	4	5
	Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
Existencia de un sistema de información completo y fiable que sirva de base para la supervisión y fiscalización forestal					
Acceso del público a información acerca de la supervisión y fiscalización forestal					
Habilidad de su institución para establecer y operar mecanismos para la participación ciudadana y transparencia					

26. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) la utilidad y relevancia de las mejoras en los sistemas de información y acceso público a información sobre supervisión y fiscalización forestal por PFSI/USFS. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Nada útil/ nada relevante	Algo no útil / algo no relevante	Ni útil ni nada útil/ ni relevante ni nada relevante	Algo útil / algo relevante	Muy útil / muy relevante
Mejoras en los sistemas de información y acceso público a la información sobre supervisión y fiscalización forestal provista por PFSI/ USFS	Utilidad					
	Relevancia					

27. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (según la escala indicada en el cuadro que se muestra a continuación) cuán completo es el inventario forestal e información de crecimiento (todo lo que usted necesite para su aplicación), cuán actualizado (de acuerdo a los ciclos aceptados), y usado en la toma de decisiones y planificación por la institución. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

	Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
		Muy en desacuerdo	En desacuerdo	Indiferente	De acuerdo	Muy de acuerdo
El inventario forestal e información de crecimiento	Es completo					
	Actualizado					
	Usado en la toma de decisiones y planificación					

28.

29. Por favor, califique del 1 al 5 (donde el número 5 representa el valor más alto) la importancia del rol de PFSI con respecto a los inventarios forestales. Marque con una X la casilla que contenga su elección.

Dimensión a evaluar	1	2	3	4	5
	Nada importante	Poco importante	Ni importante ni poco importante	Importante	Muy importante
Rol de PFSI/ USFS con respecto a los inventarios forestales					

30. Explique las experiencias más exitosas en su trabajo con PSFI.

Experiencias más exitosas

31. ¿Cuál es el más importante proceso del sistema de información con respecto a los procedimientos en la cadena de suministros forestales, guiado como resultado de la colaboración con PFSI/USFS?

Más importante proceso del sistema de información

32. Describa los principales problemas y obstáculos encontrados en ese proceso. ¿Cómo puede usted lidiar con problemas similares en el futuro?

Principales problemas y obstáculos	¿Cómo lidiar con ellos en el futuro?

¡Muchas gracias por su colaboración!

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON DGFFS - MINAGRI
(Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre-- MINAGRI)

Sistemas de información

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre:

Sexo: H M

Área:

Cargo:

Día de la entrevista: de de 201

Lugar de la entrevista:

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?
 SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON DGFFS
(Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre)

Inventarios

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: _____ de _____ de 201_____

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON MINAM
(Ministerio del Ambiente)

Ordenamiento territorial

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre:

Sexo: H M

Área:

Cargo:

Día de la entrevista: de de 201.....

Lugar de la entrevista:

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

GUÍA DE ENTREVISTA CON OSINFOR
(Organismo de Supervisión de los Recursos Forestales y de Fauna Silvestre)

Supervisión y Fiscalización de Bosques

I. INTRODUCCIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADOR

(Explicar el propósito de la entrevista)

II. INFORMACIÓN DEL ENTREVISTADO

Nombre: -----

Sexo: H M

Área: -----

Cargo: -----

Día de la entrevista: _____ de _____ de 201_____

Lugar de la entrevista: -----

¿Conoce usted acerca de las actividades del PFSI/USFS? SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en alguna actividad de capacitación del PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

¿Ha participado usted en algún viaje de estudio provisto por el PFSI/USFS?

SÍ NO

III. Dimensión: CAPACIDAD

ANNEX III: FIELD WORK REPORT

Mid – Term Evaluation of Peru Forest Sector Initiative

Fieldwork report

The main interviews with local partners at different levels and other stakeholders were carried out. At regional level, the five Amazonian regions were part of the sample: Amazonas, Loreto, Madre de Dios, San Martin and Ucayali. All the regions were visited. Seven interview guides were elaborated to collect information in the regions selected. The guides included a list of questions about their perception on forest governance issues and other closed and open questions to understand their experience with USFS/PFSI. The guides differentiate, if it was possible, between seven different types of respondents: within the forest or environmental authority, the representative of the team of forest management, forest inventories and information system; the representative of the team of land use planning; the representative of OSINFOR; an informant from the private sector, and an informant from one civil society organization.

As stated in the SOW, the evaluation will focus on three dimensions of forest governance: capacity, coordination and transparency. Each interview guide incorporated these dimensions. A group of questions were specified by dimension.

Capacity refers to the government's social, educational, technological, legal, and institutional ability to provide public access to decision-making, as well as the ability of civil society to make use of such access. This includes the capacity of government and official institutions to act autonomously and independently, the availability of resources (both human and financial) to provide access, and the capacity of civil society (particularly NGOs and the media) to analyze the issues and participate effectively.

Coordination refers to the extent to which various agencies and actors whose decisions impact upon forests are advancing common objectives. There are usually separate government agencies and authorities with oversight for forests, environment, land use, agriculture, infrastructure and general macroeconomic planning, respectively. Too often, there is a lack of coordination between these actors.

Transparency is the process of revealing actions so that outsiders can scrutinize them. Facilitating access to quality information is critical in order to inform and engage public constituents. Attributes of transparency include the quality, timeliness, availability, and comprehensibility of information, and whether efforts are made or not to make sure information reaches and is used by affected and vulnerable groups as appropriate.

One limitation is that there are more than seven types of respondents especially among civil society organizations, such as CITE Madera, public universities, and others. Although no interview guide was elaborated for indigenous communities, interviews were carried out in Amazonas and Madre de Dios.

The fieldwork was conducted between early October and the last week of November by four evaluators. Although the set of interview guides was elaborated with precise questions, all evaluators shared the same interpretation of questions and answers for the different forest governance dimensions allowing a sound approximation to the different levels of capacity, coordination and transparency. It is important to highlight the importance given in this methodological approach to the perception of informants in order to make an assessment of the level of forest governance. In this sense, most of the assessment in this evaluation is based upon respondents' perception on these forest governance dimensions. Whenever possible the evaluation team has provided complementary information to support the findings.

Managers from USFS/PFSI provided the names of key actors in the region. Normally, the first contact was the regional environmental or forest authority. Then, specific respondents were proposed to

complete the other guides, both for governmental and non-governmental institutions. The selection of respondents was made according to the different organizational structure of the forestry regional authorities. In the case of CSO and private sector, we faced the problem that they were not always available and therefore in some regions we could not complete the interviews with them. Since the methodological approach towards forest sector governance is based upon the specific functions within the forest value chain, this does not affect our results.

Table 1: Interviews guides implemented in the regions

Interview guides	Amazonas	Loreto	MdD	San Martin	Ucayali
Forest management in Forest Authority	X	X	X	X	X
Forest inventories in Forest Authority	X	X	X	X	X
Information systems in Forest Authority	X	X	X	X	
Land use planning in Regional Authority	X	X	X	X	
OSINFOR – OD		X		X	X
Private Sector				X	
CSOs	X		X	X	X
Indigenous communities	X		X		

Table 2 Interview respondents

Guía Aplicada		Nombre	Cargo
Guía de entrevista con ARAs Gestión Forestal	Amazonas	Juan Moncada	Gerente ARA
	Amazonas	Segundo Sánchez	Director Ejecutivo Gestión de Bosques
	Loreto	Wilfredo Panduro	Gerente Regional de RRNN y Gestión Ambiental
	Madre de Dios	Ronald Ríos	Gerente de Recursos Naturales
	Madre de Dios	Cristian Siguario	Director Regional Forestal y Fauna Silvestre
		Víctor Berrío	Encargado del Área de Planeamiento y Gestión Forestal
		Carlos Salazar	Apoyo en oficina
	San Martin	Miguel Alva	Director de RRNN del ARA

	Ucayali	Franz Tang	Gerente Regional de RRNN y Gestión Ambiental
Guía de entrevistas con ARAs Sistema de Información	Amazonas	Nelly Pilco Diaz	Especialista en Gestión y control forestal (DE en Gestión de Bosques)
	Loreto	Abel Benítes	Director Programa Regional de Manejo de RR Forestales y Fauna
	Madre de Dios	Julio Ochoa	Encargado CIEF
	San Martin	Germán Sanchez	Responsable Area Sistema de Información en la Dirección de RRNN
Guía de entrevista con ARAs Inventarios Forestales	Amazonas	José Diaz Salas	Responsable SIG (DE en Gestión de Bosques)
	Loreto	Abel Benítes	
	Madre de Dios	Yuri Fabián Caller Córdova	Encargado Área de Catastro
		Richard Culqui	Encargado Área de Producción No Maderable
	San Martin	Franklin Cueva	ResponsableArea Forestal en la Dirección de RRNN
	Ucayali	Miguel Cambero	Técnico de Base de datos de las concesiones
Guía de entrevista con ARAs Ordenamiento Territorial	Amazonas	Julio César Ravines Boñón	Director Ejecutivo de Recursos Naturales
	Loreto	Miguel Gutiérrez	
	Madre de Dios	Frank Cruz	Gerente de Planeamiento, Presupuesto y Ordenamiento Territorial
		HerryPinchi del Águila	Coordinador del Proyecto de Gestión Territorial
	San Martin	Ernesto Aguilar	Especialista SIG en la Dirección de Gestión Territorial
Guía de entrevista con Osinfor (OD)	San Martin	Roberto Meza	Responsable OD Tarapoto
	Ucayali	Frank Rivero	Responsable OD Ucayali
	Amazonas	Pedro Zúñiga	Director Proyecto - FONDECOR

Guía de entrevista con Organizaciones de Sociedad Civil	Amazonas	Flavio Vera	Consultor ITDG SolucionesPrácticas
	Madre de Dios	Karina Salas Ponce	Responsable Programa Forestal WWF
		Alonso Córdova	Coordinador Regional WWF
	San Martin	Cintia Mongilardi	Directora Programa Parque Azul en CIMA
	Ucayali	Pio Santiago	Coordinador Regional AIDER
Guía de entregista con Sector Privado	San Martín	Francisco Rivas	Representante Gremio de Madereros en San Martin
Entrevista organizaciones indígenas - Gestión forestal comunitaria	Amazonas	Daniel Francisco Inchipis	Presidente ECA Tuntanaim
	Amazonas	Roberto KuykumasBakuach	Presidente FAD
	Madre de Dios	Martín Huayana Flores	AFIMAD (Asociación forestal indígena de Madre de Dios)
Guia de entrevista DGFFS			General Director of DGFFS
Guia de entrevista SNIFF – Guia de entrevista IF			Information and Control Direction of DGFFS
Guía de entrevista con Organizaciones de Sociedad Civil			SPDA – SociedadPeruana de DerechoAmbiental
Guia de entrevista MINAM			MINAM
			CIAM - Consejo Inter Regional de la Amazonía

A total of 28 regional interviews were completed using the prepared guides, including 2 with indigenous communities in Amazonas and Madre de Dios.

At the national level interviews were conducted for the three functions identified related to the National Forest Sector Authority. These were done with the new General Director of DGFFS (in transition towards the new National Forestry Service –SERFOR--) and a representative of the Information and Control Direction of DGFFS (the responsible of the SNIFF). Additionally other interviews were conducted with a representative of one of the most important environmental NGOs engaged in PFSI activities (SPDA – SociedadPeruana de DerechoAmbiental), a representative of MINAM, and representatives of CIAM (Consejo Inter Regional de la Amazonía).

ANNEX IV: INDEPENDENT REVISOR OPINION ABOUT THE FOREST CONTEXT AND PFSI CONTRIBUTION

Aportes de opinión sobre la situación actual del sector forestal y el aporte del Perú Forest Sector Initiative (PFSI) en este escenario.

Daniel Hernández, 24 Febrero 2014

I. INTRODUCCION

El presente trabajo tiene por objeto realizar una evaluación de la situación actual del sector forestal peruano, identificando algunos de sus principales problemas y retos, los cuales nos permitirán generar determinadas propuestas de desarrollo, para su mejor comprensión y funcionamiento en los diferentes niveles de ejecución, tanto público como privado.

Como marco de referencia tendremos la evaluación de medio término realizada al PFSI. Esta institución se generó en base al compromiso del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América (USG), de colaborar técnicamente con el Gobierno del Perú (GOP), para la mejora de su nivel de gestión forestal, situación derivada del establecimiento del anexo forestal, que fue parte importante del Acuerdo de Promoción Comercial entre ambos países, vigente desde Febrero del año 2009.

Este escenario, nos permitirá responder a una serie de iniciativas e interrogantes formuladas por el equipo de trabajo de EVALUATIONS, que pretende a través de estas respuestas profundizar su conocimiento con respecto a la situación actual del sector forestal de manera general, y de evaluar de qué manera el PFSI ha colaborado a mejorar esta situación a través de los diferentes proyectos que soporta.

II. METODOLOGIA

La metodología planteada para este trabajo se basará en responder a las interrogantes planteadas por equipo técnico de EVALUATIONS, y que se vinculan a las siguientes inquietudes:

- a) En qué situación se encuentra el sector forestal. Cuáles son sus principales problemas. Propuestas de solución.
- b)Cuál es su opinión sobre las Autoridades Regionales Ambientales (ARA).
- c)Cuál es su opinión sobre el Sistema Nacional de Información Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre (SNIFFS), es este viable? Ha sido transparente y eficiente su desarrollo? Que problemas enfrenta? Que labor podría realizar el PFSI para colaborar en la consolidación de un SNIFFS ejecutable, confiable y útil para el sector forestal peruano.
- d) Cuales su opinión con respecto a el enfoque de la cooperación americana en el sector forestal. Ha sido muy técnico? Ha estado sincronizado con la realidad peruana?
- e) De qué manera PFSI puede responder a estos retos. Que otros enfoques podría abordar? Que acciones de cooperación podría priorizar?
- f) Es la situación actual del sector capaz de ser abordada y enfrentada solo con cooperación técnica, o requiere de decisiones a nivel político que permitan efectivizar y hacer sostenibles las políticas de cooperación?

Para este efecto se evaluará la situación actual de:

- Sector Publico

- Gobierno Central / Gobiernos Regionales
- Sector Privado
- Comunidades Nativas
- Actividades Transversales
- Sistema Nacional de Información Forestal. (SNIF)
- Autoridades Regionales Ambientales. (ARA)

III. HALLAZGOS, CONCLUSIONES y RECOMENDACIONES

a) *En qué situación se encuentra el sector forestal peruano? Cuáles son sus principales problemas? Propuestas de solución.*

Hallazgo I:

- Los avances realizados vinculados a la obtención de una Política Nacional Forestal, una nueva Ley Forestal (29763) y su reglamento -aun no aprobado-, que se forjaron en base a un largo proceso participativo iniciado en el año 2009, si bien han representado un importante avance normativo, aun no consolidan los lineamientos necesarios para propiciar un horizonte claro de desarrollo para el sector a largo plazo, así como un plan verificable de objetivos y metas para la mejor gestión del sector en el corto y mediano plazo. Estos 03 documentos de suma importancia para el sector no son ejecutables en la actualidad.
- El proceso optado por las Autoridades del Estado para la consecución de la ley Forestal y su reglamento ha tomado más tiempo de lo recomendado. No tenemos un reglamento desde Julio del 2011. Recién ha expirado la fecha para recibir aportes y se empezara la socialización y sistematización de los mismos. Nadie está en contra de los procesos participativos, pero es difícil gestionar un sector del Estado de esta forma. No se puede consolidar instituciones, armar planes públicos o privados, esperar inversiones importantes a largo plazo con un marco que se sabe va a cambiar, pero no se sabe cuándo. En la medida que nos representen funcionarios públicos, que no asuman responsabilidad y no decidan terminar los procesos y tener resultados en tiempos más reales, va a ser difícil que podamos tener un marco de desarrollo real en el sector.

Conclusión

- Si bien es cierto, que la Ley Forestal 29763 así como la Política Forestal Nacional, con todos sus avances, provienen de un complejo proceso de participación de los muchos actores que conforman el sector forestal, y fueron trabajadas dentro de un consenso mayoritario, pero su aplicación es hoy todavía nula al no estar reglamentada.

La ley 29763 reemplazara una vez sea reglamentada, a la ley 27308, la cual no fue adecuadamente implementada durante su periodo de vigencia, por problemas estructurales que aún subsisten, como la falta de voluntad política para su implementación, la ausencia de mecanismos efectivos de financiamiento para el sector, la complejidad de las competencias institucionales, la condiciones profesionales del componente humano en el sector público, los niveles de coordinación con los pueblos indígenas, la corrupción, entre otras razones.

Recomendación

- Apoyar la determinación política de culminar el proceso de reglamentación de la ley 29763 de manera participativa y plural.
- Aterrizar el documento de la Política Nacional Forestal, para que a través de la ley y su reglamento, defina metas claras y monitoreables sobre lo que se pretende ejecutar en el sector forestal.
- Proponer la formación de 05 equipos técnicos que trabajen en un plazo determinado sobre el desarrollo de programas y actividades ejecutables en función de los 05 ejes en los que se basa la Política

Nacional Forestal, con planes de desarrollo vinculados a términos de tiempo mesurables.

- Adjunto link de con opinión editorial en el Diario Gestión vinculada a este tema.
<http://gestion.pe/opinion/editorial-gestion-espera-que-desespera-2090398>

Hallazgo 2

- De la mano de un proceso de Descentralización que ha trasladado a los Gobiernos Regionales, la administración y control de los recursos forestales, sin contar con los recursos financieros y humanos capacitados para enfrentar dichos retos, se ha afectado la calidad en los servicios administrativos brindados a la población y se ha generado una consiguiente debilidad en la efectividad de los procesos administrativo de gestión y control de los recursos forestales en las regiones.
- Lo que sigue centralizado es la forma de asignar los recursos financieros. En la medida que estos no sean asignados de otra manera, o los Gobiernos Regionales no aprendan a gestionarlos de manera correcta, los recursos no llegaran con la programación adecuada. Este es un problema técnico, de capacidades, de tener los funcionarios de nivel para interactuar con el MEF en las regiones, pero también es u tema político, al no haber mayor conexión entre las oficinas del gobierno central y los gobiernos regionales. Otro detalle interesante es la limitación de los Gobiernos Regionales para endeudarse de manera unilateral, de acuerdo a sus flujos económicos, pues siempre necesitan autorización del MEF para cualquier decisión financiera de endeudamiento.
- Con respecto a cómo funcionaban mejor la gestión y control de los recursos forestales, todo dependerá de la gestión administrativa, si la gestión centralizada fuera eficiente, moderna y transparente, no tendría problemas y podría funcionar con una sola normativa a nivel nacional, que ejecutaría más uniformemente los procesos. Por otra parte, una gestión también eficiente a nivel regional, podría asegurar mejores resultados. El problema en las regiones se centra en la incapacidad de gestionar eficientemente los recursos financieros, de tener un acceso limitado a capital humano de calidad, que acepta las condiciones de trabajo que le ofrecen, de las vinculaciones sociales o amicales entre administradores y administrados, al ser todos parte de un mismo entorno, que, si sumamos todos estos factores y otros de orden cultural, nos encontraremos con un ambiente propicio para el desarrollo de la ilegalidad y la corrupción entre administradores y administrados.
- Si a eso se le suma, la poca presencia de otras instituciones del Gobierno central en las regiones donde se opera la actividad extractiva forestal, nos enfrentamos a un escenario donde se hace difícil la administración y el control efectivo de los recursos naturales del Estado. Existen múltiples diagnósticos del proceso de Descentralización y su impacto en la gestión de los recursos naturales en el Perú.
- Se adjuntan referencias.

Conclusión

- El proceso de Descentralización está aún lejos de alcanzar los objetivos para los que fue ideado, sobre todo en la administración de recursos naturales y en especial de los recursos forestales.

Recomendación

- Seguir fortaleciendo el proceso de Descentralización apostando por el fortalecimiento de la infraestructura de gestión y control forestal, así como la simplificación de procesos administrativos y mejoras en los niveles de tecnología de la información y la comunicación.
- Como ya lo explique líneas arriba, dadas las circunstancias de esta forma, lo que queda es seguir fortaleciendo el proceso de Descentralización, a 02 niveles. El primero a nivel de las relaciones entre la Autoridad central y las autoridades regionales para orientar una sola política al respecto del aprovechamiento forestal, en la gestión de los compromisos que se tiene con la sociedad peruana, y con los compromisos que se tiene como país hacia el exterior, siendo estrictos en su cumplimiento, comprometiendo presupuestos de acuerdo a la gestión de resultados transparentes en esta área y explicando de manera clara las consecuencias de los malos manejos y la corrupción. No se puede

permitir que funcionemos como múltiples países diferentes dentro de un territorio, que administran y aplican la ley de acuerdo a donde uno opere.

- En segundo lugar generándole las condiciones de trabajo a las autoridades regionales, ayudándolos en su coordinación con el Gobierno Central (MEF, MINAGRI, PRODUCE, MINCETUR, PCM, MININTER, MINdeF, MINJUS, MINISTERIO PUBLICO, SUNAT). Fortalecer equipo de trabajo interinstitucionales que tengan contrapartes establecidas en estas instituciones y que tengan las normas y responsabilidades claras del alcance de sus acciones laborales, tanto a nivel local como en su trabajo de coordinación. No creo que se necesite varios años para ponerse de acuerdo en las responsabilidades de cada actor en este proceso, su momento de intervención y sus responsabilidades, si es que existe una voluntad positiva de cooperar en la mejora del sector. Sin ser un ejemplo de perfección, pero sí de avances, podemos darle un vistazo a lo que está sucediendo en el combate a la minería ilegal y las labores de coordinación interinstitucionales para mejorar las capacidades de gestión y control de los recursos por parte del Estado.
- Introducir el concepto de estabilidad y valoración profesional del funcionario forestal en los Gobiernos Regionales, personal que deberá ser capacitado en convenio con instituciones académicas de nivel superior, para acreditar mejoras en sus capacidades, situación que debe compensarse con mejores ingresos y bonos económicos ante el mayor nivel de capacitación y nivel de resultados alcanzados en las metas de su planificación laboral.
- Proponer la formación de una escuela de administración pública forestal que prepare profesionales a nivel superior, para que trabajen en la gestión y control forestal de acuerdo a los requerimientos de una gestión moderna, eficiente y ética.
- De acuerdo a las funciones de SERVIR y los lineamientos de trabajo de la Escuela de Administración Pública, órgano de línea del mismo, podría ser perfectamente posible, que en coordinación con los gobiernos regionales, capacitaran a funcionarios claves en el actuar del sector forestal. Escapa a mi conocimiento las áreas en las cuales puede o podría cooperar SERVIR en este encargo, pero me parece vital conversar con ellos, ya sea desde el CIAM o como una iniciativa de SERVIR hacia las regiones con recursos forestales. En todo caso, si hubieran áreas de capacitación que no pudiese cubrir con sus programas, quedaría el soporte de la cooperación internacional y la gestión de los propios recursos de los Gobiernos Regionales para estas tareas de capacitación. El reto es hacerle comprender a las más altas autoridades de los Gobiernos Regionales, que este es un problema crítico si queremos obtener un resultado válido para la gestión de los recursos naturales.

Hallazgo 3

- Existe actualmente, una evidente fragilidad en la verificación de las fuentes de aprovisionamiento legal de la madera. En palabras de funcionarios del Estado, 70% de los productos forestales que se comercializan en el país provendrían de fuentes no verificables o ilegales, y aproximadamente el 50% de los productos forestales comercializados pertenecientes al convenio CITES, pasarían por la misma situación, básicamente amparadas por las autorizaciones de aprovechamiento en Predios Privados y Comunidades Nativas. Existe un análisis al respecto que podría consultarse con la Dirección de Información y Control Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre, (DGFFS) para ver si están en condición de compartir dicha información.
- Desafortunadamente no existe por escrito un informe a este respecto. El Director de Información y Control y de Fauna Silvestre ha hecho este comentario en 02 oportunidades, una, al ejecutor de este trabajo, y la segunda en una reunión de trabajo con funcionarios de la PCM (OSINFOR) y MINCETUR, de la cual se desconoce si existe un acta que guarde los actuados y comentados en dicha reunión.

Conclusión

- Los sistemas actuales de verificación y control forestal no son confiables y no se han actualizado

de acuerdo a las necesidades del país.

Recomendación

- Tomemos en cuenta que si no hay una verificación exigente, en el campo, al momento de aprobar un Plan Operativo Anual (POA) en el marco de las leyes vigentes, y luego ese documento le da legalidad a toda la cadena de aprovechamiento, encontraremos que esa falta de rigurosidad profesional permite el inicio de acciones de ilegalidad en el sector, que terminan involucrando el trabajo de una serie de instituciones posteriormente, que se sobrecargan de procesos administrativos y aumentan sus costos de gestión y bajan su eficiencia operativa. Esto se puede contrastar con las verificaciones que realiza el OSINFOR a Concesiones, Comunidades Nativas (CCNN) y Predios Privados (PrPr) de manera posterior al aprovechamiento forestal. Se recomienda cambiar los procedimientos de verificación previa al aprovechamiento.
- En la medida que no exista una verificación de los POAS previo al aprovechamiento seguirá existiendo la posibilidad de legalizar volúmenes de madera no existentes, sobre todo en Comunidades Nativas y Predios Privados, pero tomando en consideración el número de operaciones forestales, y previendo que sería complicado realizar esta verificación en campo, se puede trabajar un número representativo a modo de evaluación estadística. Lo importante sería, que de encontrarse incongruencias o información falsa con una clara actitud de engaño, esta actitud debería ser castigada rápidamente y de manera ejemplar, para poder generar un ambiente de corrección y respeto a las normas, por quienes intervienen el bosque y los profesionales que realizan los planes de aprovechamiento. Esto hoy no se da.
- A esto se le puede sumar un sistema de información más eficiente, que cruce constantemente información, y sumar la posibilidad de que OSINFOR haga una verificación de trozas en aserraderos para establecer el origen legal de procedencia de las mimas con su base de datos, lo que fortalecería a ese nivel el comercio de productos legales que ingresarían al mercado.
- Desde luego la acción de la policía, las fuerzas armadas donde se les requiera y las fiscalías ambientales debe trabajar con más inteligencia y diligencia en el combate a la ilegalidad.
- Finalmente, esto tiene relación también con los inventarios realizados en campo y los conceptos de rendimiento de madera por especie, que normativamente son muy anticuados y poco técnicos en relación a la tecnología actual. ya que identificando mejor las especies forestales, un cálculo de volúmenes más certeros y factores de rendimientos de árboles en pie y trozas trabajados de acuerdo a la tecnología actual, podríamos acercarnos fuertemente a los valores reales disponibles para ser autorizados y comercializadas tanto por Autoridades como por usuarios del bosque.
- Si el Estado no está en capacidad, a través de sus procesos de control, de identificar el origen legal de los productos forestales que transitan en gran parte del país y/o hacia el extranjero, deberíamos trabajar de manera urgente en cambiar los procesos, educar a los usuarios, castigar las infracciones de manera ejemplar, controlar de manera policial/judicial el delito organizado de la elaboración de guías que legalizan los movimiento de madera ilegal, y finalmente instrumentar un Sistema Nacional de Información Forestal (SNIF), que basado en estas estructuras, promueva una plataforma tecnológica que permita paulatinamente cerrar la brecha en la falta de información y la generación de información no verificable dentro de los propios sistemas de información del GOP.

Hallazgo 4

- Existen políticas contradictorias que parten del Ministerio de Agricultura (MINAGRI) y algunos Gobierno Regionales (Loreto y Ucayali) que promueven y permiten la deforestación de miles de hectáreas de bosque nativo, sin contar con los estudios correspondientes, ni medir el impacto que estas acciones generaran a futuro. Todo esto en base a la promoción de nuevos cultivos agrícolas. Instituciones privadas como el SPDE han evaluado estas pérdidas de recursos por deforestación en más de 900 millones de soles. Lo contradictorio se encuentra en el compromiso público del mismo Estado

peruano en reducir la deforestación y elevar sus compromisos ambientales, pero a la vez fomenta la degradación de los sistemas forestales.

- Remito la información desarrollada por la organización mencionada, mostrando detalles normativos y ejecutivos al respecto.

<http://www.biofuelobservatory.org/Documentos/Deforestacion-por-Palma-Aceitera-2013.pdf>

Conclusión

- A pesar de los esfuerzos del Gobierno central en plantear y ejecutar de la mejor forma sus compromisos ambientales, aún existen vacíos normativos y funcionarios e intereses que van en contra de lo establecido en la normatividad ambiental vigente.

Recomendación

- Establecer un sistema de información y control a nivel nacional, que permita alertar sobre solicitudes y autorizaciones a futuros proyectos productivos de distinto origen a los forestales, en áreas de aptitud forestal, para que sean correcta y transparentemente evaluados por los estamentos del GOP responsables y las organizaciones de la sociedad civil dentro de un nuevo proceso de observancia. Así se tendría una visión previa de los proyectos a implementar, y no se tendría que proceder de manera posterior a la ejecución de un daño ambiental. De esta forma toda deforestación o degradación de medio ambiente ejecutada sin permiso, sería directamente catalogada como un acto ilegal y sancionado como tal.
- Mi visión del SNIF involucra no solo una herramienta de información y control que ayude a gestionar el movimiento de productos forestales, sino una plataforma de información que permita acceder a información transparente de temas normativos, inventarios y censos forestales, planes de manejo y operativos anuales de todo tipo de operaciones forestales, información y alertas para cambios de uso del suelo, plantaciones forestales, oferta de madera comercial, sanciones y multas, áreas de producción sancionadas o caducadas, promoción de áreas de conservación, conocimientos de áreas nativas, programas e instituciones de financiamiento forestal, nuevas alternativas de desarrollo para el bosque, entre otros.

Hallazgo 5

- Existe una dicotomía en el manejo de los presupuestos necesarios para la gestión eficiente del sector forestal tanto a nivel de la Autoridad Forestal como de los Gobiernos Regionales. Por un lado, se tiene la propuesta pública del Estado peruano de mejorar su nivel de compromisos ambientales, pero esto no va de la mano con la asignación de recursos financieros por parte del Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas (MEF).
- Al margen del volumen de asignación de recursos, que puede ser mayor, sería ideal monitorear la calidad de gasto, para poder visualizar la mejor asignación de los recursos.
- Pero por otro lado, y de acuerdo a toda la problemática comentada, las autoridades forestales centrales y regionales no tienen la capacidad de gastar eficientemente los recursos asignados y plantear proyectos de inversión pública al Gobierno central para buscar estos fondos, con lo cual nos preguntamos si con las capacidades humanas actuales en las instituciones de gestión forestal del Estado, podríamos gestionar eficientemente presupuestos, 10 veces más grandes, en el sector forestal. Creo que lo primero sería prepararse para tales retos.

Conclusión

- Existe un círculo negativo que parte de la no asignación de los recursos adecuados para la correcta gestión forestal, pero a la vez, una vez asignados los recursos, no existen las capacidades profesionales en las oficinas del Estado central y regional, en el área forestal, para planificar, obtener,

ejecutar y monitorear el correcto uso de los recursos financieros. Por lo que existe, poco interés de parte del MEF, de aumentar el financiamiento para actividades del sector forestal.

Recomendación

- Desarrollar un espacio de interrelación entre funcionarios del MEF, el Gobierno Central, los Gobiernos Regionales y especialistas en modelación de políticas públicas y financiamiento sectorial para establecer los parámetros de evaluación, y valoración de la actividad forestal en el Perú.
- A mi parecer el CIAM, en el tema de financiamiento, ha estado más pendiente de ubicar fuentes de financiamiento de diferentes cooperantes y proyectos, que en dedicarse a trabajar en el fortalecimiento institucional de sus socios para la obtención y gestión de recursos ordinarios.
- Tampoco existe formalmente un comité inter-gubernamental en el ámbito forestal, que tome acción frente a los temas urgentes de evaluación, ni tampoco existe un espacio interinstitucional con los actores no gubernamentales para conversar, evaluar y proponer alternativas de desarrollo para el sector.
- Sobre estos supuestos, se tendría el aporte del sector forestal a la economía y el desarrollo del país, y cuanto se requeriría invertir de manera paulatina, a través de proyectos de inversión nacional y regional, que incluso deberían servir para poder acceder a financiamiento de la banca multilateral, instituciones de cooperación, y fondos privados para el desarrollo del sector a largo plazo.
- Capacitar a los funcionarios públicos vinculados al planeamiento y gestión de los recursos financieros, buscando que conjuguen estos conocimientos especializados en finanzas con sus conocimientos del sector para que puedan interpretar y viabilizar la ejecución de proyectos a nivel regional y nacional.

Hallazgo 6

- De acuerdo a información extraoficial que se encuentra en poder de las Autoridades Forestales DGFFS-OSINFOR-Direcciones Forestales Regionales, de las más de 580 concesiones forestales maderables concedidas a través de los diferentes concursos y procesos de concesión ejecutados, en la actualidad no más de 100 están operando de alguna forma, con lo cual la actividad forestal legal se debilita, existe menos disponibilidad de madera en el mercado formal, se desconoce públicamente si los volúmenes autorizados para movilización de productos forestales han disminuido y finalmente si las áreas que no están siendo aprovechadas formalmente están siendo deforestadas por delincuentes y traficantes de madera.
- En este proceso los concesionarios no han encontrado soporte administrativo en las autoridades forestales, que lejos de facilitar los procesos, han complicado y retardado procesos vitales para el correcto funcionamiento de las operaciones forestales, tampoco han podido acceder a fuentes de financiamiento especializadas en el área forestal, y en líneas generales tampoco han conseguido capacitación ejecutiva y puntual en el mercado, para solucionar los problemas que volvían ineficientes sus operaciones desde el punto de vista económico, social y ambiental.

Conclusión

- El sistema de concesiones forestales se encuentra bastante debilitado en función al área operativa que cubría y a la oferta potencial de productos forestales que proporcionaba. Si bien es cierto que se requería de un sinceramiento en la calidad de los operadores forestales, por otro lado no se les ha brindado a los concesionarios ningún tipo de ayuda real que les permita apostar a una gestión más integral de sus áreas de manejo, mejor informada sobre los recursos de los que disponen, así como el soporte de una autoridad forestal que vaya de la mano con una gestión eficiente del bosque.

Recomendación

- Reposicionar el proceso de concesiones forestales, otorgando en una nueva modalidad las áreas

que han sido devueltas o retomadas por el Estado. Este nuevo proceso debe basarse en la capacidad técnica, financiera y comercial del nuevo postor al área, que no imponga límites de asociación por áreas, con condiciones muy claras de usufructo de los recursos entregados.

- Establecer un proceso a nivel nacional de fortalecimiento de capacidades en manejo forestal sostenible financiado por el Estado y otras fuentes de financiamiento interesadas en conseguir que el manejo forestal se vuelva rentable, socialmente inclusivo y ambientalmente responsable con una visión más amplia de todas las oportunidades y potencialidades que otorga el bosque amazónico para su correcto aprovechamiento.
- Seguir de cerca el proceso que estaría llevando a cabo la Autoridad Forestal para concesionar nuevas áreas de bosque por 4 millones de hectáreas, para no cometer los mismos errores en su proceso de otorgamiento.
- Sin un nivel de coordinación adecuado con las Autoridades Regionales, estos procesos serán inviables.

Hallazgo 7

- Haciendo un recuento de lo sucedido con las comunidades nativas que habitan en la cuenca amazónica y viven del usufructo de sus recursos naturales, tenemos que de acuerdo a los diversos procesos acontecidos para la conformación del marco legal vigente, las comunidades nativas han entrado en un diálogo intercultural válido con el resto de la sociedad civil, han empezado a ganar presencia y han reivindicado derechos y territorios, pero a pesar de estos avances, aún tienen que asimilar mecanismos de integración más racionales con la economía occidental, que les permita interactuar con un nivel de beneficio y de responsabilidad acorde con el resto de actores que participan en el sector.

Conclusión

- Si bien existe un avance significativo en la inclusión de las comunidades nativas en el desarrollo forestal del país, estas aún requieren de mayores capacidades de gestión para poderse interrelacionar con los otros actores del sector, de forma que obtengan los mayores beneficios respetando su visión cultural con respecto al aprovechamiento sostenible.

Recomendación

- Empoderar los programas de cooperación para el fortalecimiento de capacidades en manejo forestal sostenible-comunitario.
- Trabajar fuertemente en las actividades de campo vinculadas al aprovechamiento forestal sostenible. Enfocarlos de manera real dentro de las posibilidades y facilidades financieras y logísticas que puedan conseguir estas comunidades, y no solo en función a los recursos que posean.
- Desafortunadamente mucha de la madera que ingresa al mercado de manera irregular proviene de permisos de comunidades nativas.

Hallazgo 8

- Si bien se han generado una serie de procesos participativos durante los últimos años con el fin de obtener determinados avances sectoriales, también es cierto que tanto la Autoridad Forestal Nacional como las autoridades regionales no han transparentado su información y sus procesos sobre el tema forestal, de acuerdo a lo que se había comprometido el Perú en los diferentes compromisos y acuerdos ambientales y comerciales suscritos.
- Podría citar algunos hitos sobre la falta de información precisa, actualizada y transparente en el sector como por ejemplo, no se tiene actualizada desde el Febrero del 2012 el avance de la Matriz de cumplimiento del anexo forestal del APC entre Perú-EEUU, tampoco se tiene información clara y precisa sobre los recursos financieros disponibles por la Autoridad Forestal Nacional y las regionales, para la gestión del sector en el año 2014, tampoco se tiene información sobre el avance del SNIF luego

de 5 años de trabajo, no se tiene una información precisa sobre los resultados de campo de la metodología empleada para la realización del inventario forestal, tampoco se dispone con claridad de la información de cuantas unidades de aprovechamiento forestal han sido caducadas, no están operando o pueden ser re-concesionadas, entre otros tantos detalles adicionales sobre la gestión del sector.

- La última evaluación de transparencia en el sector la realizó la organización DAR en el año 2010.

Conclusión

- Aun existe trabajo pendiente en el tema de transparencia en todas las instancias vinculadas a la gestión y el aprovechamiento de los recursos forestales del país.

Recomendación

- Activar programas de transparencia a nivel administrativo, que permitan de manera ordenada y progresiva obtener toda la información que la normatividad vigente genera para ser conocida y evaluada.
- Premiar de manera efectiva a las instituciones que mejoren o mantengan en un máximo nivel de transparencia sus ejecuciones administrativas

Cuál es su opinión sobre las Autoridades Regionales Ambientales, en adelante ARAs?

Hallazgos

- En líneas generales las ARAs se crean ante la ausencia de una Autoridad Regional transversal fuerte para la gestión de temas vinculados a los Recursos Naturales, Medio Ambiente y Territorio. Ante ello, la forma actual se asemeja más a un órgano desconcentrado, rector de la política ambiental regional, responsable de la gestión y fiscalización del uso sostenible de los recursos naturales, medio ambiente y territorio, transversal a todos los sectores y unidades ejecutoras con una autonomía relativa, tanto técnica como administrativa.
- En su desarrollo han encontrado complicaciones vinculadas a la diferencia de velocidad de los procesos políticos y las necesidades técnicas de administración de los recursos, el acceso a financiamiento corriente, la falta de capacidades especializadas, la falta de sincronía con algunos soportes de cooperación, que no coincidían con las necesidades inmediatas de funcionamiento para la gestión de los administrados.

Conclusiones

- Hoy las ARAs han pasado a ser una versión evolucionada de las anteriores Gerencias Regionales de Recursos Naturales, solo que con capacidad rectora y enfoque eco sistémico y territorial.
- El marco bajo el cual se planearon las ARAs involucraba el desarrollo de órganos desconcentrados con autonomía, transversales en sus ejecutorias, que incluso pudiesen transformarse en circunstancias más avanzadas, en Oficinas Técnicas Especiales (OTEs regionales) lo que les brindaría autonomía técnica, administrativa y económica. En ese sentido solo San Martín, con una capacidad mayor de gestión, ha avanzado en este proceso. Luego Ucayali dio paso a la formación del ARAU y ha trabajado con la cooperación en la elaboración de sus ROF y MOF, los cuales están siendo socializados y evaluados para aprobación, pero hay un tema de recursos y de apoyo político que decidirán su suerte. Finalmente en Loreto, el modelo no ha sido soportado políticamente, por lo cual no se ha mostrado avance en ese sentido. Si ese es un modelo habría que evaluar cómo se están gestionando hoy los recursos bajo ese formato, y en Madre de Dios los problemas de estabilidad en la gestión política, no han permitido mayores avances en la gestión de los recursos naturales en la región.
- A mi parecer, la opción desarrollada por San Martín, debería observarse, evaluarse y apoyarse para ser adaptada de manera individual en cada región, puesto que fortalecer las ARAs y poderlas convertir más adelante en OTEs, les daría independencia de funcionamiento y podría también aliviarla del quehacer político, en la medida que sus funciones y sus funcionarios se ubicaran en un nivel de

gestión profesional y técnica más eficiente e independiente.

- La posibilidad de tener una mayor autonomía dependerá, no tanto de las normas que se generen, sino de la toma de decisiones críticas y la habilidad para operar como un ente especializado de la mano con el contexto social y político. Este comportamiento no asegura resultados a largo plazo, pero en el camino se debe ganar legitimidad para llegar a los objetivos por los que fueron creadas.
- Además se requiere de un liderazgo político firme y estable, que facilite el tránsito entre las medidas políticas requeridas y su articulación entre el ente rector y los entes ejecutores de esas políticas, poniendo en práctica de manera consecuente el principio del mayor beneficio administrativo común.
- Es preciso observar, que la ARAs deben adecuarse a las normas nacionales en materia de política ambiental, y por otro lado, basarse en un diseño organizacional que les permita establecer prioridades de ejecución política que se orienten a resultados de corto, mediano y largo plazo, evitando caer de esta manera, en las presiones del corto plazo y descuidar temas principales que darán los resultados estables a futuro.
- Debemos evaluar que debido a la presión política y a la presión de los tiempos deberían revisarse el proceso de organización de funciones y competencias de estas instituciones ambientales, evaluándose las actas de transferencia, realizar consultas con las entidades gubernamentales correspondientes y si se necesita, un proceso de perfeccionamiento de la titularidad en cada competencia.
- Finalmente, con respecto al tema de su financiamiento debemos observar que son diferentes los tiempos entre la formación de una institución pública y la consecución de los fondos respectivo para su funcionamiento constante. Hay que prever junto a la idea de su conformación y su puesta en marcha, algún mecanismo de sustento financiero que soporte la estructura organizacional, este tema está muy atado la gestión política y se vinculara directamente luego a los resultados que vaya obteniendo la institución y la legitimidad que gane con sus accionar. En el caso de acciones desconcentradas, es válido el modelo de asociarse con los gobiernos locales para ejecutar las acciones correspondientes, pero siempre hay que tomar en consideración las capacidades de los gobiernos locales de cumplir con sus compromisos y con los respectivos contratos.

Recomendaciones

- Se recomienda tener una constante atención y vinculación al escenario político nacional y regional para conseguir un posicionamiento vigente y efectivo que les permita operar con liderazgo en su área temática. Además, deben tener la capacidad de soportar las presiones políticas de corto plazo que toda nueva institución genera en el status quo que deja de lado.
- Debe trabajarse fuertemente en el tema de la estructura organizativa, la cohesión entre sus componentes y el fortalecimiento de capacidades técnicas de sus equipos.
- La estructura organizativa debe basarse en parámetros modernos y buscar la eficiencia en el servicio, incluso con algún tipo de certificación ISO, que verifique de manera independiente el buen manejo de los procesos en la institución. Luego, de la mejora hacia adentro, hay que reformular las relaciones con socios y otros actores políticos que permitan una real articulación de los planes, y una mejora en la capacidad de ejecución de los mismos. Se debe caminar de la mano con la población en capacidades y responsabilidades para que colaboren en la vigilancia y control en el uso de los recursos naturales. Finalmente, las capacidades del recurso humano a nivel técnico y ético es fundamental fortalecerlas permanentemente, en el área del manejo de recursos naturales, mas aun en las condiciones de trabajo probables con situaciones de aislamiento físico, bajas remuneraciones, pocas facilidades técnicas, incluso condiciones de seguridad inadecuadas para ejercer labores de fiscalización. Todo esto se debe de ir cambiando progresivamente para poder exigir con mayor integridad resultados en la gestión de los funcionarios en estas instituciones.

- Realizar un constante análisis de la mejora de sus procesos, pues su función básica es la gestión y resolución de servicios, que le brinda a los ciudadanos y al Estado.
- También es válido recomendar, que el soporte técnico externo vaya de la mano con los objetivos planteados, y no genere más espacios de contingencia, en temas donde la institución no tenga capacidades iniciales de operar con normalidad. Debe entenderse este proceso con la gradualidad respectiva, buscando empezar con un enfoque en las asignaciones básicas, para luego con la experiencia y las nuevas capacidades enfrentar nuevos retos y colaboraciones.
- Como lo hemos propuesto anteriormente, en los problemas generales del sector, debe profesionalizarse al más alto nivel la gestión de recursos para su normal funcionamiento y el avance planificado en nuevas áreas de atención.

Cuál es su opinión sobre el Sistema Nacional de Información Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre, en adelante SNIFFS, es este viable? Ha sido transparente y eficiente su desarrollo? Que problemas enfrenta? Que labor podría realizar el PFSI para colaborar en la consolidación de un SNIFFS ejecutable, confiable y útil para el sector forestal peruano?

Hallazgos

- El SNIFFS es una plataforma de información requerida por todas las actores vinculados al sector forestal, tanto públicos como privados, por instituciones internacionales y gobiernos extranjeros preocupados por el tema de la ilegalidad forestal en el Perú, pese a ello, no ha podido ser puesto en ejecución y la desconfianza en la información generada por el Estado con respecto a la movilización de recursos forestales, sigue vigente.
- Existe un proceso llevado a cabo desde el año 2009 por la Dirección General de Información y Control Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre, (DGICFFS) que pertenece a la Dirección General Forestal, la cual ha sido poco transparente con la sociedad civil para mostrar los objetivos alcanzados en 05 años, y los motivos por los cuales no se ha podido, no solo, disponer de un sistema eficiente de información y control forestal ya en ejecución, sino enfrentar de manera radical el problema cotidiano de la ilegalidad que involucra el transporte y manejo de productos forestales en la mayoría de ríos, carreteras, puertos, centros de transformación y centros de comercialización de productos forestales a lo largo del país.
- A eso habría que sumar, que este proyecto es uno de los que más interés y apoyo ha recibido de instancias y oficinas de cooperación internacional. A pesar de ello, aun no tenemos elementos tangibles y monitoreables de mejora.
- No es público aun, como se va articular este SNIFFS con los Gobiernos Regionales y sus políticas de Gestión de la Información y Control Forestal.
- Otro punto a tomar en consideración es que en este caso y a diferencia de otras áreas públicas del sector forestal, esta área no ha tenido una alta rotación de personal en sus oficinas base, con lo cual no es viable el argumento de la alta rotación de personal como motivo para la falta de resultados.

Conclusión

- Pese a que este proyecto ha recibido una gran atención técnica y financiera en los últimos años, no tiene un producto funcional, que pueda generar información transparente para todos los actores involucrados en el sector forestal, y tampoco generar garantía en la legalidad del aprovisionamiento de productos forestales a nivel nacional e internacional.
- Efectivamente desde la sociedad civil no conocemos el trabajo realizado por el equipo técnico a cargo del SNIFFS. No ha habido muchas exposiciones al respecto. Falta de comunicación? En 05 años no tener un producto real o visible va más allá de la falta de comunicación. No hay información de cuanto se ha invertido en su desarrollo, ni cuanto valdrá su puesta en ejecución.
- Quien lo administrara finalmente, más allá de lo que la normativa dispone? Tomemos en

consideración que lo debería de implementar y gestionar, el mismo equipo que ha trabajado en su desarrollo hasta hoy, con las debilidades ya expuestas en los últimos años.

- Es este un escenario confiable para poner en operación este proyecto?
- Con respecto al cronograma, este se ha vulnerado y extendido en más de una oportunidad, y hasta hoy no tenemos claro si se podrá ejecutar en los tiempos previstos, ya que se desconoce si el producto trabajado hasta hoy, servirá como insumo de alto valor para la implementación final del SNIFFS. Para contrastar estas interrogantes se podría pedir la opinión de otras contrapartes como las autoridades regionales, otras oficinas del Estado involucradas en el proceso, el PFSI y Perú Bosques por separado.
- Con respecto a la existencia de un PIP para el SNIFFS, hasta donde existe información, existía la intención de gestionar fondos directamente desde la Autoridad Forestal para no depender de otras instituciones, pero me parece que finalmente se direcciono esta iniciativa, hacia darle sostenibilidad en el tiempo al SNIFFS. Se desconoce resultados finales de esta iniciativa.

Recomendaciones

- Reestructurar la visión de lo que se espera como producto final para el SNIFFS en términos de transparencia, tiempos de ejecución y calidad del producto.
- Con los productos avanzados hasta la fecha, contratar los servicios de una o varias empresas privadas especializadas en este tema, para que diseñen un producto SNIF, que permita entre otras cosas, tener información actualizada y accesible de las áreas y empresas productoras, volúmenes solicitados y autorizados, volúmenes movilizados, derechos e impuestos pagados o adeudados, personas o empresas sancionadas por malas gestiones administrativas, un nivel de interconexión entre los puestos de control que sean necesarios, que permita verificar la legalidad del origen y traslado de los productos forestales.
- No es de conocimiento público los productos avanzados hasta la fecha, pero a nivel de oficinas del Estado se conoce que la DICFFS ha realizado la prueba de un prototipo de software de seguimiento de trozas desde Iquitos hasta Lima, con resultados desconocidos. Esto pertenece a la etapa I de las 05 etapas que conforman según la DGFFS, la estructura del SNIFFS. De acuerdo a DGICFFS, el SNIFFS consta de un módulo de control que se basa en la siguiente estructura. Este texto esta tomado de la información actual de la pagina web sobre el SNIFFS
 - Mapeo de procesos (situación actual y rediseño)
 - Arquitectura (diseño del sistema, modelamiento de redes, prototipo)
 - Desarrollo de solución informática (software)
 - Prueba funcional
 - Implementación nacional
- Actualmente, se ha concluido con la etapa I, que contempló el mapeo de procesos de la situación actual de los mecanismos de administración y control, y su rediseño. Asimismo, utilizando parte del rediseño se ha avanzado con el desarrollo un prototipo de software que incluye los procesos de rastreo de arboles desde su declaración en el documento de gestión forestal y su transporte hasta la planta de transformación. Próximamente se estará convocando a la licitación para el desarrollo de la solución informática (etapa 3). <http://dgffs.minag.gob.pe/index.php/modulo-de-control>
- Esta plataforma, que podría ser temporalmente administrada por un consorcio privado como se ha dado en otros países, bajo un contrato llave en mano de instalación y ejecución con fechas y productos verificables, podría ser compartida por múltiples instituciones públicas y privadas, así como establecer una relación directa con los usuarios forestales para la realización de sus trámites y consultas respectivas, de manera progresiva.
- Existen algunas experiencias de este tipo a cargo de empresas como SGS SA (Suiza), como

modelos de mayor complejidad seguir la página web siguiente:

<http://www.sgs.com/forestry-monitoring>

- páginas de empresas que solo desarrollan software como:
 - SCS Global Services <http://www.scsglobalservices.com/es>
 - Cengea Solutions Inc. <http://www.cengea.com/industry-solutions/forestry/contractor.htm>
 - Helveta Ltd <http://www.helveta.com/>

- Es importante que ese sistema tenga un equipo de seguridad informática, de preferencia privado, 24/7 que le permita soportar ataques informáticos en cualquier momento y recuperarse lo más rápido posible de algún daño o afección. Así mismo, sería interesante tener un servidor espejo rentado en otro espacio físico, que permita tener la información registrada, no solo en los data centers propios de la Autoridad Forestal, sino también una copia de toda la información y los procesos realizados en otro Data Center, que pueda ser utilizado en caso de algún desastre natural o daño provocado contra las instalaciones físicas del SNIFFS.

- Finalmente, hoy con el avance de la tecnología de la información, este sistema podría no solo proveer información y control, sino proveer un espacio de promoción en la red para las actividades vinculadas a la producción, conservación, y provisión de servicios ambientales que se generan en el país.

- Con respecto al papel del PFSI en el soporte al SNIFFS, este dependerá de la decisión que tome la Autoridad Forestal para su implementación. Si se entrega su desarrollo al sector privado, podría colaborar con el financiamiento, para el fortalecimiento de capacidades en los equipos humanos de la autoridad central y regional. Así mismo, podría colaborar con el sector privado y las comunidades nativas, para el mejor entendimiento y aprovechamiento de la herramienta a desarrollar.

- Si el modelo a desarrollar por la Autoridad Forestal, pasa por el desarrollo interno del SNIFFS, en ese caso, podría acompañar el proceso como en los últimos años, pero sería recomendable que varíe su estrategia hacia un modelo de cooperación, que transparente la información sobre el proyecto, acepte colaboraciones de la sociedad civil e imponga un marco de cumplimiento de entregables y fechas que pueda ser monitoreable por todos los interesados.

- PFSI ha dado soporte técnico a través de especialistas proveídos por el USFS para la conformación de lo avanzado. También ha posibilitado viajes al exterior de los funcionarios de la DGGFS, para que puedan apreciar otros sistemas de información. Ha facilitado reuniones a nivel nacional con distintas autoridades para la socialización y el recojo de opiniones en sus avances. Ha facilitado talleres de información técnica sobre los diferentes componentes que conforman el proyecto SNIFFS. Finalmente, habría soportado financieramente esta iniciativa, aunque este es un dato que la sociedad civil no conoce con exactitud y quedaría por verificar.

- PFSI se apropió de este proyecto y su coordinación institucional, por lo cual no ha habido espacio para el apoyo de otros cooperantes que se interesen de participar en este desarrollo.

Cuál es su opinión con respecto al enfoque de la cooperación del USG en el sector forestal. Ha sido muy técnico? Ha estado sincronizado con la realidad peruana?

- La cooperación norteamericana tiene varios programas de soporte a las autoridades peruanas en el sector ambiental y forestal. Si bien es cierto, que cada programa tiene objetivos y metas individuales, sería interesante evaluar si es necesario la presencia en las mismas regiones de diferentes programas, o se pueden estructurar de tal forma que se organice la administración en una sola oficina, la parte técnica en otra oficina y la ejecución sea llevada a cabo por una tercera oficina, de manera tal, que cada oficina se especialice en su ámbito, interactuando solo con los actores afectos, y no exista una suerte de duplicidad de funciones o de doble presencia del personal de la cooperación norteamericana, que termina generando sobre expectativas o expectativas equivocadas en las personas, más allá de

aumentar probablemente el número de procesos internos y gastos logísticos. Esto en el ámbito del sector forestal.

- Básicamente desde la aparición del Proyecto Perú Bosques (PPB), ha habido una duplicidad aparente para el ciudadano promedio, de identificar cual es el rol de cada una de las oficinas o proyectos de la cooperación norteamericana. En un comienzo la presencia de PFSI fue más notoria en la ejecución de determinados desarrollos que luego fue compartiendo con el PPB, incluso a medida del avance de la conformación del equipo de este, se empezaron a hacer evidentes diferencias en las visiones de ejecución en espacios públicos, quedando la sensación que no había una total coordinación para la ejecución de lo proyectado. Esto no se generó por una falta de interés o una voluntad de boicotear lo actuado por PFSI, sino a mi parecer, porque el PPB obedecía a parámetros determinados de cumplimiento que no siempre coincidían con la forma de trabajo y los compromisos ofrecidos por PFSI.
- Esta situación se ha ido estabilizando, pero ha generado esa visión, posiblemente errada y no correctamente comunicada, por parte de la cooperación, de que habría dos agencias de la cooperación americana trabajando en el sector forestal, con algunos problemas de coordinación.
- Para las instituciones públicas y organizaciones del sector esta situación es más clara, en el sentido de la separación de instituciones, pero aun no del todo precisa, sobre a quién acudir con mayor oportunidad de recibir soporte o financiamiento para los proyectos disponibles.
- Con respecto a la orientación en el sector forestal, esta ha sido básicamente técnica, ha estado orientada a proyectos puntuales y de baja sostenibilidad que usualmente soportan una determinada iniciativa, no buscan transversalidad. Sería interesante evaluar la posibilidad, de tener un canal virtual y/o físico de cooperación permanente con la sociedad civil en su conjunto, para que exista un vínculo más permanente, más allá de los desarrollos especiales que el sector requiere.
- A mi parecer el Gobierno central y los regionales tienen fondos para realizar las mejoras que requieren. La cooperación debería de haberlos capacitado en preparar Proyectos de Inversión Pública (PIP) para acceder a fondos disponibles del tesoro público, los cuales serían monitoreados en base a resultados por las autoridades de control del Estado. Así se podría lograr una búsqueda de resultados más efectivos para el uso del dinero. Lo mismo con los Gobiernos Regionales que también pueden acceder a estos fondos. Además existen una serie de fondos ejecutables de instituciones multilaterales dirigidos básicamente a cooperar con las autoridades forestales para mejorar la gestión pública.
- Sin embargo, son pocos los fondos que se han dirigido a la sociedad civil para mejorar sus capacidades de gestión y monitoreo, así como a Comunidades Nativas y al sector empresarial privado. A mi parecer, son estos los que al final ejecutarán todos los cambios en la normativa, serán sujetos de los nuevos sistemas de monitoreo y control, deberán mejorar su eficiencia productivas e innovar para ser sostenibles, y deberán tener en claro por qué optar por el uso sostenible del bosque y su manejo de manera legal para no incurrir en faltas o delito. Por lo tanto, también requieren de las misma o mayor atención en temas puntuales de capacitación en este sector.
- Finalmente, la sincronía con nuestra realidad, parte por haber realizado las evaluaciones respectivas del sector, levantar la necesidad de sus actores y proporcionar soluciones de acuerdo a las posibilidades del ofertante. Tengo entendido que este trabajo se realizó luego de la firma del APC con EEUU., y quedaría ponerlo en marcha.

De qué manera PFSI puede responder a estos retos. Que otros enfoques podría abordar? Que acciones de cooperación podría priorizar?

- PFSI, realizo al comienzo de sus actividades, una serie de evaluaciones y propuestas que se vinculaban a las necesidades que tenía el sector en ese momento, esta cooperación ha perdido consistencia y direccionamiento hacia el logro de objetivos relevantes y específicos, que propongan los cambios que requiere el sector. Hoy se les aprecia más como un facilitador logístico de las iniciativas de turno, y no cooperando en conjunto con las Autoridades Forestales, y otras instituciones, para llevar

adelante procesos de implementación que involucren avances significativos para el sector.

- Pienso que PFSI podría cooperar en los procesos más importantes, ofreciendo una especie de matriz de alternativas, a la manera de un banco de propuestas, que involucren experiencias previas de la institución y de otros stakeholders, que puedan agilizar la toma de decisiones de las autoridades a nivel regional y nacional.
- Bajo este modelo, PFSI podría valerse de sus capacidades internas o convocar propuestas de entidades altamente especializados, que puedan adaptarse a la realidad nacional, y que ayuden no solo al sector estatal, sino también a la mejora de las capacidades del sector privado, las comunidades nativas y los otros actores que requieran ser fortalecidos, en tópicos como legislación comparada, innovación, investigación, manejo forestal privado y comunitario, capacidades en gestión empresarial entre otros requerimientos que podría poner en valor con su concurso. La ejecución de estos programas se realizarían en coordinación con las oficinas técnicas locales, a través de una oficina diferente, especializada en la ejecución, monitoreo y control de proyecto e iniciativas de cooperación.
- En caso de que PFSI siga operando bajo el modelo actual, se recomienda incorporar en su Plan de Acción – Plan de Monitoreo de Desempeño, metas que puedan ser monitoreadas de manera permanente, ligadas a las inversiones realizadas, a través de una oficina interna de Evaluación y Monitoreo.

Es la situación actual del sector capaz de ser abordada y enfrentada solo con cooperación técnica, o requiere de decisiones a nivel político que permitan efectivizar y hacer sostenibles las políticas de cooperación?

- Es definitivo que para llevar a cabo la implementación de cada uno de los proyectos en los cuales la Cooperación del USG está involucrado, ya sea a través del PFSI, o los otros programas de cooperación vigentes, se necesita que el GOP, a través de las Autoridades Forestales regionales y nacionales, se comprometan en el desarrollo de los mismos.
- Así mismo, se requiere de un compromiso político al más alto nivel de gobierno, para que el GOP no solo centre su atención en las necesidades básicas e inmediatas del sector forestal o en mejoras normativas, sino que asigne recursos y trabaje en un programa de largo plazo de fortalecimiento de capacidades.
- Finalmente todo esto debe estar basado en un diseño estratégico completo, que tenga como origen a la Política Forestal Nacional, en donde se puedan establecer y conocer con claridad los objetivos, prioridades y procedimiento de gestión, que el Gobierno en sus diferentes niveles, llevara a cabo para la mejora de la gestión estructural del sector forestal.

A. ACRONIMOS

APC	Acuerdo de Promoción Comercial
ARA	Autoridad Regional Ambiental
DAR	Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
CCNN	Comunidades Nativas
CITES Silvestre.	Convención Sobre el Comercio Internacional de Especies Amenazadas de Fauna y Flora Silvestre.
DGFFS	Dirección General Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre
DICFFS	Dirección de Información y Control Forestal y De Fauna Silvestre
EEUU	Estados Unidos De América

GOP	Gobierno del Perú
MEF	Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas
MINAGRI	Ministerio de Agricultura
OSINFOR	Organismo de Supervisión de Los Recursos Forestales y de Fauna Silvestre
PFSI	Iniciativa del Sector Forestal Peruano
POA	Plan Operativo Anual
PrPr	Predios Privados
SNIF FS	Sistema Nacional de Información Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre
SPde	Sociedad Peruana de Ecodesarrollo
USG	Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América

U.S. Agency for International Development
Av. La Encalada s/n, Santiago de Surco
Lima, Peru