

The Forestry Support Program (FSP) is managed jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and Office of International Cooperation and Development (OICD), with funds provided by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Bureau for Research and Development (R&D) through its Office of Environment and Natural Resources (ENR).

This report was commissioned by the USDA Forest Service, Office of International Forestry, Forestry Support Program (FSP), whose primary mission is to provide technical assistance to USAID Bureaus and Missions and the U.S. Peace Corps. Funds for this report originated from the Office of Analysis, Research and Technical Support (ARTS), Division of Food, Agriculture and Resources Analysis (FARA) of the Africa Bureau of USAID. The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the conference participants and do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the USDA Forest Service or USAID.

**Proceedings of a Conference on:
Non-Governmental Organizations and Natural Resource Management in Africa**

Prepared by: Laura Mullen and William Helin



Forestry Support Program



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service



United States Agency
for International
Development



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of
International
Cooperation and
Development

Abstract

A two day conference was convened that focussed on the theme USAID/NGO effectiveness in implementing natural resource management in Africa. A diverse group of participants represented U.S. and African NGOs, USAID, UNDP, World Bank, CIDA, Peace Corps, US Forest Service, and consulting firms. Key issue areas were discussed both in small and large group sessions. They included: 1. USAID/NGO NRM Priorities, 2. Sustaining Improvements in NRM, 3. Increasing Pluralism in African Civil Society, 4. Increasing the Impact of NGOs in NRM, and 5. The Mechanics of the USAID/NGO Relationship. Based on these discussions, participants then reviewed what they felt to be most crucial and what next steps should be taken.

Résumé

Une conférence de deux jours a été organisée sur le thème de l'efficacité de l'USAID/ONG dans l'application de la GRN en Afrique. Les participants représentaient des Organisations Non Gouvernementales Américaines et Africaines, l'Agence Américaine pour le Développement International (USAID), le Programme des Nations Unis pour le Développement (PNUD), la Banque Mondiale, l'Agence Canadienne pour le Développement Internationale (ACDI), le Corps de la Paix, le Service Américain des Eaux et Forêts et des firmes de consultation. Les thèmes principaux ont été discutés en petits groupes et séance plénière. Les débats ont porté notamment sur: 1. Priorités de l'USAID/ONG dans la Gestion des Ressources Naturelles (GRN), 2. Le soutien des Améliorations dans la GRN, 3. L'accroissement du pluralisme dans la société civile Africaine, 4. L'accroissement de l'efficacité des ONG dans la GRN, et 5. Les mécanismes des relations USAID/ONG. A l'issue de ces discussions, les participants ont ensuite examiné les points jugés les plus cruciaux et les mesures à prendre par la suite.

Preface

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), as part of its analytical agenda, is reviewing its effectiveness in working with NGOs to implement natural resource management (NRM) in Africa. This activity has four components: 1. a background study, including an annotated bibliography and issues/priorities papers, 2. a conference, 3. field data collection, and 4. synthesis of analysis.

These proceedings are for the conference held November 23 and 24, 1992 in Washington, DC and they follow the same general format as the conference agenda (Appendix A). The keynote address is followed by background information. Five key issue areas and the questions associated with each issue area are then presented. These areas were identified by key USAID staff and the authors of the issues/priorities papers. It was decided that addressing these five issues would bring us closer to understanding how to improve the USAID-NGO institutional relationship.

Conference participants were organized into five small groups and each was given a key issue area around which to focus. After analyzing the issues each group reported their findings to the large group. Major findings for each issue are included in the executive summary and are presented in full in the section entitled Small Group Reports. The small group reports are in the same form in which they were presented, with only a few minor changes made for clarity.

Following the small group reports is a section entitled Next Steps. Again, conference participants were asked to break into small groups. This time they discussed items they felt most needed addressing (from the indepth issues analysis that took place the day before) and gave recommendations on how these selected items could be addressed. Participants were also asked to give input to what they thought would be the next logical steps to follow in this analysis. The results from this task are found in condensed form in the executive summary.

The last items in these proceedings are the appendices. Appendix A is the conference agenda and Appendix B is a listing of conference participants.

Préface

Dans le cadre de son programme d'analyse, l'Agence Américaine pour le Développement International (USAID) réexamine son efficacité dans ses rapports de travail avec les Organisations Non Gouvernementales (ONG) dans l'exécution de la GRN en Afrique. Le programme porte sur quatre composantes: 1. Une étude préliminaire y compris une bibliographie annotée et des documents relatifs aux sujets.(les thèmes et priorités); 2. une conférence; 3. La collecte des données sur le terrain; et 4. Une synthèse des analyses.

Ces documents portant sur la conférence tenue les 23 et 24 Novembre, 1992 à Washington, DC. Ce rapport suit le même format que l'ordre du jour de la conférence (Voir Annexe A). Le discours principal par a été suivi par des informations de base sur les quatre parties de l'analyse. Cinq sujets principayx ont été alors discutés. C'était des sujets identifiés par les principaux agents de l'USAID et les auteurs des documents sur les sujets et priorités. Il a été décidé qu'en abordant ces cinq sujets cela nous rapprocherait de la possibilité d'une amélioration des rapports institutionels entre l'USAID et les ONG.

Les participants ont été répartis en cinq petits groupes et chaque groupe devant se concentrer sur un sujet principal. Après examen des sujets chaque groupe présente ses résultats à l'assemblée générale. Les principales conclusions sur chaque sujet sont incorporés dans le résumé exécutif et aussi présentées dans leur totalité dans la section: "Rapports des petits Groupes de travail".

Après les rapports de petits groupes vient une section intitulée "Etapas Suivantes". Là encore les participants ont été invités à se scinder en petits groupes. Cette fois, ils vont se pencher sur des points principaux qui, selon eux ont besoin d'être examinés à partir des analyses approfondies de la veille et de faire des recommandations sur comment peut on aborder ces points. Plus tard, il leur a été demandé de suggérer ce qui selon eux pourrait être les étapes logiques à suivre dans cette analyse. Cette section est également résumée dans le résumé exécutif.

Les derniers éléments de ces délibérations portent sur les annexes. Annexe A représente l'ordre du jour de la conférence. Annexe B présente la liste des participants.

Acronyms

APEC/RADI	-	Agence Panafricaine d'Etudes et de Conseils/ Réseau de Développement Intégré
ARTS	-	Analysis Research and Technical Support
BSP	-	Biodiversity Support Program
CARE	-	Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc.
CDIE	-	Center for Development Information and Evaluation
CIDA	-	Canadian International Development Agency
CODEL	-	Coordination in Development, Inc.
ENR	-	Environment and Natural Resources (R&D Bureau)
FARA	-	Food Agriculture and Resources Analysis
FFP	-	Office of Food for Peace
FHA	-	Food and Humanitarian Assistance (USAID Bureau)
FSP	-	Forestry Support Program
GEF	-	Global Environmental Facility
KENGO	-	Kenya Energy Non-Governmental Organizations' Association
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organizations
NRM	-	Natural Resources Management
PACT	-	Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc.
PVC	-	Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation (FHA Bureau)
PVO	-	Private Voluntary Organization
R&D	-	Research and Development (USAID Bureau)
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development
USDA	-	United States Department of Agriculture
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Program
WLI	-	World Learning, Inc.
WRI	-	World Resources Institute
WWF	-	World Wildlife Fund

Table of Contents/Sommaire

Executive Summary	1
Keynote Address	8
Background Information	9
Sommaire Exécutif	11
Allocution Principale	18
Informations de Base	19
Key Issue Areas/Principaux Sujets and Small Group Reports/Rapports des Groupes de Travail	21
Next Steps/Etapes Suivantes	39
Appendices	
Conference Agenda/Ordre du Jour.	A1
Conférence Participants/Participants à la Conférence	B1

Executive Summary

Background

As part of USAID's analytical agenda, the Africa Bureau's NRM Unit is examining ways to strengthen the relationship between USAID and NGOs so that they can better implement natural resources management. As part of this effort the conference entitled "USAID-NGO Effectiveness in Implementing Natural Resource Management in Africa" was recently conducted. The Forestry Support Program of the USDA Forest Service hosted the conference. The conference was co-financed by ARTS/FARA, R&D/ENR., and the USDA Forest Service Tropical Forestry Program.

Two publications were assembled prior to the conference. The first, *Non-governmental Organizations and Natural Resources Management in Africa: A Literature Review*, includes 150 literature abstracts and 135 additional citations on the subject. The second publication, *Non-governmental Organizations and Natural Resources Management in Africa: A Discussion of Issues and Priorities*, contains three papers, each looking at NGOs doing NRM work in Africa from a different perspective. The authors, Jonathan Otto, William Booth and Carolyn Njuki discussed issues and perspectives of the topic from three different viewpoints: 1. U.S.-based NGOs (PVOs), 2. African NGOs, and 3. International organizations (especially UNDP and the World Bank).

Attendees

The conference was attended by a diverse group active in NRM, each of whom had been specifically invited to assist ARTS/FARA/NRM in its analysis. U.S. PVO representation included CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Africare, World Wildlife Fund, Church World Service, World Learning, Inc., and World Vision. U.S. PVO consortium invitees included Private Agencies Collaborating Together (PACT), INTERACTION, Coordination in Development (CODEL), Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) and PVO-NGO/NRMS Project (a consortium of CARE, WWF and WLI). Four African national NGOs and two African regional NGOs (KENGO and Agence Panafricaine D'etudes et Conseils Reseau Africain de Development Integre [APEC/RADI]) were represented.

A number of offices within USAID were represented. While the focus was on strengthening the institutional relationship between USAID and NGOs, other donors were invited to enrich the debate. They included: United Nations Development Program, specifically Africa 2000 Network and GEF/Small Grants Programme; Canadian International Development Agency, both the Natural Resource Division and the Canadian Partnership Branch; and the World Bank, External Affairs/NGO Division. U.S. governmental partners included the USDA Forest Service/International Forestry and the Peace Corps. Several consultants active in the area of NRM were also participants.

Although there was great diversity in the group, there were others not present who could have added another dimension to the conference discussions. These include African government officials and USAID Mission representatives.

.. /

Expected Outcomes

Expected outcomes of the conference were:

- * Agreement on key issue areas in the USAID-NGO institutional relationship;
- * Key identifiable elements for success and;
- * Next steps and actions for improving the effectiveness of the USAID-NGO relationship related to NRM in Africa.

The central question around which the conference focussed was: So as to better help African resource users, how can we reset the stage to help create a more powerful relationship between USAID and NGOs?

Key Issues

Conference participants were asked to form five small groups and each group was given a key issue area around which to focus. The issues were all considered of equal priority. The groups were requested to review the issue areas; to decide if the right questions were being asked; to reach agreement on "what we know now" about the issue; and to identify what else we need to know. The groups were then asked to present their results to the rest of the conference participants. Each of the issue presentations is summarized below. The expanded presentations are in the small group reports section.

The five key issues discussed include:

- * USAID/NGO NRM Priorities
- * Sustaining Improvements in NRM
- * Increasing Pluralism in African Civil Society
- * Increasing the Impact of NGOs in NRM
- * The Mechanics of the USAID/NGO Relationship

Issue Area - USAID/NGO Priorities

The first issue area dealt with USAID/NGO priorities and the following questions were asked: 1. How should NRM programming be set within a given country? and 2. What are the main policies and practices at the national government level that constrain NGOs in NRM activities?

The definition of NRM is variable and often country specific. This should be taken into consideration when developing NRM programs. All interest groups should be involved in priority setting and programming. Local people and the natural resources that are essential to their way of life or livelihood should be considered first when determining priorities. These priorities should then be integrated with broader environmental concerns, "resources are larger than the river in front of the house." Finally, resource users should be educated to the broader environmental concerns that affect them.

NRM programming should not only be looked at on a country by country level but also on a regional level. Natural resources and natural resource problems are not politically bounded, therefore, programming and implementation should not be politically bounded.

NRM programs must meet the needs of the people and have long-term sustainability. Take the example of the farmer who expands his agricultural fields by clearing the forest because he needs to feed his growing family. If it becomes necessary to protect the forest for more global reasons then the farmer must be given alternative means to support his family. This may be in the form of providing him with seed to grow a crop for profit or with fertilizer to help increase his crop yields. The farmer must also be educated as to why it is essential to protect the forest.

Policies and practices that are constraining NGOs in NRM activities are many. NGO effectiveness is greatly limited by the current registration and fiscal regulation required. Some national governments have been slow to "open up" to NGOs because they fear they will be competing for development funds and for trained people. NRM activities are often greatly constrained by resource ownership questions. Who actually benefits from a specific NRM program? Land tenure and resource access need to be evaluated prior to any project implementation. Countries need to have an updated written plan for managing their natural resources. Current national government NRM policies and practices are often outdated and are often environmentally exploitative.

Finally, USAID's overall role in NRM programming is not to make the decisions but to encourage dialogue and to give support via technical assistance and resources.

Issue Area - Sustaining Improvements in NRM

The second issue area focused on sustaining improvements in NRM. Questions asked were: 1. What capacities do international and national NGOs need to support improvements in NRM? and 2. What approaches will NGOs need to support NRM improvement?

It was emphasized that the definition of an NGO needs to be flexible. This is obvious when one looks at the existing array of NGOs. There are local, national and international NGOs, each working at different levels and with different target areas.

Small, local-level NGOs are the key to sustaining improvements in NRM. For USAID to best assist local NGOs it is more efficient to work through an intermediary, such as a national or international NGO. The current links between local, national and international NGOs should be strengthened. All NGOs should be better trained in monitoring techniques so that they could modify projects, if need be, to improve NRM.

The best approach NGOs can take to support NRM improvements is to work with people (extension agents) that have an indepth knowledge of the local social structure. NGOs become more effective if they take advantage of indigenous knowledge. Communities should be approached through their "social system" (values, mentality and organization), rather than through policy, economic or technical themes.

Educating people to NRM's importance is a critical step. Environmental education should begin at the primary level and informal education should also take place for those not in school.

Issue Area - Increasing Pluralism in African Civil Society

Increased pluralism in African civil society was the next issue tackled. The main question asked was, how will increased pluralism impact NRM policies and practices? Pluralism was defined as an increased participation in decision making. It is difficult to generalize about pluralism in Africa because of the great diversity there. The group summed up their thoughts with the quote "We neither know what we know nor do we know what we don't know."

Pluralism, in general, is a benefit to NGOs. It has provided an environment for the creation of more NGOs and for the strengthening of existing NGOs. It gives the opportunity for more diversity of activities, it enables NGOs to raise issues in the political agenda and it has enabled women's organizations to emerge. NGOs are freer to work on cross-cutting issues such as food security, population pressures, and desertification. Those countries attempting pluralism currently get preferential treatment, especially in terms of funding.

The general thought is that increased pluralism means more NGOs which then means better NRM. But increased numbers of NGOs does not mean positive changes will automatically take place in NRM. NGOs and local communities can be a great help in the implementation of sound natural resource management, and in the development process in general, but national governments and donor agencies must be willing to include them in the planning process. There also needs to be a system of proper accountability among NGOs for them to remain credible and criteria should be developed under which a donor would choose which NGOs to work with. Roles and responsibilities of NGOs need to be more clearly defined.

USAID has been effective in providing training, education, motivation, funding, and institutional strengthening to African governments and to international (and sometimes national) NGOs. USAID has provided an increased awareness of NRM problems and USAID's strategic long-term planning and programming process is promoting better NRM practices. However, USAID needs to further incorporate the successes from indigenous NRM practices into their programs. Because of the immense diversity of cultures and political and economic systems in Africa, programs need to have greater flexibility so that they can better address the needs of people and the environment.

Issue Area - Increasing the Impact of NGOs in NRM

The fourth group looked at the issue of increasing the effectiveness of NGOs in NRM. The questions put forth to spur discussion were: 1. What monitoring and evaluation strategies will improve measurement of impact? and 2. How can we scale up the impact of NGO, NRM innovation?

The group made a distinction between monitoring project outputs and measuring project impact. Monitoring impacts is a long-term process and more critical because it verifies if our strategies in NRM are appropriate and if NRM projects are having the long-term positive impact that is desired. Most NGOs, presently, do not have the means or the institutional commitment to do the monitoring and evaluation that is required of them.

Monitoring and evaluation needs to be thought of as a positive process that will benefit NGOs by showing them when they are doing good development work. The reason most NGOs are currently doing monitoring and evaluation is because it is a requirement in donor contracts. When NGOs are shown the importance of monitoring and evaluation then they will begin to institutionalize it. NGOs have an

informal "gut feel" process of evaluating their effectiveness but this needs to be standardized enough to be able to analyze NRM programs' effectiveness and to be able to relay program impacts to donor agencies and to other NGOs. Often times, the donors themselves do not know the best way to monitor and evaluate a project or which indicators really relate to long-term impact.

If monitoring and evaluation is done for external reasons then it is usually not as appropriate (realistic) as it would be if it was developed internally. NGOs would like to stop feeling "policed" and want to have more say in the development of monitoring and evaluation requirements. At the same time, donor agencies would like to know if their money is being well spent. It is evident that the current process of just counting simple outputs is not providing the information needed. There is currently no monitoring and evaluation "package" or methodology available to assist NGOs and donors in the process.

Scaling up (increasing, spreading) the impact of NGO, NRM innovations can be accomplished by better understanding the process of diffusion of ideas and technology. There is a need to know how much information dissemination is occurring now and why behaviors change or do not change once information is received. Collaboration between NGOs seems to be an effective way of spreading innovation. Other methods include exchanges of staff and sharing of information through workshops and newsletters. This should be increased between all levels of NGOs, between donors, and between NGOs and donors.

Issue Area - The Mechanics of the USAID/NGO Relationship

The final issue area dealt with the mechanics of the USAID/NGO relationship. Questions were: 1. What works well for both sides in the USAID/NGO relationship?, 2. What are the dysfunctional aspects of the USAID/NGO relationship? What needs improvement? and 3. How can these improvements be made?

There is an inherent inequality between USAID and NGOs where the donor is often calling the shots. Additionally, we continually fail to learn lessons from our past experiences. USAID is currently dominating the priority setting of NRM and is too accountable to the outputs of individual projects. To alleviate these problems there should be greater fostering of independence of NGOs. A few believe that some ground has been lost on what once was a good partnership between USAID and NGOs and, if this is true, an attempt should be made to turn things around and to start improving the relationship again.

Funding mechanisms that were felt to work well include Umbrella Grants, direct grants to local NGOs, Operational Program Grants, and Endowments. Of course, each of these mechanisms has both positive and negative aspects. Umbrella Grants eliminate the need for local NGO registration but the primary recipient of the grant still needs to be registered and is held accountable to USAID's administrative requirements. The primary recipient can serve as a buffer between USAID and local NGOs. There are registration and administrative burdens associated with direct grants to local NGOs. Operational Program Grants allow for greater independence but they have a minimum cost sharing requirement of 25%. They are being used less these days in favor of Umbrella Grants. Endowments allow greater freedom in funding because the money is given up front (in the local currency) and the recipient can invest the money while working on the project. Conditionalities of endowments are unclear, for instance, what are different NGOs evaluated on? This group had not had enough experience with endowments to rate their effectiveness.

It is difficult to determine which supporting services are beneficial and to know how best to keep these in place. The PVO/NGO NRMS project was felt to be very effective but this project has not received funding for a second phase. An incubator type of project should be further analyzed to ascertain its effectiveness. Its goal is to support a broad range of NGOs by helping them develop their infrastructure. USAID can, and should, in conjunction with NGOs, try to change government policy that is detrimental to NRM.

The dysfunctional aspects of the USAID/NGO relationship included both USAID and NGOs having hidden agendas and both lacking flexibility and directness. USAID is often weak in their understanding of local conditions but yet they still want to control programs. This can keep local NGOs (who often are more aware of local conditions) from running the programs themselves. When NGOs are trusted to be more autonomous, they have more power to get the job done.

USAID brings with it many administrative requirements which cause local NGOs to "change" themselves too much by trying to fit into the system. Instead of "changing" local NGOs it would be wiser to go through intermediary NGOs. In this case, USAID can take advantage of its successful relationship with U.S. PVOs by having them serve as intermediaries.

Next Steps

After the five groups gave their presentations it was time to assess what had been accomplished at the conference and to decide what the next steps should be. The group was challenged to be radical in their thinking when it came to giving ideas for improvements that could be made to help USAID become more effective in strengthening NGO's ability to implement NRM.

Conference participants were again organized into small groups. Each individual was to share what stood out for them as most crucial in light of the key issues discussions and to give recommendations as to how those crucial elements could be fixed or improved. How could the USAID/NGO relationship be strengthened? The groups were also asked what they thought should be the next logical step in the four part analysis. if resources were available what would the group recommend be done.

Replies to the task follow:

- * Hold regional meetings to bring USAID and NGOs (both national and international) together to exchange ideas and experiences and to become more transparent to each other.
- * Have USAID and NGOs look at specific projects and identify key areas where flexibility is needed.
- * Build coalitions of NGOs within countries and provide capacity building services.
- * Provide seed money to NGOs so they can research their needs for long-term NRM planning.

- * Give support to local NGO networks so they can continuously have an open dialogue for information exchange. Information exchange should continue to be increased between USAID, international NGOs and national NGOs.
- * Use a filter, such as a liaison officer, between USAID and NGOs to cushion the interface.
- * Organize a structured gathering of lessons learned from past experience of USAID and NGOs working together in NRM.
- * Encourage NGOs to take responsibility in educating USAID staff to local conditions.
- * Pull together knowledge on technical requirements for sustainability.
- * Have NGOs and resource users participate in national environmental planning exercises.
- * Attempt to make USAID documents more readable.

Conference Impressions

Many participants said they liked the composition of the group, both in terms of African representation and gender, and that it was one of the best collections of people on the subject. The exchange of information and openness of discussion were also cited as positive points, as was USAID's concern to bring NGOs together to share ideas and experiences in order to improve its activities.

Some participants would like to have seen a clearer focus on NRM and believed that the expertise of the group was not tapped on this subject. Others suggested that the discussion should have been between USAID Missions and NGOs and should have taken place in regional meetings. In addition, it was suggested that the experiences and approaches USAID has taken could have been shared more fully.

According to the participants, major issues and questions not addressed include, for example, the possibility of USAID to have more administrative flexibility; NRM technical matters (too much time was spent on the "big picture"); and approaches (what is and is not working).

Keynote Address

On behalf of the Africa Bureau, welcome. I would like to extend a very special welcome to those who came from overseas and especially the African participants. I also wish to thank Tim Resch, of our office, and William Helin and others in the Forest Service for organizing this conference.

This conference is funded out of the Food, Agriculture, and Resource Analysis Division of the Africa Bureau and is part of the Natural Resource Management (NRM) Analytic Agenda. USAID is using scarce resources to fund this conference so, obviously, USAID believes that its relationship with NGOs is important, especially in enabling conditions for better NRM in Africa.

The U.S. Congress and USAID cooperatively created the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) to address difficulties in program implementation and accomplishment of goals. USAID's programs are supposed to have "people level impacts", such as, increases in resource user productivity and income. To help us achieve this goal and address natural resource management in the DFA, USAID needs to know how to more effectively work with NGOs.

This workshop is not designed to build a relationship between USAID and NGOs. That relationship is already existing. Rather, we need to understand the current constraints to working with NGOs. We need to look at lessons learned and we need to find out how USAID can do a better job. The Africa Bureau is especially interested in how to improve devolution of authority to local organizations and communities' levels. NGOs are an existing link that can relate knowledge in NRM to different levels.

I look forward to the next few days and I expect that we will all learn a lot from each other. Again, welcome.

Gary Cohen
AFR/ARTS/FARA
USAID

Background Information

The keynote by Gary Cohen provided a great foundation for me to build on. What I would like to do is provide more background which, I hope, will help you understand why we asked you to participate in this conference.

Before I do, first I want you to do this; imagine the most powerful institutional relationship possible between USAID and NGOs that would then be applied to assisting African resource users. I want you to dream big, how we could reset the stage. That's the direction I want us to go, the path I want us to follow...

We all know there are many groups and organizations involved in natural resource management, not only USAID and NGOs. Other donors and African governments are two of most note. We should not neglect these important players and that is why we have with us representatives from the World Bank, UNDP, and CIDA. At the same time, we should remember our current focus on the USAID/NGO relationship.

When the Africa Bureau of USAID asked us to initiate this analysis, I was interested, and also intrigued, in how we could best accomplish this research. I knew I did not have all the questions, let alone the answers, and decided at the onset to convene a consultative group representing various organizations. You are that group. Put another way, you are a panel of experts, each bringing a unique skill that we would like you to share with us. I challenge you to help us ask the right questions and seek answers to them.

In advance of this conference we decided to have studies done that could help serve as a "spring board" for discussion and to identify information gaps. T.R. Ramanathan was asked to complete a literature review and, with the time and resources available, I think he did a great job. My feeling, however, is that there are many documents not yet captured in this review. We would like for you to take some time within the next two weeks and help us identify any other pertinent information that should be incorporated. I wish to stress that sharing this information will help all of us. I hope you will take the time to review and comment on this document and have these comments back to me by mid-December.

Three people were asked to prepare brief issues and priorities papers, from three perspectives: 1) US-PVOs, 2) African NGOs, and 3) International Organizations. They were done by Jonathan Otto, Carolyn Njuki, and William Booth. It is our intention that each of the three papers will spur new ideas.

From these two days of discussion, proceedings will be produced. Then what? This analysis has been broken into four parts and, after tomorrow, we will have completed the first two parts. Based on the background studies and this conference, additional analysis will be done, this will be part three, and it could involve literature reviews, field-based surveys in Africa, or focussed case-studies, to name only three options. However, we have deliberately not yet decided what will be done and I am asking you to help provide direction to this analysis. This brings me back to you, this consultative group. It also brings me back to the key question for this conference: How can we reset the stage to help create a more powerful relationship between USAID and NGOs, so we can better help African resource users?

William Helin
Forestry Support Program
USDA Forest Service

Sommaire Executif

Historique

Dans le cadre de son programme d'analyse, l'Agence Internationale pour le Développement des Etats Unis d'Amérique (USAID), par le biais de sa Division d'Analyse de la GRN, est en train de reviser l'efficacité de l'agence dans le renforcement de ses relations de travail avec les Organisations Privées de

Volontariat (PVO) et Organisations Non Gouvernementales (ONG) dans l'exécution de la GRN en Afrique. A cette fin, s'est tenue récemment une conférence intitulée "Efficacité de l'USAID/ONG dans l'Exécution de la GRN en Afrique". La conférence a été organisée sous l'égide du Programme de Recherche & Développement sur l'Environnement de la Division de Soutien Forestier du Ministère de l'Agriculture des Etats Unis (USDA). Le co-financement par ARTS/FARA (Recherche et Analyse Support Technique)/Alimentation Agriculture et Analyse des Ressources), Recherche & Développement/ Environnement Programme de Support Forestier, et le Programme Forestier Tropical du Ministère de l'Agriculture des Etats Unis.

Deux publications ont été assemblées avant la conférence. La première, "Les Organisations Non Gouvernementales et la GRN en Afrique: Une revue littéraire répertorie des résumés sur 150 oeuvres et 135 annotations bibliographiques sur le sujet. La seconde publication; "Les Organisations Non-Gouvernementales et la GRN en Afrique: Une discussion des thèmes et des priorités" comporte trois documents qui analyse chacun à partir de perspectives différentes le travail des ONG dans la GRN en Afrique. Les auteurs, Jonathan Otto, Williams Booth et Carolyn Njuki argumentent sur les thèmes et perspectives à partir de trois différents points de vue: 1. les ONG et PVO basés aux USA; 2. les ONG Africaines; 3. les organisations internationales (en particulier le Programme des Nations Unis pour le Développement PNUD, et la Banque Mondiale).

Participants

Les participants représentaient divers groupes s'occupant de la question de la GRN, chacun de ces groupes ayant été spécialement invité à assister ARTS/FARA/NRM dans son programme d'analyse. Au nombre des Organisations Privées Américaines de Volontariat, il y avait: CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Africare, World Wildlife Fund, Church World Service, World Learning, Inc. et World Vision. Les consortia des PVO Américaines invitées comprenaient: PACT, CODEL, BSP, PVO/NGO/NRMS Project (un consortium de CARE, WWF, et WLI). Quatre (4) des ONG Nationales Africaines et deux (2) ONG Régionales (KENGO et l'Agence Africaine d'Etudes et Conseils Réseau Africain de Développement Intégré) ont été représentées.

Un certain nombre de services à l'intérieur de l'USAID ont été représentés. Bien que l'accent soit sur le renforcement des rapports institutionnels entre l'USAID et les ONG, d'autres donateurs ont été invités pour enrichir les débats. Parmi eux, il y avait le Programme des Nations Unies / Afrique 2000 et GEF/Small Grants Programme; les deux divisions des ressources Naturelles et du Partenariat (ONG) de l'Agence Canadienne pour le Développement, la Division des Affaires Exterieurs ONG de la Banque Mondiale et plusieurs autres partenaires du gouvernement Américain, à savoir le Service Forestier du

Ministère de l'Agriculture Américain, le Corps de la Paix, de même que plusieurs consultants s'occupant de GRN.

Malgré la grande diversité du groupe, Il n'en demeure pas moins que d'autres groupes auraient pu apporter une autre dimension aux travaux de la conférence. Il s'agit notamment des représentants de gouvernements Africains et des représentants des missions de l'USAID.

Resultats Escomptes

Les résultats escomptés de la conférence étaient:

- * Accord sur les principaux sujets des relations institutionnelles entre l'USAID et les ONG;
- * Les éléments principaux identifiables de réussite; et
- * Etapes Suivantes et Actions pour améliorer l'efficacité des relations USAID-ONG dans le domaine de la gestion des ressources naturelles (GRN) en Afrique.

La principale question au centre des travaux de la conférence était: Afin de moins aider les utilisateurs des ressources africaines, comment pouvons nous arriver à contribuer à créer des rapports plus puissants entre l'USAID et les ONG?

Sujets Principaux

Les participants à la conférence ont été invités à constituer cinq petits groupes et chaque groupe devait se concentrer sur un sujet principal donné (Voir Annexe B). Il a été souligné que les sujets avaient tous une priorité égale, l'ordre de numérotage n'avait aucune importance. Les équipes ont eu à examiner les sujets; à décider si les questions avancées étaient des questions appropriées; d'arriver à un consensus sur: " Ce que nous savons à présent" à propos du thème et d'identifier "Ce que nous devons savoir d'autre". Les groupes ont par la suite présenté leurs conclusions à l'audience générale. Chacun des thèmes présentés est résumé ci-dessous. La version détaillée des présentations est incluse dans la section "Rapports des Groupes de Travail".

Les cinq (5) sujets discutés sont:

- * Priorités des relations USAID/ ONG dans la GRN
- * Le soutien des améliorations de la GRN
- * L'accroissement du pluralisme dans la société civile en Afrique
- * L'accroissement de l'impact des ONG dans la GRN
- * Les mécanismes des relations USAID/ONG

Domaine du sujet- Priorités USAID/ONG

Le premier sujet débattu a porté sur les priorités de l'USAID/ONG et les questions suivantes ont été soulevées: **1.** Comment établir le programme de GRN dans un pays donné? et **2.** Quelles sont les politiques et pratiques du gouvernement national qui gênent les activités des ONG dans la GRN ?

La définition de GRN est variable et spécifique souvent à chaque pays. Ceci devra être pris en considération lors de la conception des programmes de GRN. Toutes les parties intéressées doivent être associées à l'établissement des priorités et à la programmation. En déterminant les priorités, il faudrait tenir compte de la population locale et des ressources naturelles essentielles à leur mode de vie. Ces priorités devront alors être incluses dans les sujets plus vastes d'environnement, "les ressources sont plus grandes que la rivière en face de la maison". Finalement les utilisateurs des ressources doivent être éduqués sur les plus grands sujets d'environnement qui les affectent.

Les programmes GRN ne devraient pas seulement être perçus sur la base des pays individuellement mais également au niveau régional. Les ressources naturelles et leurs problèmes ne dépendent des frontières politiques, par conséquent, leurs programmes et leur exécution ne devraient pas l'être non plus.

Les programmes de GRN doivent répondre aux besoins des habitants et doivent avoir un soutien durable à long terme. Prenons par exemple du cultivateur qui agrandit son terrain ou son champ en défrichant une partie de la forêt pour répondre aux besoins alimentaires de sa famille qui s'accroît en nombre. S'il devient impératif de protéger la forêt pour des raisons d'environnement global, alors d'autres moyens doivent être mis à disposition du cultivateur pour satisfaire les besoins de sa famille. Ceci peut être sous forme de semence pour un produit commercialisable ou de fertilisant pour un rendement supérieur de ses cultures vivrières. Le cultivateur devra être éduqué sur la nécessité de protection des forêts.

Nombreuses sont les politiques et les pratiques qui retardent les activités de GRN. L'efficacité des ONG est largement affectée par les réglementations et fiscalité d'inscription actuellement en vigueur. Certains gouvernements craignant la compétition pour les fonds de développement et le partage des cadres compétents ont été très lents à s'ouvrir à l'idée des ONG. Les activités de GRN sont souvent contraintes à cause de la question sur l'appartenance des ressources. Qui bénéficie réellement des programmes de GRN? Avant l'exécution de tout projet, il faut vérifier l'état des titres fonciers et l'accès aux ressources. Chaque pays doit disposer d'un plan d'exécution, remis à jour pour la GRN. Les politiques et pratiques actuelles de GRN sont souvent dépassées et sont souvent dérivatives à l'environnement.

Finalement, dans le programme de GRN, le rôle général de l'USAID n'est pas de prendre des décisions mais d'encourager le dialogue et d'aider par les ressources et l'assistance technique.

Domaine du sujet: Soutien des améliorations de la GRN

Le second thème a porté sur le soutien des améliorations de la GRN. Les questions ont portées sur: **1.** De quelles capacités les ONG Nationales et Internationales ont-elles besoin pour soutenir les améliorations de la GRN? et **2.** Par quelles approches peuvent-elles donc maintenir ces améliorations?

On a insisté sur le fait de la flexibilité de la définition des ONG. C'est une évidence quand on considère la gamme des ONG existantes. Ces ONG existent aux niveaux local, national et international, travaillant à des niveaux différents avec des objectifs différents.

Les petites ONG au niveau local constituent les piliers de soutien à l'amélioration de la GRN. Pour mieux aider les ONG locales, il est plus efficace pour l'USAID d'opérer par des intermédiaires, comme les ONG nationales ou internationales. Il faut aussi renforcer les liens de travail entre les ONG locales elles-mêmes, avec les nationales et les internationales. Une meilleure formation en technique de suivi et d'évaluation est nécessaire pour toutes les ONG, afin de pouvoir opérer des modifications de projets si besoin est et d'améliorer aussi la GRN.

La meilleure approche des ONG pour soutenir les améliorations de GRN est de coopérer avec des agents ayant une connaissance approfondie de la structure sociale locale. Les ONG deviennent plus efficaces si elles profitent des connaissances locales. Il faudrait mieux s'adresser aux communautés à travers leur système sociale (valeurs, mentalité, et organisation), plutôt qu'à travers la politique, l'économie ou la technologie.

Il est très important d'éduquer la population sur la signification de la GRN. L'éducation sur l'environnement doit commencer au niveau du primaire et doit être donnée également à ceux qui ne sont plus à l'école.

Domaine du sujet: Accroissement du pluralisme dans la société civile en Afrique

On a abordé ensuite la question du pluralisme accru dans la société civile Africaine. La question principale posée a été: L'impact d'un pluralisme accru sur la politique et les pratiques de GRN ? La définition du pluralisme retenue est celle d'une participation accrue dans les prises de décisions. En raison de la grande diversité locale il est difficile de généraliser sur le pluralisme en Afrique. Le groupe de travail a conclu ses travaux par cet adage: "Nous ne savons jamais ce que nous connaissons, et ne savons non plus ce que nous ne connaissons pas".

En général, le pluralisme est un avantage pour les ONG. Cela favorise un environnement pour la formation d'ONG et le renforcement de celles déjà existantes. Le pluralisme a suscité une diversité accrue dans les activités et a permis aux ONG de soulever des questions au niveau politique et il a aussi débouché sur l'émergence des organisations féminines. Les ONG sont plus libres d'aborder des sujets de préoccupations majeures telles que la sécurité alimentaire, la démographie et la désertification. Les pays qui font l'expérience du pluralisme reçoivent un traitement préférentiel, en particulier en termes de financements.

On pense généralement que pluralisme signifie davantage d'ONG, ce qui à son tour, veut dire une meilleure GRN. Mais, une multiplication des ONG ne signifie pas que des changements positifs se feraient automatiquement dans la GRN. Les ONG et les communautés locales peuvent être d'une grande assistance dans l'exécution d'une gestion efficace des ressources naturelles et en général dans le processus de développement, mais les gouvernements et les agences donatrices doivent accepter de les inclure dans le processus de planification. Il est aussi nécessaire d'avoir un bon système de contrôle entre les ONG afin qu'elles soient crédibles; de même, il est nécessaire de développer des critères pour le donateur dans son choix des ONG. Il faut clairement définir les rôles et les responsabilités des ONG.

L'USAID, a démontré son efficacité dans l'assistance à l'éducation, la motivation, le financement et le renforcement des institutions auprès des gouvernements Africains et des ONG internationales (quelques fois nationales). L'USAID a favorisé une sensibilité accrue sur les problèmes de la GRN, sa stratégie de planification à long terme et ses programmes assurent une meilleure promotion des pratiques de la GRN. Cependant, Il faut que dans ses programmes, l'USAID tienne compte des réussites obtenues

par des pratiques locales de GRN. L'immense diversité des cultures, des politiques et des systèmes économiques, exige une plus grande flexibilité dans les programmes axés sur les besoins de la population et de l'environnement.

Domaine du sujet: Accroissement de l'impact des ONG dans la GRN

Le quatrième groupe de travail s'est penché sur le sujet de l'accroissement de l'efficacité des ONG dans la GRN. Les questions avancées pour susciter le débat étaient: **1.** Quelles sont les stratégies de suivi et d'évaluation susceptibles d'améliorer la dimension de l'impact? **2.** Comment pouvons nous élever le niveau d'impact des ONG et l'innovation de la GRN?

Une distinction a été faite entre suivi des résultats de projet et la mesure de l'impact du projet. Le suivi de l'impact est à la fois un processus à long terme et plus sérieuse car il permet de vérifier si nos stratégies de GRN sont appropriées et si les projets de GRN produisent l'impact positif à long terme souhaité. Présentement, la plupart des ONG ne disposent pas de moyens ou de la volonté institutionnelle pour exécuter les suivis et les évaluations attendus d'elles.

Les processus de suivis et d'évaluations doivent être perçus comme un processus positif pour les ONG car c'est un moyen pour elles de se rendre compte si elles font un bon travail de développement. Les ONG procèdent actuellement à des suivis et évaluations simplement parce-que c'est un critère des contrats des donateurs. Une fois que les ONG seront sensibilisées sur l'importance du suivi et évaluation, cela deviendrait un procédé institutionnalisé. Les ONG ont un "sens informel" du processus d'évaluation de leur efficacité qu'il faudra harmoniser suffisamment pour pouvoir analyser l'efficacité des programmes de la GRN et pouvoir communiquer l'impact du programme aux agences donatrices et autres ONG. Bien souvent les donateurs eux-mêmes ne connaissent pas les meilleures façons de mener le suivi et l'évaluation d'un projet ou quels indicateurs traduisent vraiment l'impact à long terme.

Si le suivi et l'évaluation sont menés pour des raisons externes, ceci n'est généralement pas approprié comme si c'était fait pour des raisons internes. Les ONG aimeraient ne plus se sentir "contrôlées" et voudraient participer davantage dans la mise au point des critères du suivi et de l'évaluation. En même temps les donateurs aimeraient savoir si leurs fonds sont bien dépensés. Il est évident que le processus actuel de simplement compter les résultats ne fournit pas les informations nécessaires. Il n'existe pas actuellement de "système" de suivi et d'évaluation ou de méthodologie pour aider les ONG et les donateurs dans ce domaine. On peut obtenir un accroissement de l'impact des ONG, des innovations de GRN par une meilleure compréhension du processus de dissémination des idées et de la technologie. Il nous faut connaître le niveau de dissémination d'information en cours et pourquoi les habitudes changent ou ne changent pas une fois l'information reçue. La collaboration entre les ONG elles mêmes représente un moyen efficace de propager les innovations. On peut procéder par d'autres méthodes telles que les échanges de cadres et d'information grâce aux ateliers et aux communiqués.

Une telle pratique doit s'accroître entre les ONG à tous les niveaux et entre les donateurs aussi.

Domaine du sujet: Les mécanismes des relations USAID/ONG

En dernier lieu, on a traité des mécanismes des relations entre l'USAID et les ONG. Les questions avancées sont: **1.** Quels sont les aspects positifs des relations USAID/ONG? **2.** Quels sont les aspects négatifs? Que faut-il améliorer? et **3.** Comment ces améliorations peuvent être faites?

Il y a toujours eu une inégalité dans les relations USAID/ONG lorsque c'est le donateur qui a toujours pris les décisions. De plus, nous manquons toujours d'apprendre de nos expériences passées. Actuellement l'USAID joue un rôle déterminant dans le choix des priorités de la GRN et est trop responsable des résultats de chaque projet. Pour éviter une telle situation, il faudrait promouvoir davantage l'indépendance des ONG. Certains pensent que l'USAID a perdu un peu de terrain dans ce qui était de son temps du bon partenariat entre l'USAID et les ONG. Si tel est le cas, il faudrait retourner la situation et essayer d'améliorer les relations à nouveau.

Les mécanismes de financement jugés fonctionnels comprennent notamment les "dons parapluies", les dons directs aux ONG locales, les dons pour les programmes opérationnels et les donations. Evidemment chacun de ces mécanismes a ses aspects positifs et négatifs. Dans le cadre des dons parapluie les ONG locales ne sont pas tenues de s'inscrire, exceptée la principale ONG bénéficiaire du don et qui est tenue de remplir les conditions administratives de l'USAID. Cette principale ONG peut servir de d'intermédiaire entre l'USAID et les ONG locales. L'attribution des dons directes aux ONG locales comporte des devoirs administratifs et d'inscription. Les dons pour des programmes opérationnels permettent une plus grande indépendance mais nécessitent un partage minimum des coûts de 25%. Ce procédé est de plus en plus abandonné ces jours-ci au profit des "dons parapluies". Les dotations comportent une plus grande liberté de financements, car l'argent est versé immédiatement (en monnaies locales) et le bénéficiaire peut investir les fonds tout en travaillant sur le projet. Les conditionnalités ne sont pas claires dans le cas des dotations, par exemple sur quels bases se fait l'évaluation des différentes ONG? Les participants ne possèdent pas assez d'expérience dans le domaine des dotations pour se prononcer sur leur efficacité.

Il est difficile de déterminer quels services de support sont avantageux et de savoir comment les maintenir en place. Le projet PVO/ONG GRN a été jugé très efficace mais pas reçu de financement pour une seconde phase. Un projet du genre incubateur doit être davantage analysé pour en juger de son efficacité. L'objectif serait d'assister un grand nombre d'ONG à développer leurs propres infrastructures. L'USAID peut et doit, avec la collaboration des ONG tenter de changer les politiques gouvernementales dérivées à la GRN. Il a été question de savoir combien les services d'appui sont actuellement accessibles aux ONG locales.

Les aspects négatifs des relations entre l'USAID et les ONG comprenaient le fait que, aussi bien que l'USAID et les ONG ont des objectifs cachés et manquent de flexibilité et précision. L'USAID est souvent faible dans ses connaissances des conditions locales, cependant cette agence voudrait toujours contrôler les programmes. Ce qui pourrait empêcher les ONG locales (qui sont plus souvent mieux informées des conditions locales) de poursuivre elles mêmes ces programmes. Quand on accorde plus d'autonomie aux ONG, elles ont plus d'autorité pour accomplir le travail.

Les nombreuses conditions administratives requises par l'USAID entraînent les ONG locales à trop se transformer lorsqu'elles essayent d'être conformes au système. Au lieu de "transformer" les ONG locales, il serait plus sage de passer par l'intermédiaire de leurs homologues. Dans ce cas précis, l'USAID, grâce à ses bonnes relations de travail avec les organisations américaines privées de Volontariat peut les utiliser comme des intermédiaires.

Etapas Suivantes

Après les présentations des rapports des cinq groupes de travail, il fallait évaluer à présent ce qui

a été accompli dans les travaux et décider des étapes suivantes. Les participants ont été encouragés à être radical dans leur approche quant aux idées susceptibles de rendre l'USAID plus efficace dans le renforcement de la capacité des ONG à gérer les ressources naturelles.

Les participants ont été répartis à nouveau en petits groupes de travail. Chacun devant exprimer ce qu'il a retenu de plus crucial à travers les débats et faire des recommandations sur comment résoudre ces problèmes cruciaux et les améliorer. Comment les relations USAID/ONG peuvent être renforcées? Les participants ont été également invités à dire ce qui, selon eux, serait l'étape logique suivante dans le cadre de cette analyse en quatre parties. Si les ressources étaient disponibles quelles seraient leurs recommandations sur ce qui doit être fait.

Voici les réponses à cette tâche:

- * Organiser des rencontres régionales entre l'USAID et les ONG (nationales et Internationale pour procéder à des échanges d'idées et expériences et se familiariser davantage.
- * L'USAID et les ONG doivent analyser des projets spécifiques et identifier les domaines principaux exigeant de la flexibilité.
- * Mettre en place des consortia nationaux d'ONG et fournir des services de renforcement de capacité.
- * Procurer des fonds de base aux ONG leur permettant de mener des analyses de besoins de la planification à long terme en matière de GRN.
- * Appuyer les réseaux d'ONG locales afin qu'elles puissent continuellement échanger ouvertement des informations. L'échange d'information doit se poursuivre de manière accrue entre l'USAID, les ONG nationales et internationales.
- * Utiliser un agent de liaison entre l'USAID et les ONG afin de faciliter les contacts.
- * Organiser une collecte structurée des leçons apprises à partir des expériences de l'USAID et des ONG travaillant ensemble sur la GRN.
- * Encourager les ONG à prendre la responsabilité d'éduquer le personnel de l'USAID à s'adapter aux conditions locales.
- * Consolider les connaissances sur les techniques de maintien
- * Amener les bénéficiaires et utilisateurs des ressources à prendre part à la planification de programmes nationaux sur l'environnement.
- * Tenter de rendre les documents de l'USAID plus faciles à lire.

Allocution Principale

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je vous souhaite la bienvenue au nom de notre bureau Afrique, et surtout à nos participants venus d'Afrique. J'aimerais aussi remercier Mr Tim Resch, de notre bureau et Mr William Helin et tous ceux qui sont venus du Service Forestier, pour l'organisation de cette conférence.

J'aimerais faire un bref historique sur les relations USAID/ONG. Actuellement, la plupart des fonds de l'USAID est dépensé à l'étranger dans les missions bilatérales. Cette conférence est financée par FARA du bureau Afrique et fait partie du programme d'analyse de la Gestion des Ressources Naturelles (GRN). L'USAID consacre des ressources maigres à l'organisation de cette conférence, ce qui prouve évidemment l'importance que nous accordons à nos relations avec les ONG, particulièrement dans le but de créer de meilleures conditions de GRN en Afrique.

Le fond de développement pour l'Afrique a été créé par le Congrès Américain afin de répondre à des difficultés antérieures dans l'exécution et la réalisation des objectifs des programmes. Les programmes de l'USAID sont supposés avoir un niveau d'impact sur la population, par exemple, l'on doit parvenir à des augmentations dans les revenus et la productivité des bénéficiaires des ressources. Nous croyons que, pour y parvenir l'USAID doit savoir comment travailler plus efficacement avec les ONG.

L'objectif de cet atelier n'est pas d'établir des rapports entre l'USAID et les ONG. Ces rapports existent déjà. Au contraire, nous devons examiner les contraintes existant actuellement dans le travail avec les ONG. Nous devons examiner les leçons retenues du passé et il nous faut chercher comment l'USAID peut faire un meilleur travail. Le bureau Afrique s'intéresse particulièrement à accorder plus d'autorité aux structures de base. Les ONG, sont un ensemble de liens capables de communiquer des informations de GRN à différents niveaux.

J'entrevois avec anticipation les quelques prochains jours et j'ai l'espoir que nous apprendrons tous quelque chose l'un de l'autre durant cette rencontre.

Encore une fois soyez les bienvenus.

Gary Cohen
AFR/ARTS/FARA
USAID.

Information de Base

L'allocution principale de Gary Cohen me donne une bonne base de départ pour mon intervention. J'aimerais simplement vous apporter davantage d'informations qui, je l'espère, vous permettront de comprendre pourquoi vous êtes invités à cette conférence.

D'abord, je vous invite à imaginer les rapports institutionnelles les plus puissants entre l'USAID et les ONG, qui pourraient servir à aider les utilisateurs des ressources en Afrique. Je vous invite à faire un grand rêve sur comment nous pouvons restructurer la scène. Voilà la direction sur laquelle je vous engage...

Nous savons tous qu'en dehors de l'USAID et des ONG, il existe de nombreux groupes et organisations qui s'occupent de gérer les ressources naturelles. Les gouvernements Africains et d'autres donateurs sont deux des principaux de ces groupes. Nous ne devons pas négliger ces acteurs importants et c'est pour cette raison que nous avons avec nous des représentants de la Banque Mondiale, du PNUD/Nations Unis et de l'ACDI. En même temps, nous ne devons pas oublier notre attention présente sur les relations USAID/ONG.

Lorsque le bureau Afrique de l'USAID nous a demandé d'initier cette analyse, j'étais intéressé et à la fois intrigué par comment mieux accomplir cette recherche. Je savais que je ne dominais pas toutes les questions, encore moins les réponses et j'ai décidé de convoquer un groupe consultatif représentant diverses organisations. Vous êtes ce groupe là. Autrement dit, vous êtes un groupe d'experts dont chacun dispose de compétences uniques que nous aimerions voir partager avec nous. Vous avez le défi de susciter chez nous les questions appropriées et leurs réponses.

Avant cette conférence nous avons décidé de réaliser des études qui pourraient servir de base de discussions et pour identifier les lacunes dans les informations. Mr Ramanathan a été chargé de procéder à un examen de la bibliographie et vu le temps et les ressources disponibles, j'ai le sentiment qu'il a fait un bon travail. Je pense cependant qu'il y a beaucoup de documents qu'il n'a pas pu couvrir. Nous vous demandons entre autres, au cours des deux prochaines semaines, de nous aider à identifier n'importe quelle information pertinente qui devrait faire partie de cette analyse. J'aimerais insister sur le fait que un tel échange d'informations nous aidera tous. Je pense que vous aurez le temps de revoir ce document et de me faire parvenir vos commentaires vers la mi-Décembre.

Nous avons confié à trois personnes de préparer de brefs mémoires sur les sujets et les priorités à partir de trois perspectives: **1.** Les Organisations Privées Américaines de Volontariat, **2.** Les ONG Africaines et **3.** Les organisations internationales. Ce travail a été accompli par MM Jonathan Otto et William Booth et Mme Carolyn Njuki. Nous pensons que de nouvelles idées pourraient sortir de chacun de ces trois mémoires.

Quelle sera la suite de ces deux jours de discussions? Cette analyse a été divisée en quatre parties et après demain on aura terminé les deux premières parties. Selon les informations de base et d'après les travaux de cette conférence, il sera nécessaire de procéder à une analyse complémentaire dans la troisième

partie qui pourrait porter sur des révisions bibliographiques, des recherches sur le terrain en Afrique, ou des études de cas précis, pour ne citer que trois options. Néanmoins, nous nous sommes abstenus délibérément de décider de ce qui sera fait et je vous invite à contribuer à donner une direction à cette analyse. Je parle bien de vous en tant que groupe consultatif. Cela me ramène également à la question principale de cette conférence, à savoir, comment restructurer la scène pour aider à créer des rapports plus puissants entre l'USAID et les ONG, des rapports permettant de mieux aider les utilisateurs des ressources en Afrique.

William Helin
Programme d'appui Forestier
Service Forestier Département Américain de l'Agriculture

Key Issue Areas (as presented to the small groups)¹ and Small Group Reports²

Issue Area 1: USAID/NGO NRM Priorities

1. How should NRM programming be set and implemented within a given country?

Sub-Questions

- * Which stakeholder should be involved? In what roles?
- * What is the appropriate process?
- * What keeps this from happening in its best form?
- * Who should be the lead implementer and why?
- *³

2. What are the main policies and practices at the national government level that constrain NGOs in NRM activities?

Sub-Questions

- * What policies and practices are NGO-specific?
- * What policies and practices relate to natural resource use?
- * What policies and practices constrain resource user groups?
- * What can USAID and other donors do through policy reform programs to reduce these constraints?

¹ Each small group was given one key issue area. The key issue areas were determined in advance of the conference and were based on input from the three issues/priorities papers and from the NRM Unit of USAID's Africa Bureau. Each small group was given the task, that, for their issue area: a) Have the right question(s) been asked? If not, fix them or add to them; b) Reach agreement on "what we know now" re: the major question(s); c) Identify what else we need to know re: the major question(s); and d) Summarize and prioritize the key points from your discussion.

² Each Key Issue Area (as presented to the small group) is followed by the Small Group Report. This is the summary of the small group's discussion. This report also incorporates major topics that came out when the small group reported out to the large group.

³ The questions related to issue areas were thought of as a partial list and conference participants were asked to add questions if they felt those listed did not fully explore the issue.

Small Group Report - Issue Area 1: USAID/NGO NRM Priorities

- 1. How should NRM programming be set within a given country?**
- 2. What are the main policies and practices at the national government level that constrain NGOs in NRM activities?**

Are they the right questions? One addition was made to the first question. NRM programming should not only be looked at on a country level but should also be looked at on a regional level. Natural resources and natural resource problems are not politically bounded. Programming and implementation, then, should not be politically bounded.

What we know about NRM programming:

- o NRM means different things to different people. Programs should be flexible enough to include different ideas and definitions of NRM. Situation-specific circumstances determine programming needs.
- o All interest groups should be involved in priority setting and programming. Interest groups are defined as all people or groups that would be affected by an NRM project. If all interest groups are not known or if all groups are not aware of NRM plans, then they should be sought out and informed and involved in priority setting.
- o NRM priorities should come from resources and people dependent on these resources. These priorities should then be integrated with broader environmental priorities.
- o Resultant NRM programs should also include educating resource users as to why there are other environmental priorities. "Resources are larger than the river in front of the house".
- o Programs must meet needs of people and incorporate a long term vision of sustainability. An example is a farmer who depends on clearing the forest to supply food to his growing family. If it is necessary to protect the forest for more global reasons then the farmer must be given alternative means to support his family. This may be in the form of providing him with seed to grow a crop for profit. The farmer must also be educated as to why it is essential to protect the forest.
- o The appropriate process to NRM programming needs to include an assessment of the critical resource and then, knowing what is critical, needs to focus on achievable objectives.
- o Successful NRM projects have the common thread of all having had strong leadership at the NGO or implementation level.

What we know about the policies and practices at the national government level that constrain NGOs in NRM activities.

- o The legal status of NGOs (registration and fiscal regulation required) has limited their effectiveness in many cases.
- o There has been a lack of information sharing between national governments and NGOs. This may be due to the government's fear that NGOs will compete for money and for qualified people. Because of this, governments may not allow NGOs to operate in a way that is most beneficial to the resource. Conversely, NGOs may not have made the effort to become aware of a national government's NRM plans and priorities.

Constraints can also come from policies and practices related to natural resource use.

- o The main constraint here is resource ownership. Who actually benefits from a specific NRM program? This will affect a resource users motivation and acceptance of the project. Therefore, land tenure and resource access need to be evaluated prior to any project implementation.
- o National government NRM policies and practices are often outdated and are often environmentally exploitative.

Issue Area 2: Sustaining Improvements in NRM

1. What capacities do international and national NGOs need to support improvement in NRM?

Sub-Questions

- * What technical, financial, and managerial capabilities are needed?
- * How do we account for the diversity of NGOs out there?
- * What should USAID do to assist in strengthening these capabilities?
- * How do NGOs best gain these skills?
- *
- *

2. What approaches will NGOs need to support NRM improvement?

Sub-Questions

- * What are the key elements of each approach?
How should they be prioritized?
- * How can NRM activities balance environmental concerns with increases in productivity and income?
- * How should NGOs permit/activate user group participation?
- * How can USAID assist NGOs to develop and use successful methodologies?
- * How can NGOs better tap the leadership skills and knowledge of women?
- *

Small Group Report - Issue Area 2: Sustaining Improvements in NRM

1. What capacities do international and national NGOs need to support improvement in NRM?

2. What approaches will NGOs need to support NRM improvement?

Are they the right questions? Additional questions needed to be asked to better analyze the issue.

1. What is an NGO? This definition needs to be flexible, particularly at the local level.
2. What kinds of NGOs are working in the country? There are a complex array of NGOs, each working at different levels and with different target areas.
3. What are the goals, mandates, principles and target areas of these NGOs?
4. What technical, financial and management capabilities are needed by NGOs to support improvement in NRM? This also depends on information from questions two and three.
5. How do NGOs best gain these technical, financial and management skills?
6. What should USAID do to strengthen them?

What we know about sustaining improvements in NRM:

- o Small, local-level NGOs are the key to NRM. To be effective USAID must always try to reach this level.
- o To assist local NGOs it is usually best to work through an intermediary, a national or international NGO. However, USAID should continue to try to improve their ability in working at the local level (directly with local NGOs).

What we need to know about the capacities NGOs have in supporting improvement in NRM:

- o Principles and goals of both local and national NGOs need to be determined.
- o Determine existing links between local and national NGOs in order to strengthen these ties.
- o National NGOs, with common themes and principles, can be combined.
- o NGO's need to be trained to design projects and develop proposals. They should also be trained in monitoring techniques so they can modify projects, if needed.

What we need to know about the approaches NGOs will need to support NRM improvements:

- o We should work with extension agents that have an in-depth knowledge of the local social structure.
- o We should approach the community through its social system (values, mentality and organization), rather than through policy, economic or technical themes.

VALUES MENTALITY SOCIAL ORGANIZATION	POLICY ECONOMICS TECHNOLOGY
--	-----------------------------------

- o We should ensure that priority setting for a country or a community includes local participation.
- o National governments should seek local input when formulating NRM plans.
- o Projects should be designed to address immediate needs and priorities but should also incorporate long-term NRM goals.
- o NRM is often not identified as a local priority, so we need to determine how to incorporate NRM into local priorities.
- o We should work with a variety of NGOs.
- o We must ensure that the local people are educated to the objectives of NRM activities.
- o Help local people work through their own problems by introducing NRM techniques only when requested.
- o Remember that national NGOs are not necessarily the voice of the people. There is a danger that the increased flow of money will increase corruption or self interest of NGOs.
- o Solid, older established NGOs (or institutions) that are democratic and transparent should be identified.
- o Diagnostics can be performed in a community to determine an NGOs value what is their level of input and participation in the community.
- o Use panels made up of representatives from NGOs, national governments and donors to "weed out" inappropriate projects.
- o NGO's should consolidate and make applications to USAID.

- o USAID and NGOs need to learn from experience.
- o Environmental education should begin at the primary level. Informal education should also take place for non-school age people.
- o Women (particularly autonomous women's groups) should be involved in design and implementation of projects.
- o South to south information exchange change should be facilitated.
- o Take advantage of indigenous knowledge.
- o Communications can be improved using radio/films, etc.
- o Identify methods to assist NGOs in achieving financial autonomy.

Issue Area 3: Increasing Pluralism in African Civil Society

1. How will increased pluralism in civil society impact NRM policies and practices?

Sub-Questions

- * How is the increased pluralism affecting NGOs and the NGO/donor relationship?
- * How can national NGO's work in NRM further positive changes?
- * What is the role of the international NGO in this process?
- * What is the role of USAID:
 - vis-a-vis African governments?
 - vis-a-vis international and national NGOs?
 - vis-a-vis other donors?
- * From the NGO perspective in building pluralism, what is the optimal relationship between African governments and NGOs?
- *
- *

Small Group Report - Issue Area 3: Increasing Pluralism in African Civil Society

1. How will increased pluralism in civil society impact NRM policies and practices?

Are they the right questions? An additional question was added:

1. Can NRM be formulated as a central survival issue so that it is a national priority?

What we know about increased pluralism affecting NGOs and the NGO/Donor relationship:

- o NGOs are politicized, they have constituencies to whom they are answerable.
- o Pluralism, in general, is a benefit to NGOs (increases formation/legalization of NGOs)
- o Pluralism has enabled women's organization to emerge.
- o There is still fear among NGOs that one party will continue to dominate.
- o Pluralism gives the opportunity for a diversity of activities.
- o Pluralism enables NGOs to raise issues in the political agenda and it promotes debate among various political parties.
- o NGOs can increase specialization and focus their activities.

What we need to know about increased pluralism affecting NGOs and the NGO/Donor relationship:

- o What are the country specific implications of gaining legal status?
- o What is the current control of access to capital and other resources?
- o What is the financial sustainability of NGOs?
- o What is the internal structure of individual NGOs? Some NGOs are fragile because they are formed around one individual.
- o Why are some NRM projects "successful"? These projects need to be analyzed and capitalized on.

What we know about how national NGO's work in NRM can further positive changes:

- o Those countries attempting pluralism (multi-partyism/transparency) get preferential treatment, especially in terms of funding.

- o Different donors have different understandings and definitions of pluralism.
- o Different donors react/respond differently to attempts at pluralism.
- o There will be an increased competition for funding. This can be looked at positively because it would most likely result in increased quality of projects.
- o Donors that are not government-related have more flexibility working with national organizations.

What we need to know about national NGOs work in NRM furthering positive change:

- o There needs to be a system of proper accountability among national NGOs for them to remain credible.
- o Is USAID's relationship with NGOs going to be direct or indirect (passing through national governments)?
- o There needs to be criteria developed under which any donor will choose which national NGOs to work with.

What we know about the role of the international NGO in this process:

- o There has been broader participation in more "transparent" countries. This includes an increased participation by the local population and an increased involvement at the national level by NGOs helping governments learn more about NRM.
- o NGOs play a pioneering role in some countries.
- o With increased pluralism there are more NGOs working in the cross-cutting issues (such as food security, population pressures, and desertification) incorporated in NRM.

What we need to know about the role of the international NGO in this process:

- o How can we mobilize the force of NGOs in order to have positive effects?
- o How does the country (national government and NGOs) define NRM and what methodologies are used in addressing NRM?
- o What indigenous NRM practices exist and how can we capitalize on them?

What we know about the role of USAID in relation to African governments:

- o USAID provides training, education, motivation, funding and institutional strengthening.
- o USAID is expanding networks.

What we need to know about the role of USAID in relation to African governments:

- o USAID needs to incorporate "successes" from indigenous NRM practices into their programs.
- o What are the strengths and weaknesses of individual NGOs?
- o What are the priorities/focus areas of donors?

What we know about the role of USAID in relation to international and national NGOs:

- o USAID has provided an increase in awareness of NRM problems.
- o USAID's strategic long-term planning and programming process is promoting better NRM practices.
- o USAID provides technical information and data.

What we need to know about the role of USAID in relation to international and national NGOs:

- o What should USAID's criteria be in selecting which NGOs to work with?

What we know about the current relationship between African governments and NGOs:

- o There is a more harmonious relationship between NGOs and African governments.
- o Politicalization of NGOs can be problematic.
- o The roles and responsibilities for government and NGOs should be clearly defined.
- o NGOs and governments should know the limitations in NRM work.
- o Government's should be supportive of NGOs.
- o There needs to be an appropriate delegation of authority.

Issue Area 4: Increasing the Impact of NGOs in NRM

1. What monitoring and evaluation strategies will improve measurement of impact?

Sub-Questions

- * Why do we need a monitoring and evaluation strategy?
- * How do we measure impact?
- * What data do we really need and why?
- * Why are we not getting the data we need?
- * What level of resources should be allocated to monitoring and evaluation?
- * How can we measure and value impact on local institutions (local institutions here include informal NRM rule systems)?
- * How can USAID contribute to improved NGO NRM monitoring and evaluation?
- *

2. How can we scale up the impact of NGO NRM innovations?

Sub-Questions

- * How do NGOs currently learn and adapt NRM innovations?
- * How can information exchange be encouraged and improved?
- * How can NGO collaboration in NRM be improved?
- * How can USAID work with others in the larger development community to support the knowledge transfer of innovations?
- * What is the role of the larger development community in scaling up?

Small Group Report - Issue Area 4: Increasing the Impact of NGOs in NRM

1. What monitoring and evaluation strategies will improve measurement of impact?

2. How can we scale up the impact of NGO, NRM innovations?

Are they the right questions? The group participants thought that the issue could be better clarified if additional questions were asked.

Under the lead question, what monitoring and evaluation strategies will improve measurement of impact, the following questions were added:

1. How do we ensure the linkage between monitoring and evaluation and implementation?
2. How do we go beyond indicators that measure simply outputs to indicators that instead look at impacts? Outputs are referred to here as number of trees planted, number of wells drilled, etc., while impacts refer to a change in lifestyle.
3. Who evaluates and who monitors?
4. Should all projects, at all times, be monitored? What is the cost of not capturing the lesson learned?
5. What are the objectives of the monitoring and evaluation? For example, is monitoring and evaluation to fulfill project requirements or is it to refine the project?
6. Do we need to collect data on several indicators because we do not know which ones are critical?
7. How can we institutionalize monitoring and evaluation in NGOs and how can we make it a positive process?

Questions added to the second part of this issue on "scaling up" the impact of NGO, NRM innovations follow:

1. How do people (stakeholders) learn and adopt NRM innovations?
2. How do we better understand the process of diffusion of ideas and technology?
3. How do we increase the diffusion rate of innovation? Change laws/policies? Train more staff? Create more NGOs? Increase networking/communication (videos, newsletters, workshops, word of mouth)? Partnerships funding projects? Collaboration? Is USAID willing to fund these activities?
4. Are there economies of scale in scaling up?
5. What are the opportunities/constraints in the diffusion of innovation?

What we know about what monitoring and evaluation strategies improve measurement of impact:

- o Monitoring and evaluation is a requirement and that is largely why it is done.
- o Most NGOs do not have the means to do monitoring and evaluation.
- o There is often no institutional commitment to monitoring and evaluation.
- o We know how to pass judgement through monitoring and evaluation.
- o We know how to measure outputs.

What we need to know about what monitoring and evaluation strategies improve measurement of impacts:

- o We currently do not have a monitoring and evaluation "package" or methodology.
- o What is the best way to do monitoring and evaluation?
- o What indicators are really related to impact, especially long-term impact?
- o We do not know the validity of our proxy indicators.
- o What are NGOs and other agencies doing in monitoring and evaluation?
- o How can we make monitoring and evaluation a positive learning experience?

What we know about scaling up the impact of NGO, NRM innovations:

- o We know the mechanics of information dissemination.
- o NGO collaboration is an effective way of spreading innovation.
- o We should build on experience gained in the PVO-NGO/NRMS project.
- o Collaborating and sharing of experience between donors would be beneficial.
- o South to south information exchange should be increased.

What we need to know about scaling up the impact of NGO, NRM innovations:

- o What is the natural process of information dissemination that is occurring now?
- o Why does behavior change or not change after information is spread?
- o How can a policy environment be created that encourages the formation of NGOs and community-based NRM?

Issue Area 5: The Mechanics of the USAID/NGO Relationship

1. What works well for both sides in the USAID/NGO relationship?

Sub-Questions

- * From the USAID side:
 - What funding mechanisms work well and should be replicated?
 - What supporting services work well?
- * From the NGO side:
 - What works well?
- * What are positive elements in the USAID/NGO relationship?
- *
- *

2. What are the dysfunctional aspects of the USAID/NGO relationship?

Sub-Question

- * What needs improvement?
("Open microphone")
- *
- *

3. How can these improvements be made?

- *
- *

Small Group Report - Issue Area 5: The Mechanisms of the USAID/NGO Relationship

- 1. What works well for both sides in the USAID/NGO relationship?**
- 2. What are the dysfunctional aspects of the USAID/NGO relationship? What needs improvement?**
- 3. How can these improvements be made?**

Are they the right questions? Additional questions were added:

1. What are the trends for funding NGO support in Africa?
2. Is the relationship between USAID and the NGO community one of a partnership or is it something else?
3. To what degree should the USAID/NGO relationship be driven by USAID priorities or by NGO priorities?
4. Should USAID or should NGOs be held accountable for program/project design and implementation?
5. What funding mechanism can be developed that would allow NGOs major long term design and implementation independence?

What we know now about the mechanics of the USAID/NGO relationship:

- o The total direct funding for NRM in fiscal year 1991 was 86 million dollars. How much money went to funding NGOs? What are programming trends? What do we know about the quality of programs?
- o We have lost some ground on what once was a good partnership.
- o We have failed to pay attention to lesson learned.
- o There has been an increase in "contracting" like demands coming from USAID.
- o The current relationship between USAID and NGOs is not clear. But there is an inherent inequality where donors are often calling the shots.
- o There is no apparent definition of NGO. Organizations that have government employees on their boards should not be called NGOs.
- o USAID currently dominates the priority setting of NRM and USAID's actions are politically driven. In the future, priority setting should be equally divided between USAID and NGOs.

- o USAID is currently too accountable, this accountability should be shifted to NGOs and the accountability should be shifted from administrative accountability to actual outputs.
- o Timetables need to be flexible to foster independence of NGOs.
- o Cost sharing of projects will help foster independence of NGOs.

What we know about what funding mechanisms work well and should be replicated:

- o Whatever funding mechanism that is developed needs to be flexible.
- o Umbrella Grants have different levels of design independence. They eliminate need for local NGO registration. The primary recipient of the grant still needs to be registered and is held accountable for all USAID requirements. The primary recipient can serve as a buffer between USAID and local NGOs.
- o With direct grants to local NGOs there are registration and administrative burdens. NRM objectives of U.S. PVOs may not be incorporated into local NGO projects.
- o Operational Program Grants (OPGs) allow for greater independence but they have a minimum cost sharing requirement of 25%. They are being used less these days in favor of Umbrella Grants.
- o Endowments allow greater freedom in funding because the money is given up front (in the local currency) and the recipient can invest the money while working on the project. The recipient does not have to go back to USAID every few years, it is a one time decision. The conditionalities of the endowment are unclear, for instance, what are the NGOs evaluated on? The group had not been enough experience with these to determine their effectiveness.

What supporting services work:

- o PVO Initiatives Project (Africa Bureau funded) - There was question as to whether this "worked" or not.
- o PVO/NGO NRMS Project - This project is a good example of what worked but this project has not received funding for the next phase.
- o Incubator types of projects - This type of project is to support a broad range of NGOs by helping them develop their infrastructure. Not enough is known about this type of project to "rate" it.
- o USAID can, in conjunction with NGOs, try to change government policy that is detrimental to NRM.
- o It is questionable how accessible support services are to local NGOs.

What are the dysfunctional aspects of the USAID/NGO relationship:

- o There is central versus bilateral funding. Is a centrally funded project operative in the field?
- o USAID is weak in the understanding of local conditions.
- o There already is a good link between USAID and U.S. PVOs.
- o Both USAID and NGOs tend to have hidden agendas.
- o There is a lack of continuity in the funding cycle.
- o USAID brings with it many administrative requirements. Administration is further complicated for French speaking countries.
- o It is not healthy for local NGOs to receive direct funding from USAID because the administrative requirements cause local NGOs to change too much by trying to fit into the system.
- o There is a lack of flexibility and directness by both USAID and NGOs.
- o Food For Work should only be used in special circumstances.
- o USAID often wants to control the program and this keeps NGOs from running programs themselves.
- o Some NGO, NRM programs are questionable.

What works from NGO side:

- o Projects that build on NGO experience are more successful.
- o Project designs that are a collaborative effort are more effective.
- o More priority needs to be placed on organizational infrastructure and manpower needs. USAID is more successful in doing this than it is at hands-on management.
- o Application and reporting guidelines need to be simplified.
- o When NGOs are trusted to be more autonomous, they have more power to get the job done.

Next Steps

In light of the discussion of the last day and a half:

- A. Share what stands out for you as most crucial;**
- B. What specific next steps/actions could be taken to help strengthen the USAID/NGO relationship?**
- C. If resources were available for a "study" or "workshop" or "etc.", what specifically would you recommend.?**

ACTIONS/NEXT STEPS

- * USAID/NGOs should look at specific projects and identify key areas where flexibility is needed. USAID would then look at its regulations with the thought "how can I accommodate these needs?"
- * Regional meetings to bring together USAID and NGOs every two years to exchange ideas/experiences and become more transparent to each other.
 - to allow more flexibility/mutually to bring together strengths groups have
 - compromise a need.
- * Organize a structured gathering of lessons learned on how to improve the interface between USAID/NGOs (international and national) in regards to NRM.
 - workshop
 - eg., Datex review of umbrella projects
- * Support for dialogue, mechanisms, and information exchange between three groups: USAID, international NGOs and national NGOs.
 - give resources for workshops and training programs
 - support to local NGO networks
- * Support for multisectoral, institutional capacity building of NGOs.
- * "Patient" has not yet really articulated his/her needs. Problems need to be jointly clarified. NGOs need to be clear on what they want to see different/accomplished.
- * Seed money for NGOs to research their needs-"action oriented" research for long-term NRM planning.

- * Build coalitions of NGOs within countries and provide capacity-building services through this coalition, i.e. financial management systems, etc....this would allow long-term funding/recurrent costs.
- * Need to pull together knowledge on technical requirements for sustainability..de-link from monitoring and evaluation.
 - workshops, conferences.
- * Do historical reviews of NGOs doing NRM activities (what do we know from 20 years experience?).
- * Encourage NGOs and beneficiary resource users to participate in national environmental planning exercises.
 - as conditionalities
 - as elements of design
- * Filter between USAID and NGOs to cushion interface.
 - liason officer
- * Develop guidelines for USAID officers to follow for different NGO/NRM programs-one-stop place to learn about endowments, etc.
- * Pull together all information on monitoring and evaluation of PVO programs.
- * Two entities not being able to communicate, need:
 - "understandable" USAID documents on its goals, structure, etc.
 - field visits by NGO/USAID staff to other regions to see NGO activities.
- * NGOs should take responsibility for educating USAID staff (especially at the local level).
 - more umbrella projects that enable NGOs to approach USAID.
- * Program or project to provide institutional strengthening to NGOs.
- * Regional road show on particular theme-would include monitoring for impact.
- * Immediately begin to flag umbrella projects for NGO-subject/process.
- * Africa 2000--analysis as a model and start similar project elsewhere.

Appendix A - Conference Agenda

CONFERENCE ON USAID-NGO EFFECTIVENESS IN IMPLEMENTING NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA

November 23 and 24, 1992

Holiday Inn - Arlington at Ballston
I-66 and Glebe Road 4610 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, Virginia Phone: (703) 243-9800

Expected Conference Outcomes

- * Agreement on key issue areas in the USAID-NGO institutional relationship and;
- * Key identifiable elements for success and;
- * Next steps and actions for improving the effectiveness of the USAID-NGO relationship related to natural resource management (NRM).

Conference Schedule

Monday, November 23

- 8:00 - Informal Coffee/Pastries
- 8:30 - Welcome and Introductions
- Keynote Address
- Conference Background, Expected Outcomes, and Schedule
- 10:30 - Key Issues: USAID-NGO Effectiveness in Implementing NRM in Africa
 - * Presentations of Key Issues
 - * Small Group Analysis
- 12:15 - Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 - Small Group Analysis - Continued
- 3:30 - Plenary: Key Issues - Small Group Reports
- 5:30 - Day One Closure
- Optional: Cocktails/Dinner (On Your Own)

Tuesday, November 24

- 8:00 - Informal Coffee/Pastries
- 8:30 - Plenary: Key Issues - Small Group Reports (Continued)
- 12:15 - Lunch (On Your Own)
- 1:30 - Next Steps and Actions
 - * Small Group Discussion
 - * Plenary
- 5:00 - Conference Closure

A1

U1

Appendix B - Conference Participants

Anthony Albert Adomako
Diocesan Catholic
Secretariat
P.O. Box 450
Sunyani, B/A
Ghana, West Africa
Tel 061-7379
Telex 3045 BTH 22 GH

Barbara Agonga
INTERACTION
1717 Massachusetts Avenue
Washington, D.C.
Tel 202-667-8227
Fax 202-667-8236

Achoka Awori
KENGO
P.O. Box 48197
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel 749747/748281
Fax 749382

Manzi Bakuramutsa
United Nations Development Program
Africa 2000 Network
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
Tel 212-906-5815
Fax 212-906-5493

Elizabeth Bassan
Chemonics
2000 M Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel 202-466-5340
Fax 202-331-8202

Roger Benjamin
CIDA
Natural Resource Division/
Agriculture Sector
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec
Canada KIA 0G4
Tel (819) 994-4094
Fax (819) 997-0602

John Clark
Room T-8107
The World Bank
1818 H Street
Washington, D.C. 20433
Tel 202-473-1840
Fax 202-676-0576

Gary Cohen
USAID/AFR/ARTS/FARA
Room 2941 NS
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

James Cotter
Community Economics Corporation
1616 North Fort Meyer Drive
11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22209
Tel 703-538-8336
Fax 703-528-7480

Vicki Denman
Catholic Relief Services
209 West Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201-3403
Tel 410-625-2220
Fax 410-685-1635

Nicole G. Gaymon
Africare
440 R Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel 202-462-3614
Fax 202-387-1034

Curt Grimm
USAID/AFR/DP
Room 2495 NS
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523
Tel 202-647-2943
Fax 202-647-3364

Judy Hayes-Ellison
USAID/CIDE
SA-18 Room 217B
8708 Melwood Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
Tel 301-875-4988
Fax 301-469-8562

Peter Hazelwood
GEF/Small Grants
UNDP/NGO Programme
One United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Sally Jones
USAID/PVC
Room 719 SA-8
Washington, D.C.
Tel 703-351-0224
Fax 703-351-0212

Koffi Kouakou
PVO-NGO/NRMS Project
Suite 500
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tel 202-778-9689
Fax 202-293-9211

John Michael Kramer
DATEX
1400 Eye Street
Suite 750
Washington, D.C. 20005-2208
Tel 202-789-4300
Fax 202-789-1520

Patricia Larson
World Wildlife Fund
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037-1175
Tel 202-861-8315
Fax 202-293-9211

Timothy LaVelle
USAID/FHA/FFP/AFR
Room 315 SA-8
Washington, D.C.
Tel 703-351-0138
Fax 703-351-0154

Mike McGaughey
USAID Africa Bureau/ARTS/FARA
Washington, D.C. 20532-1515
Tel 703-235-????
Fax 703-235-3805

Liberty Mhlanga
Agriculture and Rural Development Authority
P.O. Box 8439
Causeway
Harare
Zimbabwe
Tel 263-4-700099
Fax 263-4-705847 / Telex 22272 A.D.A.

Terrance Mooney
CIDA/Canadian Partnership Branch
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec
Canada K1A 0G4
Tel 819-997-7645
Fax 819-997-0602

Julia Morris
USDA Forest Service/IF
P.O. Box 69090
Washington, D.C. 20090-6090
Tel 202-205-1571
Fax 202-205-1603

Susan Mubbala
PVO-NGO/NRMS
World Learning, Inc.
Colline House
Pilkington Road, Plot 4
P.O. Box 9007
Kampala
Uganda
Tel 256-41-242429/234900
Tel 256-41-233237
Fax 256-41-231743

Kate Newman
Biodiversity Support Program
Suite 500
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037
Tel 202-778-9524
Fax 202-293-9211

Caroline Njuki
Coordination in Development (CODEL INC.)
475 Riverside Drive
Room 1842
New York, NY 10115
Tel 212-870-3000
Fax 212-870-3545

Jonathan Otto
P.O. Box 120
RFD 2
Chester, VT 05143
Tel 802-875-2672
Fax 802-875-2672

Bernard Ledea Ouedraogo
Association Internationale
Six "S"
BP 100
Ouahigouya
Burkina Faso, West Africa
Tel (226) 55.04.11
55.01.10

Tom Painter
CARE, West Africa Unit
660 First Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Tel 212-686-3710
FAX 212-696-4005

Tony Pryor
USAID/Africa Bureau
1111 N. 19th Street
Rosslyn, VA
Tel 703-235-3832
Fax 703-235-3805

Gaston Razafinanja
Church World Service
1955 West Broadway
Suite 104
Madison, WI 53716
Tel 608-222-7008
Tel 608-222-2041
Fax 608-222-2854

Tim Resch
AFR/ARTS/FARA
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-0089
Tel 703-235-3786
Fax 703-235-3805

Bonni Ricci
World Learning, Inc.
Projects International
Development and Training
1015 15th Street NW
Suite 750
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel 202-408-5380
Fax 202-408-5397

Robert Richards
Private Agencies Collaborating Together
1901 Pennsylvania Ave.
Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20006+
Tel 202-466-5666
Fax 202-466-5669

Lynn Bellard Sauls
World Vision
2201 Street NE
Suite 270
Washington, D.C. 20002
Fax 202-547-4834

Sidy Seck
Agence Panafricaine Detudes
et Consoils Reseau Africian
de Development Integre
APEC/RADI
rue 4, Zone B
Dakar BP 12.227
Senegal, West Africa
Tel 25 55 62 / 25 55 63
Fax 25 55 64

John Shores
Peace Corps
Office of Training and Program Support
1990 K Street
Washington, D.C. 20526
Tel 202-606-3100
Fax 202-606-3024

Sister Mary Ann Smith
Coordination in Development
475 Riverside Drive
Room 1842
New York, NY 10115
Tel 212-870-3000
Fax 212-870-3545

Axel Thoma
Nyae Nyae Development Foundation
P.O. Box 9026
Windhoek
Namibia, Africa
Tel 061-36327
Fax 225997

Dwight Walker
AFR/ARTS/FARA
US Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523
Tel 202-647-7622

David Williams
Private Agencies Collaborating Together
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel 202-466-5666
Fax 202-466-5669

Bob Wilson
Africare
440 R Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
Tel 202-462-3614/Fax 202-387-1034

Barbara Wycoff
World Wildlife Fund
1250 24th Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20037-1175
Tel 202-861-8315
Fax 202-293-9211

Florence Sara Zake
Catholic Relief Services
209 West Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201-3403
Tel 410-625-2220/Fax 410-685-1635

Conference Staff

William Helin
Forestry Support Program
USDA/Forest Service

Steve Joyce
Primary Facilitator
Training Resources Group

Michel Bagbonon
Translator

T.R. Ramanathan
USDA/Forest Service

Laura Mullen
USDA/Forest Service

Gretchen Merrill
USDA/Forest Service

Charles Owubah
Food Aid Management